

# **IMPROVING STUDENTS' ACHIEVEMENT IN WRITING REPORT TEXT THROUGH SEMANTIC MAPPING TECHNIQUE**

**Ivana Octaria**

**Prof. Dr. Hj. Sumarsih, M. Pd**

## **ABSTRACT**

This study deals with improving students' achievement in writing report text through semantic mapping technique. This study was conducted by using classroom action research. The subject of the research was class VIII-2 SMP Swasta UPMI which consisted of 30 students. The research was conducted in two cycles; first cycle consist of four meetings and seond cycle consists of two meetings. The data have been collecting by using quantitative and qualitative data. The analysis showed that the improvement of students' achievement in writing report text based on two cycles, namely the mean of cycle I is = 64,66, and the mean of cycle II is = 74, 3. It means that the implication teaching writing through semantic mapping technique can improve students' achievement in writing report text.

Key words : Semantic Mapping Technique, Writing, Report Text

## **INTRODUCTION**

English is one of the international languages that are used by many people in the world and in many areas of daily life. Therefore, using English is the easiest way to communicate with people from

the other countries about many aspects in human life such as technology, economy, social, and politics.

Learning a foreign language is an integrated process that the learner should study the four basic skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. These four skills are the aim of the teaching and learning of the English as the foreign language. One of them is writing. Writing is one of the most powerful communication tools used today and for the rest of our life.

Many genres in English, one of them are report text. Within writing report text, students have to write something decent to report by researching and analysis something. Based on writer experience when she did the training teaching practice (PPL) in SMP N 1 P. Cermin, writer found some problems in the field when giving writing material to the students specially in the report text.

The first problem is that the students' writing is not comprehensible, because the content of the composition is not relevant to the topic, the ideas are not clearly stated, the ideas and sentences are not well organized. The second problem is that there are many errors in vocabulary, grammar, and spelling.

Another problem is the students have low motivation and are not interested in doing task since the writing activities are not interesting. Besides that, the students have difficulty to write. This occurs because writing is difficult for them so they have to master enough vocabulary, spelling, and grammar.

In reference to the explanations above and the strong desire of finding the solution of these problems, the writer has motivation to do the research in improving the teaching of writing in real class through Semantic mapping. Semantic mapping is one of technique of cooperative learning in which the students are assigned. Semantic mapping are designed as a specific type of graphic organizer to support or assist student to become more strategic in writing. In conceptual terms, a semantic map contains "verbal information within and between the shapes which create a pattern and/or relationships of ideas". Semantic mapping can help students to overcome their anxiety in

writing because the student can imagine and write all of the problems where are related to writing, so this technique can help students to develop their ideas in writing.

Based on the background above, it is necessary to formulate the problem of this research as:  
Is the students' achievement in writing report text improved if they are taught through Semantic Mapping?

Writing is the expression of language in the form of letters, symbols, or words. (Lamb and Johnson, 1999) Primary purpose of writing is communication. In other words, writing is how does someone more creative to develop their mind by written.

Writing is the mental work of investing ideas, thinking about how to express and organizing them into paragraphs that will be clear to reader. On the other hand, writing is not merely process of thinking something to say and selecting words needed to express it. The ideas and thoughts are informed into paragraphs and have a meaning, so the readers can understand the meaning of the content. In conclusion, writing is a process to put some thoughts into words in a meaningful form that used to express the ideas.

Gerrot and Wignell (1994 :196-197) state that report is a text which functions to describe the way things are, with reference to a range of natural, man made and social phenomena in pur environment. A report presents information about a subject. It is a result of an observation and analysis. Within writing report text, students have to write something decent to report by researching and analyzing something.

The generic structure of report text are General Classification: tell what the phenomenon under discussion, Description: tells what the phenomenon under discussion is like in terms of parts and their functions, qualities, and behaviour. The language features of report text focus on Generic Participants, Use of relational processes, Use of simple present tense, No temporal sequence.

### **Semantic mapping**

Speidel (1982:35) states that map is an arrangement of vocabulary (concepts) about a topic.

These concepts are categorized in some ways. The making of semantic map is a procedure for building a bridge between the known and new. The map informs the teacher what students know about a topic and give the students' anchor points to which they can attach new information and concepts they will encounter. Semantic mapping is consistently associated with higher scores on test items measuring specific comprehension, such as recall of text ideas and recall of key concepts. Dale Johnson and others have introduced refocused semantic maps for helping students become familiar with-text specific meanings associated with a central concepts (Johnson, Tom-Bronowski, and Pittleman 1981).

Semantic mapping is a method to visualize the structure of knowledge. Since the knowledge expressed in the maps is mostly semantic, concept maps are sometimes called semantic networks. Often is claimed that concept mapping bears a similarity to the structure of long-term memory. Instead of describing all concepts and their relations in text, one way choose to draw a map indicating concepts and relations in a graph or network.

Semantic mapping technique is also a way to help students to think more creative to associate ideas more easily. Fisher (1995,p.68) states that semantic map is an arrangement of shapes such as boxes, rectangles, triangles, circles, and so on, connected by lines and/or arrows drawn between and among figures. It means that semantic mapping can be used to explain certain objects (diagrams, lines, boxes, arrows, and circles) to show their relationship. He also states that it will be easier for students to write report text by referring to related words as many as possible, identifying characteristic of the word given. Therefore, semantic mapping are designed as a specific type of graphic organizer to support or assist student to become more strategic in writing. In conceptual terms, a semantic maps contains "verbal information within and between the shapes which create a pattern and/or relationships of ideas".

As "Knowledge representation tools" Novak (1998, p.3) states that semantic maps should be red from top to bottom, starting with the higher order (more general) concept at the top and proceeding to the lower (more specific) concepts at the bottom. They may be characterized by cross

links that show relationships between ideas in different parts of the map. As Lowman (1984:9) states that thinking skills is important component of class discussion. From quotaion, it can be concluded that semantic mapping is a type of prewriting that allows the students to explore many ideas as soon as they occur to them. Like brainstorming of free associating, semantic mapping allows the students to begin without clear ideas.

Semantic mapping techinque developed to improve writing skills and previously used to facilitate thinking in classroom setting as a stimulus for class discussion. Fisher (1995) states that semantic mapping are allows the learner to create an understanding of the world by making connections, by creating links, by exploring and testing links (a basic process of all creative thinking). Thus, creating a semantic mapping is one way of representing and communicating one understanding of concepts.

### **2.5.3 The Procedure of Using Semantic Mapping**

The procedure of using semantic mapping is very important. It gives a brief explanation how to apply semantic mapping technique in teaching writing. The procedure consists of several tests in using semantic mapping in the classroom. It also gives a brief elaboration about the form of semantic mapping as well as its usage. The teacher should notice them before teaching writing. It seems very helpful in order to use semantic mapping in good order.

To create a concept map, students need to do five things:

1. Read the passage
2. Writing down the main topic
3. Noting and writing down what is being said about the topic and subtopics. It means that students are asked to look for the related word with the word given.

4. Then, connecting the ideas to the subtopics with arrow to show relationship. In this case, students list new words in the arrow given.
5. After students get some important ideas, students can focus an idea and describe their writing in their paper.

In addition, Smalley (2001 : 56) states that the using of this technique is started with the circle in the middle of a sheet the linier paper, then drawing a line radiating out from the center it the name of a major division of the subject.

Then the procedure is continued with circling it and from the circle, moving out further to subdivision, keeping associating to further ideas and details related to them. After that, it is needed to study the semantic mapping to find new associations about the topic and to see the relationship of ideas. When finishing with one major division of the subject, go back to the center and start again with another subdivision as going along, add anything that occurs for section of semantic mapping. Continue to the process until running out of the ideas.

#### **2.5.4 The Advantages of Semantic Mapping**

According to fisher (1995, p.68) states that there are some advantages of semantic mapping technique.

They are :

1. It clearly defines the central idea, by positioning it in the center of the page.
2. It allows students to indicate clearly the relative importance of each idea.
3. It allows students to figure out the links the key ideas more easily. This is particularly important for creative work such as easy writing.
4. It allows students to see all their basic information on one page.
5. It allows students to add in new information without mewssy scratching out or sequencing it.

6. It makes it easier for students to see information in different way because it does not lock it into specific position.

## **2.6 Conceptual Frame Work**

Writing is the most difficult process in language; students have to study harder to be able to write effectively. There are some reasons which make writing difficult. Firstly, writing requires good grammar. Secondly, people are often known to spend less time to write than to listen, to speak and even to read. Thirdly, when students of English as a foreign language to write something, they have a big question in mind whether what they write is correct or incorrect. In conclusion, writing is the most difficult skill that learners got. Writing report text is an important skill to be acquired by the students since it needs observtion and analysis before starting to write.

To improve student's achievement in report writing, semantic mapping technique can be used to help the students to associate ideas while describing physical, moral, and intellectual. There are two ways to go about writing a description of a person. Start from the overall impression and break it down into the details or start from the details and build up toward an overall impression.

Semantic mapping is a way of teaching writing where students make their own word diagram that use lines, boxesm arrow, and circles to show relationship among the ideas and details. Through semantic mapping technique, the student also find out related words, ideas, concept or question as many as possible to the topic given, so the students can apply semantic in their writing.

## **CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHOD**

### **3.1 Research Design**

This study would be conducted in classroom action research. Action research purposed to improve the teaching for instance the success of certain activities or procedures used by teacher in teaching and learning process. According to Anderson, Herr and Nihlen in

<http://www.bamaedua/listaples/actionres.htm/2011/05/26> stated that action research was directed toward an action or cycle of actions that a researcher want to take address of situation. This was a reason why the term “action” was used for this research method.

Wallace in Benson (2001: 32) states that Action research is the systematic collection and analysis of data relating to the improvement of some area in professional practice. It would be often considered as the most accessible form of research for teacher because its goal would be solution of problems encountered in every practise. Action research also particularly suited to the field of autonomy because it was an effect which can help the teacher to develop her/ his autonomy as a teacher.

### **3.2 Subject of Research**

The subject of this research was third grade students of SMP SWASTA UPMI. The total numbers of students in this class were 30 students. This subject was chosen because the writer finds some problems in writing, so that the students need the improvement of their report writing.

### **3.3 The Instrument for Collecting Data**

The data of this study consists of two types: quantitative and qualitative data. Quantitative data will be collected to find out the improvement of students writing report ability by asking them to write. For gathering qualitative data, the writer would use observation sheet, interview sheet and diary notes. Observation sheet would use to identify all the condition that happened during the teaching learning process including teachers, studentsm and the context of situation that would be done by the collaborator and diary notes would use to record result of observation during the action and diary notes as the personal record which usually taken by the writer that would be written up daily.



### **3.4 The procedure of Collecting Data**

Before doing the research procedure, the writer administrated orientation test to identify the baasic knowledge of students about report writing. The procedures of data collection of the study will be conducted into two cycles, cycle I and cycle II. Cycle II would be done if there was no significance progress in the cycle I. First cycle consists of four meetings, second cycle had two meetings so there would be six meetings in this research included the meeting in the orientation test. Each meeting included four stages namely planned, action, observation, and reflection.

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **DATA AND DATA ANALYSIS**

#### **4.1 The Data**

In this research, there were two cycles, namely Cycle I and Cycle II. Cycle I consisted of four meetings and Cycle II consisted of two meetings. Thus, there were six meetings during the research done.

The data in this research was taken from quantitative and qualitative data. The quantitative were got from students' writing tests in first, fourth, and sixth meeting. The qualitative data were got from questionnaire sheet, observation sheet, and diary note.

The research was conducted in second year class of SMP SWASTA UPMI. The subject of this research was taken only from one class which consisted of 30 students. All the students always came in every meeting.

##### **4.1.1 The Quantitative Data**

The quantitative data was taken from students' writing tests to know the students' achievement in writing report through Semantic Mapping Technique. The quantitative data was carried out in two cycles. Cycle I consisted of four meetings and cycle 2 consisted of two

meetings. The students' test scores were taken fourt meeting in first cycle. The students' test scores were also taken from sixth meeting in second cycle.

The improvement of students' achievement in writing report through Semantic Mapping Technique could be seen as follow:

**Table 4.1 Students' Score during Six Meetings**

| Num. | Students' Name | Meeting I        | Meeting IV                   | Meeting VI                    |
|------|----------------|------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
|      |                | Orientation Test | Assessment (Test in cycle I) | Assessment (Test in cycle II) |
| 1.   | IR             | 70               | 80                           | 87                            |
| 2.   | RI             | 50               | 75                           | 82                            |
| 3.   | AB             | 30               | 50                           | 70                            |
| 4.   | TA             | 45               | 55                           | 72                            |
| 5.   | AN             | 50               | 60                           | 75                            |
| 6.   | MRN            | 30               | 65                           | 70                            |
| 7.   | HNS            | 50               | 65                           | 70                            |
| 8.   | JRMY           | 25               | 50                           | 65                            |
| 9.   | MNC            | 35               | 55                           | 70                            |
| 10.  | YLI            | 40               | 60                           | 73                            |
| 11.  | YSPN           | 50               | 65                           | 75                            |
| 12.  | MYA            | 55               | 70                           | 80                            |
| 13.  | RY             | 45               | 60                           | 75                            |
| 14.  | WDY            | 60               | 65                           | 72                            |

|     |              |       |       |      |
|-----|--------------|-------|-------|------|
| 15. | RTH          | 45    | 60    | 70   |
| 16. | SMT          | 50    | 60    | 75   |
| 17. | EK           | 60    | 60    | 70   |
| 18. | SRY          | 60    | 70    | 77   |
| 19. | PTR          | 55    | 65    | 70   |
| 20. | LNA          | 60    | 65    | 75   |
| 21. | DW           | 70    | 75    | 77   |
| 22. | CNTY         | 65    | 60    | 73   |
| 23. | NVA          | 50    | 70    | 75   |
| 24. | IV           | 60    | 70    | 78   |
| 25. | AGG          | 50    | 65    | 70   |
| 26. | DMS          | 60    | 65    | 72   |
| 27. | SNTS         | 60    | 70    | 80   |
| 28. | AMN          | 65    | 70    | 76   |
| 29. | JLI          | 70    | 75    | 80   |
| 30. | DNA          | 55    | 65    | 75   |
|     | <b>Total</b> | 1570  | 1940  | 2229 |
|     | <b>Mean</b>  | 52.33 | 64.66 | 74.3 |

The result of students' score in assessment before applying semantic mapping from 30 students, total score was 1570 and the mean was 52.33. The result of the students' score in assessment during cycle I, total score was 1940 and the mean 64.66. The result of students' score in assessment during cycle II, total score was 2229 and the mean was 74.3 showed the improvement of students' score in every cycle by calculating the mean of students' score. Highest score was achieved by the students in assessment during cycle II. The score increased from the first assessment until the last assessment (from 64.66 then become 74.3).

## **4.1.2 The Qualitative Data**

### **4.1.2.1 Questionnaire Sheet**

Questionnaire sheet was used to know the knowledge, opinions, ideas, and experiences of the students about Semantic Mapping Technique in teaching learning process, especially in writing report. Questionnaire Sheet consisted of 15 statements. There were three scales in the questionnaire, namely A= Strongly Agree (score 3), B= Agree (score 2), and C= disagree (score 1). Thus, the maximum score was 45. The complete questionnaire could be seen in Appendix D.

### **4.1.2.2 Observation Sheet**

Observation sheet was used to measure the level of students' activities during teaching learning process. The observation was focused on the situation of teaching learning process in which Semantic Mapping Technique was applied, students' activities and behavior, and students' ability by using the technique which was applied. The result of the observation showed that the students were very active and enthusiastic in learning. They are able to improve their writing through Semantic Mapping Technique, although at the beginning some of students were hard to write a report text, but finally almost of the students are motivated to write a report text.

### **4.1.2.3 Diary Note**

Diary Note was written up by the writer in every meeting during the research. Diary note was used to describe the writer's personal evaluation about the class in

every meeting during the research in Semantic Mapping Technique. The complete data could be seen in Appendix E.

## **4.2 Data Analysis**

### **4.2.1 Quantitative Data**

The research was conducted by six meetings. The students were given written tests three times, namely first, fourth, and sixth meeting. Students' score always increased in every test (see Appendix B). It meant that the teaching process showed students' achievement in writing report improved from meeting to meeting.

Students' writing was scored by calculating two main criteria, namely Generic Structure and Linguistic Features. Generic Structure consisted of three parts, namely Orientation, Events, and Reorientation. Linguistic Features consisted of three parts, namely Grammar; Punctuation, Spelling, and Mechanic; and Style and Quality of Expression.

The students' scores in every test were different. In the orientation test, the lowest score was 25 and the highest score was 70. In writing test I (cycle I), the lowest score was 50 and the highest was 80. In writing test II (cycle II), the lowest was 65 and the highest was 87.

The comparison of students' writing score can be seen in table 4.2 below:

**Table 4.2 The Comparison of Students' Writing Score**

| <b>Types of Score</b>  | <b>Orientation Test</b> | <b>Test I</b> | <b>Test II</b> |
|------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| The Lowest Score       | 25                      | 50            | 65             |
| The Highest Score      | 70                      | 80            | 87             |
| Mean                   | 52.33                   | 64.66         | 74.3           |
| The Number of Students | 30                      | 30            | 30             |

By considering the improvement of students' achievement in writing report text, it can be proven by the list of students' score from the table of assessment before applying semantic mapping technique, assessment during cycle I and II. It can be seen that the mean score of the students kept growing from cycle to cycle. In writing test II was higher than writing test I.

From the table conducted we can analyze that the students' score has been improved from the first assessment for most students by considering and determining the scores.

The mean of the students' score in writing test II was the highest, it could be concluded that the mean of students' writing increased from 64.66 to 74.3.

The percentage of students who got point up 65 as the standard score of students' report writing competence showed the improvement of students' ability from first meeting to six meeting.

The percentage could be seen as follow:

**Table 4.3 The Percentage of Students' Report Writing Competence**

| Test             | Meeting | Students Who Got Score Up to 65 | Percentage |
|------------------|---------|---------------------------------|------------|
| Orientation Test | I       | 5                               | 16.6 %     |
| Test I           | IV      | 19                              | 63.3 %     |
| Test II          | VI      | 30                              | 100 %      |

In orientation test, there were 5 students who got points up 65 as the standard score for students' report writing competence. In writing test I, there were 19 students who got points up 65. In writing test II, all students got points up 65. It had proved that 100% students got the good score in writing report. It could be concluded that Semantic Mapping Technique worked effectively and effeciently in helping students in improving their report writing.

Besides, we also could know the improvement of scores from each student. We could see the table below:

**Table 4.4 The Range of Score Improvement**

| Range of score Improvement | Students' Initial Name                                    | Total | Percentage |
|----------------------------|---|-------|------------|
| 31-40                      | AB, MRN, JRM, MNC, YLI, RI                                | 6     | 20 %       |
| 21-30                      | TA, AN, YSPN, MY, RY, RTH, SMTI, NVA                      | 8     | 27 %       |
| 11-20                      | IR, HNS, WDY, SRY, PTR, LNA, IV, AGG, DMS, SNTS, DNA, AMN | 12    | 40 %       |
| 1-10                       | EK, DW, CYNT, JLI   | 4     | 13 %       |
| <b>Number of Students</b>  |   | 30    | 100 %      |

From the table 4.4, it could be seen that there were 20% of the students (6 students) who improved from 31-40 points. Their scores increased in every test. From questionnaire sheet, observation sheet, and diary note, it could be known that they paid their attention to the explanation of the teacher seriously. They enjoy the teaching learning process. They gave good response to the teacher's explanation and instruction. They gave good answer when the teacher gave some questions. They also asked to the teacher when they didn't know about something.

They were 8 students who got the improvement of score about 21-30 points. The improvement of scores was 27%. Questionnaire sheet, observation sheet, and diary note showed that all students listened to the teacher seriously. Thus, in every test they got the improvement score. The overall of students gave good response to the teacher and the material so they knew how to produce good report writing.

They were 40% of students (12 students) who improve from 11-20 points. From questionnaire sheet, observation sheet, and diary note, it could be known that they had tried to produce good report writing but for the first meeting they didn't give good response so to connect the material in every meeting sometimes made them confused. Finally, in the last test they could produce good report writing.

Besides, there were 13% of students (4 students) who improved from 1-10 points. From questionnaire sheet, observation sheet, and diary note, it could be seen that the students had tried to follow all instructions from the teacher, but the achievement in writing from the student had low improvement.

Based on the data analysis, it could be drawn that all the students got improvement on their score. Some of the students got high improvement and the others got medium and low improvements.



#### **4.2.2. Qualitative Data**

The qualitative data were taken from questionnaire sheet, observation sheet, and diary note.

##### **4.2.2.1 Questionnaire Sheet**

The writer gave questionnaire sheet to each student. Based on the result of questionnaire scores, it was gained that the number of students who disagree was 0 students (0%), the number of students who agree was 9 students (30%), and the number of students who strongly agree was 21 students (70%). Based on the data, it could be concluded that all students strongly agreed that Semantic Mapping Technique was applicable in writing process, especially in writing report. Students agreed that Semantic Mapping Technique could improve their writing.

Based all questionnaire scores that were from questionnaire sheet, all students agreed that Semantic Mapping Technique was appropriate to be applied in improving students' achievement in writing report.

##### **4.2.2.2 Observation Sheet**

Observation sheet were filled by the English teacher as a collaborator of this research. The collaborator observed the writer as the teacher, the students, and context during the teaching learning process. Observation sheet was given in fourth (Cycle I) and sixth (Cycle II). Therefore, in fourth (cycle I) and sixth (Cycle II) meeting the

collaborator was in the classroom and observed the writer as the teacher by filling the available observation sheet. Based on the observation sheet in fourth meeting (Cycle I) for the writer as the teacher, there was 1 point which fair category. Then, there were 4 points which had good category and 2 points which had very good category. For students, there were 4 points which had fair category and 2 points which had good category. For context, there were 3 points which had good category. Based on the observation sheet in sixth meeting (Cycle II), all points had very good category. The complete data could be seen in Appendix E.

It could be concluded that the application of Semantic Mapping Technique created good result. From first meeting until sixth meeting showed good improvement.

#### **4.2.2.3 Diary Note**

Based on the diary note of writer, cycle I was conducted by four meetings and cycle II was conducted two meetings.

##### **First Meeting**

In the first meeting, the researcher started the class by greeting the students and checking the attendance list. Then researcher introduced herself and explained to the students the purpose of her coming. Then, the writer emphasized the importance of English. The teacher gave the orientation test to the students. During the test, the students paid attention to their writing test. No sound was heard in the first minutes. When the time went by, they started to make some movements. Only two students did it by themselves but most of them did cheating while finishing it. So, it could be concluded that the students still had difficulties in writing.

##### **Second Meeting**

In the second meeting, the researcher brainstormed the student's prior knowledge about report. She explained about report as one genre in writing. Then the students were thought about the characteristics of report text included the social function, generic structures and linguistic features. After that the researcher introduced Semantic Mapping Technique. Students listened and participated to the teacher's explanation.

### **Third Meeting**

This meeting was enjoyable. Students felt interested during the teaching learning process. When the writer asked the students to write report based on semantic mapping that had been formed in group work, the students tried to write their writing with their own words. They tried to do the best, but when the writer checked them to their desks, there were still some mistakes and there were some students who cheated other, but the writer always remembered them to believe with their own writing. This meeting was better than the second meeting.

### **Fourth Meeting**

In fourth meeting, the students asked to sit in their groups. Students were given some texts and asked them to determine what texts were they, because researcher wanted to know, did the students able to recognize and compare the text well. If they had able to recognize that, it meant that the students can compare and analyze some texts in writing. After that, they were asked to do written test 1 in a piece of paper individually.

### **Fifth meeting**

In this meeting, the researcher asked the students to analyze report text based on the generic structure and language feature analysis. After finished to do it, researcher asked students work in groups, researcher asked them to write report text about Earthquake based on generic structure and language feature analysis. Then, the writer asked them to construct semantic mapping to connect the topic that had given. In this meeting, students were happy because they had known the technique. There were no students who cheated because they have understood about report text.

### **Sixth Meeting**

The last meeting was a fantastic meeting. The writer was very happy. All students had been able to apply Semantic Mapping technique and to produce good report writing. When the writer asked the students to make report writing based on their own mapping, all students did individually and seriously. There were no students who cheated each other.

Semantic Mapping Technique significantly helped students in writing report. Based on the reflection of this cycle, it was not needed to conduct three cycle. The cycle of this researcher could be stopped because the students' achievement in writing report had improved.

## **4.3 Research Finding and Discussion**

After data was analyzed, there were some research findings. It could be proven from mean of students' scores. The score mean of the test I in cycle I was 52.33, the mean of the test II in cycle II was 64.66, and the test III in cycle II was 74.3. There was a significant improvement of students' scores from cycle I until cycle II.

The improvement could be seen from the percentage of students' mastery. The percentage of students' mastery in test I was 16.6%, test II was 63.3%, and test III was 100%. Therefore, it could be concluded that the procedure of cycle II was successfully done because the result was very good.

The research findings were also obtained from the qualitative data. From the observation sheet, it was found out that the students were confused in the first meeting. However, after next meeting the students could increase their understanding.

Furthermore, from the observation sheet and diary note, it was found out that teaching-learning process ran effectively and the students seemed more active and enjoyable. Even though the students got problems in the early meeting, but by and by they could overcome the problems and enjoyed the lesson. Therefore, it could be concluded that Semantic Mapping Technique significantly improved students' achievement in writing report

## **CHAPTER V**

### **CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION**

#### **5.1 Conclusion**

After analyzing the quantitative data, the writer found out that the student's scores increased during the cycles. In orientation test, total score was 1570 and the mean was 52.33. In writing test I (cycle I), total score was 1940 and the mean 64.66. In writing test II (cycle II), total score was 2229 and the mean was 74.3. Moreover, the qualitative data showed that the students were more interested and enjoyable in writing report by applying Semantic Mapping Technique. Therefore, it can be concluded that Semantic Mapping Technique can improve student's achievement in writing report.

#### **5.3 Suggestion**

Related to the writer's research, some suggestions are pointed out as follows:

- a. The English teachers are suggested to apply Semantic Mapping Technique in writing report text because this technique can improve the students' achievement in writing report easily and creatively.
- b. The readers are suggested to explore and enlarge the further knowledge so that the readers can apply semantic mapping in writing report text.
- c. The students are suggested to improve their writing by applying semantic mapping not only in writing report text but also in writing another text.

## REFERENCES

- Ahlberg Mauri, PhD. *Practical methods and techniques of knowledge representation in particular those related to concept mapping and mind mapping*, available in <http://www.helsinki.fi/people/mauri.ahlberg>
- Burns, Anne. 2010. *Doing action research in English language teaching: a guide for practitioners*. New York:Rutledge.
- Bloom, B. S. 1956. *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals*. New York:Logman.
- Chanler, Daniel. 2000. *An Introduction to Genre Theory*. Available: <http://www.aber.ac.uk/media/Documents/intgenre.html> (accessed on March, 12th 2010)
- Gerot, Linda and Wignell, Peter. 1994. *Making Sense of Functional Grammar*-Sydney: Gerd Stabler.
- Hughey, Jane B. et al. 1983. *Teaching ESL Composition : Principles and Techniques*. Massachusetts: Newburry House.
- Hornby, AS. 2010. *Oxford Advanced Learner's University (eight edition)* Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Johnson, Dale D, Toms-Bronowski, Susan and Pittleman. November 1981. *An Investigation of the Trends in Vocabulary Research and the Effects of Prior Knowledge on Instructional Strategies for Vocabulary Acquisition*. Madison: Wisconsin Center for Educational Research.
- Johnson, D.W, Johnson, R.T, and Holubec, E.J 1993. *Cooperative in the classroom*. (6th ed.) Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.
- Kemmis,S.<http://kangaonline.com/KaganClub/FreeArticles/IncreaseAchievement.html>. Accessed on August, 25th 2009.
- Lamb, Annette and Johnson, Larry. 1999. The Topic: writing, Available in: <http://42explore.com/writing.htm> (accessed on March, 13th 2010)
- LIM, Swee Eng, Cheng, Pui Wah Chan, Lam, Mei Seung and Ngan. So Fong.2003. *Developing Reflective and Thinking Skills by Means of Semantic Mapping Strategies in Kindergarten Teacher Education, Early Child Development and Care*, available in <http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t713640830>
- MacIsaac, D. 1995. "An Introduction to Action Research", available: <http://www.phy.nau.edu/~danmac/actionresearch.html> (22/03/2011)
- Slavin, R. 1990. *Cooperative Learning: Theory, Research and Practice*. Engle Wood cliffs: N.J Prentice Hal.
- Speidel, Gisele E. 1982. *Oral Language in a successful Reading Program or Hawaiian Children*.

Wallace, Michael. J. 1998. *Action Research for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Concept Mapping in Science Class: A Case Study of fifth grade students, 17  
[http://www.ifets.infojournals10\\_117.pdf](http://www.ifets.infojournals10_117.pdf)

<http://Anderson> Herr and Nihlen/www.bamaedua.edu/listaples/action res.htm (Accessed 26th May 2011)

<http://Bagol>, March 2010:14/www.encyclo.co.uk/define/Generic%20Structure (Accessed on April, 4th 2011)

<http://Elizabeth> Cohen G, 2004:36/localhost/D:/proposal/Teaching Cooperative learning.html (Accessed at May, 2011)