

***A STUDY ON THE ABILITY OF THE SECOND YEAR STUDENTS  
OF SMAN 11 PEKANBARU IN COMPREHENDING NARRATIVE  
TEXTS***

Etri Oktaviani<sup>1</sup>, Effendy Gultom<sup>2</sup>, Fakhri Ras<sup>3</sup>  
Email: etrioktaviani20@gmail.com<sup>1</sup>, effendygultom@gmail.com<sup>2</sup>, fakhriras@yahoo.com<sup>3</sup>  
Contact: 081270093263

Students of English Study Program  
Language and Arts Department  
Faculty of Teachers Training and Education  
Universitas Riau

***Abstract:*** *The purpose of this study is to find out the ability of the second year students of SMAN 11 Pekanbaru in comprehending Narrative texts. The number of population is 256 students divided into nine classes. The researcher used random sampling technique to determine the sample. The samples were 54 students. The needed data were taken from the students' score in comprehending narrative texts. The test comprehends five narrative texts of which all text has eight items or 40 items all together. The time allocation was 120 minutes. The result of the study revealed that the mean score was 65.56 which indicated that the students were in good level of ability. The highest mean score (73.7) was in finding references. The lowest mean score (51.48) was in finding the meaning of vocabulary.*

***Key Words:*** *Students' ability, Reading Comprehension, Narrative Texts*

## **STUDI TENTANG KEMAMPUAN SISWA SEMESTER KEDUA SMAN 11 PEKANBARU DALAM MEMAHAMI TEKS-TEKS NARATIF**

Etri Oktaviani<sup>1</sup>, Effendy Gultom<sup>2</sup>, Fakhri Ras<sup>3</sup>  
Email: etrioktaviani20@gmail.com<sup>1</sup>, effendygultom@gmail.com<sup>2</sup>, fakhriras@yahoo.com<sup>3</sup>  
Kontak: 081270093263

Mahasiswa Program Studi Bahasa Inggris  
Jurusan Bahasa dan Seni  
Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan  
Universitas Riau

**Abstract:** Tujuan dari penelitian ini untuk mengetahui kemampuan siswa kelas dua SMAN 11 Pekanbaru dalam memahami teks-teks naratif. Jumlah populasi 256 siswa yang dibagi menjadi sembilan kelas. Peneliti menggunakan teknik random sampling untuk menentukan sampel. Sampel terdiri dari 54 siswa. Data yang dibutuhkan diambil dari nilai siswa dalam memahami lima teks dimana tiap teks memiliki delapan pertanyaan yang jumlah semuanya 40 item. Alokasi waktu yang diberikan 120 menit. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa skor rata-rata adalah 65,56 yang menunjukkan kemampuan siswa berada di level yang baik. Mean skor tertinggi (73,7) yaitu pada aspek menemukan referensi. Sementara itu, mean skor terendah adalah (51,48) pada aspek menemukan arti dari kosa kata.

**Kata Kunci:** Kemampuan siswa, Pemahaman membaca, Teks Naratif

## INTRODUCTION

Based on the 2006 curriculum, the students are expected to be able to access knowledge by using language skills. The four language skills are listening, speaking, reading, and writing with different types of genre. Reading is one of the competences that should be learned by the students. Anderson (2003) states that reading is a process of combining information from a text and the reader's background knowledge to get meaning. Murcia (2001) argues that reading is assumed to be the central means for learning new information and gaining access to alternative explanation and interpretation. From reading the reader can get information and explanation about something from written texts.

Reading is one of the language skills that the students should focus on. In foreign language learning, reading is likewise a skill that teachers simply expect learners to acquire. Reading arguably is the most essential skill for success in all educational contexts (Brown, 2004). In fact, national examination and school examination mostly focus on reading skill. 2006 curriculum used texts as material to learn English, starting from short functional texts to monologue texts.

The 2006 curriculum requires the students to have the ability to comprehend and write many kinds of short functional texts to monologue texts. In learning monolog texts, the students learnt many types of genre to enrich their knowledge about different purposes of text types. In addition, 2013 curriculum using text-based learning approaches in studying and learning process to increase the students English. Both of curriculums 2006 and 2013 emphasize on rules, contexts, and comprehension of a text to facilitate students to grasp the meaning of different types of texts. Reading comprehension means the ability to derive meaning from texts and it is deemed to be the ultimate aim of most reading activity (Rathvon, 2004). Reading comprehension is the process to understand and to deliver the information from a text. Students learn some types of genre in English, such as narrative, descriptive, and exposition (Hyland, 2004).

A narrative text is one the type of texts learned in every semester at senior high school by students. It starts from the first year until the third year. In addition narrative text materials include in the national examination together with the other types of text.

According to 2006 school-based curriculum, the students are expected to understand the meaning of the texts by finding main ideas, finding the meaning of vocabulary, identifying references, finding factual information, identifying the structures of the texts, identifying the generic structure, etc. On the basis of generic structure, narrative texts are realized as orientation, complication, and resolution. Students need to comprehend the elements that are involved in the text.

To know the real condition about students' comprehension especially their understanding about narrative text, writer conducted a research entitled a study on the ability of the second year students of SMAN 11 Pekanbaru in comprehending narrative texts.

## RESEARCH METODOLOGY

The time for data collection and analysis of this research were from April to June 2016. The location of this research was at SMAN 11 Pekanbaru. It was conducted to the second year students in academic year of 2015/2016. This research uses descriptive research design. It has only one variable that is, the second year student ability in comprehending narrative texts. Gay (1990) explains that descriptive research involves collecting data in order to answer question concerning the current status of the subject of study. It is useful for investigating a variety of educational problems. In this research, the descriptive is used to describe the ability of the second year students at SMAN 11 Pekanbaru in comprehending narrative texts.

The population of this research was the second year students of SMAN 11 Pekanbaru in academic year of 2015/2016. Frankel and Wallen (1993) state that a population is the group to which the results of the study are intended to apply. The number of population was 256 students divided into nine classes, five classes major in natural science and four classes major in social science. To determine the sample in this research, the writer used cluster sampling technique since the sample divided into nine classes. According to Gay and Peter (2000), cluster sampling means that the groups, not individuals, are randomly selected. The real test which is aimed to collect data was administered to 27 students of XI IPA1 and 27 students XI IPS3 of SMA Negeri 11 Pekanbaru.

The data for the research was quantitative data. The writer used a test as instrument in collected the data. The test was multiple choices. The test focused on the material of narrative text. The data for the research were taken from the students' scores in answering the questions in the narrative texts. The test consists of 40 questions. The test represents narrative texts. The narrative texts were adapted from some books, such as Look Ahead, Seri Pendalaman Materi Bahasa Inggris and Creative English Workbook. The writer asks the students to put their answers in the paper related to comprehending the narrative texts. The time allocated about 120 minutes to finish the test. The distribution of the test items as the following data:

<b>No.</b>	<b>Component of the Test</b>	<b>Number of Items</b>
1.	Finding main idea	1,9,17,25,33
2.	Finding factual information	2,10,18,24,26
3.	Finding meaning of vocabulary	3,11,19,27,35
4.	Finding references	4,12,20,28,36
5.	Finding inferences	5,13,21,29,37
6.	Identifying generic structure	6,14,22,30,38
7.	Identifying language feature	7,15,31,34,40
8.	Finding social function	8,16,23,32,39
<b>Total</b>		<b>40 items</b>

Before the test given to the sample classes (XI IPA1 and XI IPS3), the writer conducted a try out in class XI IPA4. The purpose of the tryout is to make sure whether or not the test is valid and reliable to measure the students' reading comprehension. Thus, the items analyzed in order to see the reliability and validity of the test.

After that, the writer computed the determination index, the mean score, the standard deviation, and the reliability of the test. The test is reliable and then it will be given at the sample class. After that, it is analyzed according to the students' scores and their level of ability. The classification is such followed.

<b>The Classification and Categories of Students' score</b>	
The Classification of Score	Categories Score
81 – 100	Excellent
61 – 80	Good
41 – 60	Mediocre
21 – 40	Poor
0 - 20	Very poor


(Harris, 1974)

## THE RESEARCH FINDINGS

This research focuses on the students' ability in reading comprehension which has some components namely finding the main ideas, finding factual information, finding the meaning of vocabulary, finding references, finding inferences, identifying generic structures, identifying language features, and finding social function. The real test which is aimed to collect data was administered to 27 students of XI IPA1 and 27 students XI IPS3 of SMA Negeri 11 Pekanbaru. The description of the result of this research as follow:

### Individual Score

To find out the students individual score, the writer divided the number of the correct answers with the total number of items and then multiplied it by one hundred (100). From 54 students, ten students get the score of 81-100, twenty-five students get the score of 61-80, fourteen students get the score of 41-60, five students get the score of 21-40 and none of the student gets the score 0-20. It can be stated that the highest number of students obtained by 25 students with the score 61-80. No one of the student in score 0-20 prove that students score was in good level.



The highest percentage that students can gain is in the good level; it is 48.18% of students. It means that most of them (26 students) can comprehend the text easily. The second percentage is the mediocre level; there are 25.92% of students (14 students) in mediocre level. Then, there are only 16.66% of students (9 students) in excellent level. The last, 9.25% of students are (5 students) in poor level ability and no student in very poor level. It means that, most of the students passed the test given, only 5 students still hard comprehending the text.

### **The Students' Ability in Finding Main Ideas**

The highest percentage that the students achieve is 11 students (20.37%) in excellent level. 15 students (27.77%) are in good level. Then, 18 students (33.33%) are categorized in mediocre level. After that, 6 students (11.11%) are categorized in poor level. The last, there are 4 students (7.40%) in very poor level. The students' ability in finding main idea is categorized into good level. The students' average score in finding main idea is 68.15.

### **The Students' Ability in Finding Factual Information**

From 54 students, there are twenty-three students (42.59%) in good level. There are ten students (18.51%) in mediocre level. And then, there are ten students (18.51%) in poor level. After that, there are eight students (14.81%) in excellent level. The last, there are 3 students (5.55%) in very poor level. From the average score 60.37, the students' ability in finding factual information is categorized into mediocre level.

### **The Students' Ability in Finding Meaning of Vocabulary**

The highest score are in poor level (31.48 %). 14 students (25.92%) are in mediocre level. Then 12 students (22.22%) are in very poor level and 7 students (12.96%) are in excellent level, 4 students (7.40%) are in good level. From the mean score 51.48, the students' ability in finding meaning of vocabulary is categorized into mediocre level.

### **The Student's Ability in Finding References**

The highest score are in poor level (31.48 %). 14 students (25.92%) are in mediocre level. Then 12 students (22.22%) are in very poor level and 7 students (12.96%) are in excellent level, 4 students (7.40%) are in good level. From the mean score 51.48, the students' ability in finding meaning of vocabulary is categorized into mediocre level. The students mean score of the students in comprehending narrative text in terms of finding references is 73.70. In short, it means that the students' ability is in good level.

### **The Students' Ability in Finding Inferences**

The highest percentage that the students can obtain is 18 students (33%) in good level. There are 15 students (28%) in mediocre level. Then, there are 13 students (24%) in poor level. After that, there are 5 students (9%) in very poor level. The last, there are 3 students (6%) in excellent level. The students' ability in finding inferences is categorized into mediocre level. The students' average score in finding inferences is 60.

### **The Students' Ability in Identifying Generic Structure**

First the highest percentage that the students achieve is 17 students (31%) in good level. The second is 15 students (28%) in excellent level. Then, there are 12 students (22%) in mediocre level. After that, there are 9 students (17%) in poor level. The last, there are 1 students (2%) in very poor level. The students' ability in identifying generic structure 73.33 is categorized into good level.

### **The Students' Ability in Identifying Language Feature**

The highest percentage that the students can gain is 18 students (33%) in mediocre level. The second is 16 students (30%) in good level. Then, there are 10 students (18%) in excellent level. After that, there are 7 students (13%) in poor level. The last, there are 3 students (6%) in very poor level. The students' ability in identifying language feature 68.52 is categorized into good level.

### **The Students' Ability in Finding Social Function**

The highest percentage that the students can obtain is 21 students (39%) in good level. The second is 11 students (20%) in excellent level. Then, there are 9 students (17%) in mediocre level. After that, there are 8 students (15%) in poor level. The last, there are 5 students (9%) in very poor level. The students' ability in identifying generic structure 68.89 is categorized into good level.

According to table 4.1, the students' mean score in comprehending narrative text is 65.56. Furthermore, the students' ability in comprehending the text in the test was varied. There are 9 students could gain the high score which is categorized in excellent level. But, there are 26 students could reach the good level and 14 students could reach the mediocre level. The number of students who gained excellent to the good level is 35 students (65%). The number shows that more than half of students found the test was fairly easy for them to comprehend narrative text. Therefore, the number of students who gained mediocre to the poor level is 19 students (35%) in term of finding main ideas, finding factual information, finding meaning of vocabulary, identifying references, making inferences, identifying generic structure, identifying language feature, and finding social function. Meanwhile, 5 students (9.25%) are in poor and no one of student in very poor level. In conclusion, there are some students still have the problem in comprehending narrative texts.

From all the data, it can be inferred that the students' ability in comprehending narrative text of second year students at SMAN 11 Pekanbaru is in good level.

In addition, there is a difference in term of the mean score for each component. The most difficult component in comprehending narrative text is in term of finding meaning of vocabulary with the mean score of 51.38. Meanwhile, the easiest component is in finding references with the mean score of 73.7. Then, the students' mean score in term of identifying generic structure is 73.3. The students' mean score in term of finding social function is 68.89. After that, the students' mean score in term of identifying language feature is 68.52 and the students' mean score in term of finding factual information is 60.37. The last, the students' mean score in term of inferences is 60. For the word and sentence comprehension, the highest score obtained by the students was 80. The lowest score was 20. It means, from 10 questions from each component, the maximum correct answer that students got was 8, whereas the minimum correct answer was 2. For the paragraph comprehension, the highest score that obtained by students was 80 and the lowest scores was 0. It means that there were some students who got 2 wrong answers and no one got the correct answer. And the last, for the text comprehension, the highest score obtained by students was 80 and the lowest score was 10. It means that there were students who got 8 correct answers and only got 1 correct answer.

The findings of this research were answered the research question about the ability of the students in reading comprehension and the most difficult aspect in reading comprehension.

## **CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Conclusion**

According to researcher finding about the second year students' reading ability at SMAN 11 Pekanbaru in comprehending narrative texts was relatively good. It can be seen from the students' mean score was 65.56 and it was categorized as 'good' level. However, there were some students still have a problem in finding meaning of vocabulary of a text.

Furthermore from 54 students, 9 students (16.6%) got the score ranging from 93 up to 80 was categorized as excellent level. There were 28 students in good level. Meanwhile, 19 students (35%) got the scores ranging from 60 up to 35 where was categorized as mediocre level and poor level. It means that the students' ability in reading comprehension the students were in good level but still some of the students have difficulties in comprehending a text especially in finding meaning of vocabulary.

Besides that, all of the components in comprehending narrative texts, five of them are at the same level (good level). But, there is a difference in the mean score of each component where the highest mean score of the students' reading comprehension was in finding references. Whereas, the lowest mean score of students' reading comprehension was in finding meaning of vocabulary.



## Recommendations

Writer believes this research still had a lot of weaknesses. However from this research finding, the writer would like to give some recommendations as follow: First, for the next researcher, the writer suggested to use more than 54 samples. Second, after conducted the data, the writer did not interview the teacher and the students. The writer could not clarify the result of the low and the good score of students and the reasons that caused it. So that the writer couldn't match the result of the low and good score of students and the reasons that caused it. It is useful for the next researcher to do interview after the research. Third, the texts in the instrument must be adjusted again to the student's background. Fourth, considering the students lower score in term of finding meaning of vocabulary, the teacher may increase the time allocation of teaching regarding this aspect.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, M and Anderson, K. 2003. *Text Types in English (Book Two)*. Oxford: Macmillan Education.

Brown, H. D. 2004. *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*. New York: Longman.

Fraenkel, Jack R and Norman E. Wallen.1993.*How to Design and Evaluate Research*.Singapore: McGraw-Hill Inc

Gay,L.R.1990.*Education Research*.New Jersy:Prentice Hall,Inc.

Harris, D.P., 1974. *Testing English as a Second Language*. TMH, edition, New Delhi: Megraw Hill Publishing Company It

Hyland, Ken. 2004. *Genre and Second Language Writing*. London: The University of Michigan Press.

Murcia, Celce, M. 2001. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*.USA: University Press.

Rathvon, N.2004. *Early reading assessment*. New York: The Guilford Press.