

A STUDY ON THE ABILITY OF THE SECOND YEAR STUDENTS OF SMAN 1 GAUNG INDRAGIRI HILIR IN COMPREHENDING REPORT TEXTS

Aulia Tresna Ningtyas, FakhriRas, Erni

auliatresna12@gmail.com, fakhrriras@yahoo.com, erni.rosda@yahoo.co.id

Contact: +6282386101440

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

Abstract: *This descriptive research was aimed at finding out how the ability of the second year students of SMAN 1 Gaung in comprehending Report texts. The sample was XI IPA 1 (30 students) chosen by cluster random sampling technique. The result showed that the reading ability of the second year students of SMAN 1 Gaung in comprehending report text is in good level with the mean score was 62.42. However, this score was lower than the minimum score criteria is 70.00. The most difficult aspect in comprehending report text was in finding factual information is 53.2 which was categorized into mediocre level. Then, the easiest aspect was in finding reference 75.3 which was categorized into good level. Based on research finding, it would be better to recommend as the follow. First, the students need to have more practice in finding factual information ability in reading activity. Second, the English teacher may increase the students' motivation and encourage them to read report text in English book as a part of practicing activities of comprehending report texts.*

Keywords: *Study, Ability, Report Text.*

SEBUAH KAJIAN TENTANG KEMAMPUAN SISWA KELAS 2 SMA N 1 GAUNG INDRAGIRI HILIR DALAM MEMAHAMI TEKS REPORT

Aulia Tresna Ningtyas, FakhriRas, Erni.

auliatresna12@gmail.com, fakhrras@yahoo.com, erni.rosda@yahoo.co.id

Contact: +6282386101440

Mahasiswa Program Studi Bahasa Inggris
Jurusan Bahasa dan Seni
Fakultas Pelatihan Guru dan Pendidikan
Universitas Riau

Abstrak: Penelitian ini merupakan penelitian deskriptif yang bertujuan untuk mengetahui bagaimana kemampuan siswa SMAN 1 Gaung dalam memahami teks report. Kelas sampel adalah XI Ipa 1 (30 siswa) yang dipilih secara cluster random sampling. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa kemampuan membaca siswa kelas II SMAN 1 Gaung dalam memahami teks report berada pada tingkat yang baik dengan skor rata-rata adalah 62.42. Meskipun demikian siswa belum mencapai nilai KKM sekolah yaitu 70. Aspek yang paling sulit dalam memahami teks report adalah menemukan informasi faktual 53.2 yang masuk dalam kategori menengah. Kemudian, aspek termudah adalah dalam menemukan referensi 775.3 yang masuk dalam kategori baik. Berdasarkan hasil penelitian, disarankan agar para guru bahasa Inggris memusatkan perhatian pada komponen dimana siswa masih merasa sulit dan siswa harus mempelajari tentang komponen-komponen dalam teks report yang akan membantu mereka dalam memahami teks reading yang lainnya.

Kata kunci: Penelitian, Kemampuan, Teks report

INTRODUCTION

Reading is a crucial part of English as foreign language learning and teaching activity. Reading ability to comprehending a text makes the students able to understand what the text tells about from the text. Beside that if the students able to getting the main point of the texts it will help the students to improve their knowledge or their comprehending about the text.

Cline et.al (2006) states that reading is the process of deriving meaning from the text. Ahuja and Ahuja (2001) , reading is both a sensory and mental process. It involves use of the eye and the mind. The eyes receive messages and the brain has to work out the significance of this messages. It requires the students to read for meaning. According to Burhan (2012) reading is a physic and mental activity to reveal the meaning of the written texts, while in that activity there is a process of knowing letters. It says a physic activity because the parts of the body, our eyes particularly, do it.

In addition, Perry and Ron (2001), the purpose of report text is to give a truth account of something, somebody, place, or activity. After investigating and collecting the fact, report text has language features, there are present tense , third person , heading and subheadings , use of technical and scientific language , selective use of adjective and adverb for description, action verb to describe behavior, use of cause and effect in presenting information.

METHODOLOGY

This is a descriptive reasearch that it has only one variable namely, to describe the student ability in comprehending report text, Gay (1991) says that a descriptive research involves collecting data to test hypothesis or to answer question concerning the status of the study.

Therefore, this research only describes the level of ability the second year students of SMA N 1 Gaung in comprehending report text. The test form of this research is objective test and it consists of thirty items.

Freankel and Wallen (1993) state that a population is the group to which the result of the study is intended to apply. The population of this research is second year students of SMAN 1 Gaung in academic 2017-2018. The population are 150 students that consist of five classes.

Table 1 The Distribution of the Population

NO	Classes	Population
1	XI IPA 1	30
2	XI IPA 2	30
3	XI IPS 1	30
4	XI IPS 2	30
5	XI IPS 3	30
	Total	150

According to Gay (2000), if the population is large and spread out in an intact group that has similar characteristic, cluster sampling is useful. Cluster sampling is a sampling technique where the entire population is divided into groups, or cluster and a random sample of these clusters are selected. Kelly (2006), states that selecting clusters such as groups defined by area of residence, organizational membership or other group-defining characteristics. Meanwhile, Sudjana (1998) in cluster sampling the population is divided into some group/cluster. These clusters will be taken in a random process. Every member in cluster that has been taken randomly will be a sample.

To get the sample the writer used cards, the writer named cards based on every class of second year students of SMAN 1 Gaung. They are class XI IPA 1, XI IPA 2, XI IPS 1, XI IPS 2 and also XI IPS 3. After mixing these cards for a moment and the writer took two pieces as the sample class in this research.

The classification of students' scores by Harris (1974) were used to classify the students' scores in comprehending the texts.

Table 2. The Classification of students' score

No.	Scores	Category
1.	81 – 100	Excellent
2.	61 – 80	Good
3.	41 – 60	Mediocre
4.	21 – 40	Poor
5.	0 – 20	Very Poor

(Adopted from Harris, 1974)

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

The items of the test are accepted if the difficulty level is between 0.30-0.70 and they will be rejected if the index of the difficulty is below 0.30 (too difficult) and above 0.70 (too easy). By using the formula, there were 5 items that should be revised; they were items number 7, 15, 18, 21, and 22. Item number 21 and 22 were revised because their index difficulty below 0.3. It means that they were too difficult. Whereas, the item number 7, 15, and 18 were revised because their index difficulty were above 0.7. It means that they were too easy.

Table 3. Percentage of Students' Ability in Comprehending Report Text

No	Range score	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Ability	Mean score
1	81-100	0	0	Excellent	62.2
2	61-80	18	60.0	Good	
3	41-60	11	36.6	Mediocre	
4	21-40	0	0	Poor	
5	0-20	1	3.0	Very poor	
	Total	30	100 %		

The Table of percentage of the students' ability in comprehending report text indicates that the students' ability in all level is in different numbers. The level ability of the majority of students is in *good level* (60.00%). It means that most of them (18 students) did not find difficulty in this test. This number is quite different from the level of very poor. There are only 3% of students (1 student) in *very poor level*. Then, 36.6% of students (11 students) in *mediocre level*.

Table 4. The Students Score Classification in term finding main ideas

No	Range score	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Ability	Mean score
1	81-100	1	3.3	Excellent	54.6
2	61-80	11	36.6	Good	
3	41-60	14	46.6	Mediocre	
4	21-40	3	10.0	Poor	
5	0-20	1	3.3	Very Poor	
	Total	30	100 %		

The level ability of the majority of students is in *mediocre level*, it is 46.60% of students (14 students). 11 students (36.60%) in *good level*. 3 students (10%) in *very poor level*. 1 student (3.3%) in *excellent level*. Then, 1 students (3.3%) in *poor level*.

Table 5. Percentage Finding Factual information

No	Range score	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Ability	Mean score
1	81-100	7	13.0	Excellent	53.2
2	61-80	5	21.0	Good	
3	41-60	6	7.90	Mediocre	
4	21-40	1	3.0	Poor	
5	0-20	1	5.0	Very Poor	
	Total	30	100 %		

From 30 students for finding factual information, 7 students (13.0%) are in *excellent level*, 5 students (21.0%) are in *mediocre level*, 6 students (20.0%) are in *mediocre level*. Besides that 1 students (3%) are in *poor level* and 3 students (5%) are classified in *very poor level*.

Table 6. The Students Score Classification in Term Finding Meaning of Difficult Word

No	Range score	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Ability	Mean score
1	81-100	16	53.3	Excellent	68.73
2	61-80	4	13.3	Good	
3	41-60	5	16.6	Mediocre	
4	21-40	3	10.0	Poor	
5	0-20	0	0	Very Poor	
	Total	30	100 %		

The students' ability in finding meaning of difficult word varies, 16 students (53.3%) are in *excellent* level, 4 students (13.3%) are in *good* level, 5 students (16.6%) are in *mediocre* level. Besides that, 3 students (10%) are in *poor*. But, there is no student (0%) is in very poor level.

Table 6. The Students Score Classification in term finding reference

No	Range score	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Ability	Mean score
1	81-100	18	60.0	Excellent	75.3
2	61-80	6	20.0	Good	
3	41-60	5	16.6	Mediocre	
4	21-40	0	0	Poor	
5	0-20	1	3.3	Very Poor	
	Total	30	100 %		

The students' ability in finding meaning of difficult word varies, 16 students (53.3%) are in *excellent* level, 4 students (13.3%) are in *good* level, 5 students (16.6%) are in *mediocre* level. Besides that, 3 students (10%) are in *poor*. But, there is no student (0%) is in very poor level.

Table 7. The Students Score Classification in term finding reference

No	Range score	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Ability	Mean score
1	81-100	18	60.0	Excellent	75.3
2	61-80	6	20.0	Good	
3	41-60	5	16.6	Mediocre	
4	21-40	0	0	Poor	
5	0-20	1	3.3	Very Poor	
	Total	30	100 %		

The students' ability in finding reference varies, 18 students (60%) are in *excellent* level, 6 students (20.0%) are in *good* level, 5 students (16.6%) are in *mediocre* level. Besides that, no students are in *poor* level and 1 students (3.3%) are in *very poor* level.

Table 8. The Students Score Classification in term finding restatement

No	Range score	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Ability	Mean score
1	81-100	11	36.6	Excellent	60.3
2	61-80	4	13.3	Good	
3	41-60	5	16.6	Mediocre	
4	21-40	6	20.0	Poor	
5	0-20	4	13.3	Very Poor	
	Total	30	100 %		

The students' ability in finding restatement varies. From the total of 30 students, 11 students (36.6%) are in *excellent* level, 4 students (13.3%) are in *good* level, 5 students (16.6%) are in *mediocre* level, 6 students (20.0%) are in *poor* level and 4 students (13.3%) are in *very poor* level. The students' mean scores in each classification of question in comprehending report text can be seen in table below:

Table 9. The Students' Mean Scores in Each Classification

No.	The Classification of Question	Mean Score	Level of Ability
1.	Finding main idea	54.6	Mediocre
2.	Finding factual information	53.2	Mediocre
3.	Finding the meaning of difficult words	68.7	Good
4.	Finding reference	75.3	Good
5.	Finding restatement	60.3	Mediocre
Total		62.42	Good

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

After conducting the research, some conclusions can be drawn. The objective of the research is to find out how is the ability of the second year students of SMAN 1 Gaung Indragiri Hilir in comprehending report texts for each component. Based on the result of the data analysis in chapter IV, the writer makes some conclusions. Among 30 students, there are 18 students (60%) is in good level, 11 students (36.6%) in mediocre level, 1 students (3.3%) are in very poor level, and The last, there is no students in the excellent level and *poor level*. So, most of the students are in good level. The mean score of the whole students' scores in comprehending report text is 62.2. In conclusion, the reading ability of the second year students of SMAN 1 Gaung Indragiri Hilir in comprehending recount text is in good level.

In detail, the students' ability in comprehending report text for the five components can be concluded that the students is in level of mediocre (finding main idea, finding factual information, and finding restatement) and level of good (finding references and finding the meaning of difficult word). The most difficult aspect in comprehending report text is in finding factual information, with the mean score 53.2. Then, the easiest aspect is in finding the meaning of reference, with the mean score 75.3. Then, the students' mean score in terms of finding main idea is 54.6. The students' mean score in term of finding meaning of difficult word is 68.7. The last, the students' mean score in terms finding restatement is 60.3.

Recommendations

The writer would like to propose some recommendations as follow:

1. Considering that the student's ability level in comprehending report text is *good level*, it is recommended that the students should do more practice reading a book about report text.
2. For English teacher should have some effort to develop the students' motivation and encourage them to practice in comprehending report text in order to make the

students familiar with reading materials in terms of five indicators of reading comprehension.

3. The last one, the researcher recommended other researcher to continue the research findings in the other kinds of research.

In additions, students need to enjoy reading activity because there will be many advantages that they can get. They can start reading activity through reading a report text which can improve their knowledge and can entertain them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alderson, J. C. 2000. *Assessing Reading*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Beare, Kenneth. 2009. *Improve Reading Skill*. Retrieved 10 July 2015 from <http://esl.about.com/od/englishreadingskills/a/readingskills.htm>

Burnes, Don and Page, Glenda. 1991. *Insight and Strategies for Teaching Reading*. Australia: Harcourt Brace Sovanovich Group.

Harris, P. David. 1974 J. *Effect of random defects on the critical behaviour of Ising model* Phys. C: Solid State Phys.

Hatch, E dan Farhady, H. 1982. *Research Design and Statistic For Applied Linguistic*. Newburry House Publisher Inc, Massachussets.

Heaton, JB. 1991. *Writing English Language Test*. Longman Group. London

Heinemann, Rigby. 2004. *Writing Resource Book Advance Press*. Australia. Bassendean Western.