
**A STUDY ON THE ABILITY OF THE SECOND YEAR STUDENTS OF
SMAN 1 KASIKAN TAPUNG HULU, KAMPAR
IN COMPREHENDING NARRATIVE TEXT**

**Masri
Fakhri Ras
Syafri K**

The English Study Program
Language and Arts Department
Teachers Training and Education Faculty
Riau University

Abstract

This was a descriptive research. The specific objective of this research was to find out the ability of the second year students of SMAN 1 Kasikan Tapung Hulu, Kampar in comprehending Narrative Text. The research was conducted in the academic year of 2012 / 2013 at SMAN 1 Kasikan Hulu, Kampar. It is located on jalan kampung lama No.10 Desa Kasikan Kecamatan Tapung Hulu Kabupaten Kampar. The data of this research was collected from on April 2013. In this study, the researcher took the sample by using cluster sampling. Before the test was administered to the students, the researcher did a try out to the 40 students of XI.1 class to find out the validity and reliability of the test. After validating the instrument, the real test was administered to the students. The subjects of this research were 40 students of XI.1. After collecting the data, the researcher analyzed the result to find out the ability of the second year students of SMAN 1 Kasikan Tapung Hulu, Kampar in comprehending Narrative Texts. The ability of the students was analyzed through five components: finding factual information, reference, generic structure, language feature and social purpose.

Keyword: Ability, Reading, Reading Comprehension

INTRODUCTION

Teaching of narrative text in senior high school involves the above skill and some sub skills as it is mentioned in the school curriculum (KTSP): finding factual information, reference, generic structure, language feature and social purpose.

Reading is one of four basic skills in learning language. As one of the basic skills, reading is very important in learning English. Reading is a thinking activity and it depends on the level of intelligence of the reader, his or her speed of thinking

and ability to detect the relationship (Burnes, 1985:47). In reading activity, students are expected to read effectively and efficiently. So, they can catch the ideas or the information from the text. Reading is a complex requiring among other things, specific ability and certain skills. But not all people can understand what they are read including the students who usually learn English. They just read sentences without understanding. Reading English text is very important because it gives us an opportunity to gain knowledge and technology. English is a compulsory subject for students in Indonesia. Being able to read English texts well is a necessity for everyone in anticipating the information of global era. Therefore, good ability in reading English texts is very important for the students to follow the development of today's world.

Reading process involves the interaction between readers and texts. In other words, reading is an activity which makes the reader's mind active. One phase of reading process is reading comprehension that is the process of inferring the ideas, concepts, feeling and information that the writer intends to convey. From the result of observation to the English teacher at SMAN I Kasikan Tapung Hulu, Kampar. The writer found that many students still get difficult to understand what they read. Most of them had difficulties in selecting the correct answer in reading narrative text. Then, some of the students confused in answering the question about narrative text.

There are some components in reading comprehension which should be focused on comprehending reading text. King and Stanley (1989:330) states that there are five components that my help the students to read carefully:

1. Find Main Idea

Main idea is the main topic that is being discussed in a paragraph. Main idea is also fundamental idea. It is describe the content of paragraph. Main idea helps the reader to understand not only ideas but also their relative significance, as expressed by author.

2. Finding Factual Information

Factual information is the important information about the reality that describe from the text. We can find the factual information in every paragraph.

3. Guessing Vocabulary in Context

Difficult word or unfamiliar word is the word that difficult to be understood. We can guess the difficult word from context clues. The context can give us the meaning not only familiar words, but also unfamiliar words.

4. Reference

Reference is the word that represent the another word. It is issued to avoid the repeated word. We can find it in the beginning, the middle, or the end of the sentence. Reference word are usually short and frequently pronouns, such s it, she, he, this, they, them and soon.

5. Making inferences

Inference is a skill where the reader has to able to read between lines. King and stanly divide into two main attentions, draw logical inferences and make accurate prediction.

The researcher chose narrative text because they are always found in the reading comprehension test for the senior high school level. The researcher focused

on how well do the second year student of SMAN I Kasikan Tapung Hulu, Kampar in comprehending narrative text.

METHODOLOGY

This was a descriptive research, which has only one variable that was the ability of the second year students of SMAN I Kasikan Tapung Hulu, Kampar. This research was administrated the data in order to get generalization or a conclusion of a certain population. Gay (1987) described that a descriptive research is also carried out to find out an answer to a question concerning the current status of the subject of the study. This research is designed to observe and interpret as objectively as possible the ability of the second year students of SMAN I Kasikan Tapung Hulu, Kampar in reading comprehension of narrative text. In this study, the researcher took the sample by using cluster sampling. In taking the sample, the researcher uses lottery technique. The researcher has four cards, one of which is written with the word “sample”. The chairman of each class has to draw one card. The class that got the word “sample” becomes the sample of this research. Since the chairman of class XI-1 got the word “sample”, it became the sample of the research.

In this research, the writer collected the data using a multiple choice question test. It consists of 8 passages; each text has 5 question items and has been done by the students in 90 minutes that consist of 40 items. Each passage consists of 5 questions and one question has four options (A, B, C and D). The researcher asked them in reading comprehension.. According to Hughes (2003), one of the tests that can be set to give a test in reading comprehension is multiple choices because it is best suited to relatively infrequent of large number candidate. The texts for the instrument were taken from English Textbooks.

Before the test was given to the students, the writer did try out on the second year students of SMAN I Kasikan Tapung Hulu, Kampar. The try out was conducted to find out the validity and reliability of the test. From the try out, the researcher knows the items which are too difficult or too easy.

According to Heaton (1995:179), a test item is accepted is the result of index of difficulty falling between 0.30 and 0.70. But, if the score is less than 0.3 (too difficult) and over 0.7 (too easy), it means that they are rejected.

To calculate the reliability, the researcher finds the mean score and standard deviation. To find the mean of the test scores, the following formula is used:

$$m = \frac{\sum fx}{N}$$

Where: m = Mean score
 $\sum fx$ = The sum of respondents score
N = Total number of students

(Heaton, 1975:175)

To get the standard deviation of the scores, the researcher uses the following formula:

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{\sum d^2}{N - 1}}$$

Where: SD = Standard deviation
 d^2 = Mean Deviation
 N = The number of the students

(Heaton, 1975:170)

The reliability is a necessary characteristic of any good test. To be valid, a test must be reliable as a measured instrument. In order to find the reliability of the test, the following formula is used:

$$r_{ii} = \frac{N}{N - 1} \left\{ 1 - m \frac{(N - m)}{N x^2} \right\}$$

Where: r_{ii} = The reliability of the whole test
 N = The number of items in the test
 m = The mean score on the test for all the test score
 x = The standard deviation of all

(Heaton , 1975:157)

The researcher analyzes the data obtained from the data collection techniques. The researcher uses descriptive research that is intended to describe current condition by collecting numerical data to answer the questions about current status of the object of the study. Then, to classify the scores obtained by the students, the researcher has established five categories: Excellent, Good, Mediocre, Poor, Very poor.

After that, the researcher checked their answer and counted their correct answers. Then the researcher calculated the students' individual score from the test by using this following formula:

$$M = \frac{X}{N} \times 100\%$$

Where:
 M = Individual score
 X = Correct answer
 N = Number of items

Wayan and Sumartana (1986:76)

Then, to make interpretation of the mean scores, the writer used scale of ability that was adapted by Harris in Romianna (2009:29) as follows:

Ability Scores	Ability classifications
81-100	Excellent
61-80	Good
41-60	Average
21-40	Below Average
0-20	Poor

The percentage of the students who able to answer the test correctly is calculated by using the following formula:

$$P = \frac{X}{N} \times 100\%$$

P = Percentage

X = Number of frequency

N = The Number of Respondents

(Hatch & Farhady, 1982:43)

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The researcher conducted a try out the test to 40 students of SMAN I Kasikan Tapung Hulu,Kampar on April 2013. The researcher tried out the test in order to find the validity and reliability of the test.

According to Heaton (1995:179), a test item is accepted is the result of index of difficulty falling between 0.30 and 0.70. But, if the score is less than 0.3 (too difficult) and over 0.7 (too easy), it means that they are rejected. In this research, there is one items was too easy (items number 1) and three item were too difficult (item number 10,28 and 33)

According to (Heaton , 1975:157). The reliability is a necessary characteristic of any good test. To be valid, a test must be reliable as a measured instrument. In order to find the reliability of the test, we need to find out first the mean and the standard deviation. After obtaining the mean and standard deviation, the reliability was calculated.

The real test is conducted to 40 students of second year students of SMAN I Kasikan Tapung Hulu,Kampar class XI-1. After collecting the data, the researcher analyzed the result to find out the ability of the second year students of SMAN I Kasikan Tapung Hulu,Kampar in comprehending Narrative Texts.

In order to find out the individual score of each student, the writer divided the number of the correct answers with the total number of items and then multiplied it by one hundred. The percentage of the students' ability in reading comprehension can be seen in the table below.

Table 1.
The Percentage of the Students' Ability in Reading Comprehension

No	Clasification		Frequency	Percentage
	Level of Ability	Scores		
1	Excellent	81-100	4	10%
2	Good	61-80	13	32,5%
3	Average	41-60	19	47,5%
4	Below Average	21-40	4	10%
5	Poor	0-20	0	0%

From table 1, it explain that From 40 students, 4 students (10%) were in *excellent* level, 13 students (32.5%) were in *good* level, 19 students (47.5%) were in *average* level, 4 students (10%) were in *below average* level and no student was in Poor level. The mean score of the second year students of SMA N I Kasikan Tapung Hulu, Kampar in comprehending Narrative Text is 60.25. Therefore, it can be stated that the students' mean score is at *average* level.

The Classification of the Students' Ability in Reading Comprehension

After obtaining the individual scores of the students in reading comprehension based on the classification of question as stated in the blue print of the instrument, it is important to know the range score of the students' ability in statistically. It shows as follow:

Table 2
The Students' Scores Classification in Finding Factual Information

No.	Classification		Frequency	Percentage
	Level of Ability	Scores		
1.	Excellent	81-100	7	17.5%
2.	Good	61-80	11	27.5%
3.	Average	41-60	9	22.5%
4.	Below Average	21-40	7	17.5%
5.	Poor	0-20	6	15%

Table 2 shows that students' scores and their level of ability classification in all level varied. From 40 students, 7 students (17.5%) were in *excellent* level, 11 students (27.5%) were in *good* level, 9 students (22.5%) were in *average* level, 7 students (17.5%) were in *below average* level and 6 students (15%) were in *poor* level..

To find out the mean score of the students' ability in terms Factual Information, the writer calculated it by using the formula below:

$$M = \frac{\sum FX}{N} = \frac{2150}{40} = 53.75$$

Table 3
The Students' Scores Classification in Finding Reference

No.	Classification		Frequency	Percentage
	Level of Ability	Scores		
1.	Excellent	81-100	6	15%
2.	Good	61-80	19	47.5%
3.	Average	41-60	9	22.5%
4.	Below Average	21-40	5	12.5%
5.	Poor	0-20	1	2.5%

Table 3 shows that the percentage of the students' scores and their level of ability classification in all level varied. From 40 students, 6 students (15%) were in *excellent* level, 19 students (47.5%) were in *good* level, 9 students (22.5%) were in *average* level, 5 students (12.5%) were in *below average* level and 1 student (2.5%) was in *poor* level.

To find out the mean score of the students' ability in terms of finding reference, the writer calculated it by using the formula below:

$$M = \frac{\sum FX}{N} = \frac{2600}{40} = 65$$

Table 4

The Students' Scores Classification Finding Meaning of Generic Structure

No.	Classification		Frequency	Percentage
	Level of Ability	Scores		
1.	Excellent	81-100	5	12.5%
2.	Good	61-80	17	42.5%
3.	Average	41-60	13	32.5%
4.	Below Average	21-40	5	12.5%
5.	Poor	0-20	0	0%

Table 4 show that The percentage of the students' scores and their level of ability classification in all level varied. From 40 students, 5 students (12,5%) were in *excellent* level, 17 students (42.5%) were in *good* level, 13 students (32.5%) were in *average* level, 5 students (12.5%) were in *below average* level and no student (0%) was in *poor* level.

To find out the mean score of the students' ability in terms of Generic Structure, the writer calculated it by using the formula below:

$$M = \frac{\sum FX}{N} = \frac{2550}{40} = 63.75$$

Table 5

The Students' Scores Classification in Identifying Language Feature

No.	Classification		Frequency	Percentage
	Level of Ability	Scores		
1.	Excellent	81-100	6	15%
2.	Good	61-80	17	42.5%
3.	Average	41-60	12	30%
4.	Below Average	21-40	5	12.5%
5.	Poor	0-20	0	0%

The percentage of the students' scores and their level of ability classification in all level varied. From 40 students, 6 students (15%) were in *excellent* level, 17

students (42.5%) were in *good* level, 12 students (30%) were in *Average* level, 5 students (12.5%) were in *below average* level and no student (0%) was in *poor* level. To find out the mean score of the students' ability in terms of Language feature, the writer calculated it by using the formula below:

$$M = \frac{\sum FX}{N} = \frac{2600}{40} = 65$$

Table 8.
The Students' Scores Classification in term Social Purpose

No.	Classification		Frequency	Percentage
	Level of Ability	Scores		
1.	Excellent	81-100	5	12.5%
2.	Good	61-80	12	30%
3.	Average	41-60	12	30%
4.	Below Average	21-40	10	25%
5.	Poor	0-20	1	2.5%

The percentage of the students' scores and their level of ability classification in all level varied. From 40 students, 5 students (12.5%) were in *excellent* level, 12 students (30%) were in *good* level, 12 students (30%) were in *average* level, 10 students (25%) were in *below average* level and 1 student (2.5%) was in *poor* level. To find out the mean score of the students' ability in terms of Social Purpose, the writer calculated it by using the formula below:

$$M = \frac{\sum FX}{N} = \frac{2250}{40} = 56.25$$

CONCLUSIONS

The research has been conducted to find the objective of this study is to find out the ability of the second year students of SMAN 1 Kasikan Tapung Hulu, Kampar in comprehending Narrative Text. Based on the result of the data analysis in chapter IV, the writer makes some conclusions. Among 40 students, 4 students (10%) were in *excellent* level, 13 students (32.5%) were in *good* level, 19 students (47.5%) were in *average* level, 4 students (10%) were in *below average* level and no student was in *poor* level. The mean score of the whole students in comprehending Narrative Text is 60.25. In conclusion, the ability of the second year students of SMAN 1 Kasikan Tapung Hulu, Kampar in comprehending Narrative Text was *average* level.

Since the research dealt with comprehending Narrative Text, the writer drew conclusions for each classification of Comprehending English Narrative text. In terms of Factual Information, from 40 students, 7 students (17.5%) were in *excellent* level, 11 students (27.5%) were in *good* level, 9 students (22.5%) were in *average* level, 7 students (17.5%) were in *below average* level and 6 students (15%) were in *poor* level. In terms of Reference, 6 students (15%) were in *excellent* level, 19 students (47.5%) were in *good* level, 9 students (22.5%) were in *average* level, 5 students (12.5%) were in *below average* level and 1 student (2.5%) was in *poor* level. In terms

of Generic Structure, 5 students (12.5%) were in *excellent* level, 17 students (42.5%) were in *good* level, 13 students (32.5%) were in *average* level, 5 students (12.5%) were in *inbelow average* level and no student (0%) was in *poor* level. In terms of Language Feature, 6 students (15%) were in *excellent* level, 17 students (42.5%) were in *good* level, 12 students (30%) were in *average* level, 5 students (12.5%) were in *below average* level and no student (0%) was in *poor* level. In terms of Social purpose, 5 students (12.5%) were in *excellent* level, 12 students (30%) were in *good* level, 12 students (30%) were in *average* level, 10 students (25%) were in *below average* level and 1 student (2.5%) was in *poor* level.

SUGGESTIONS

Based on the result of the research, the following suggestions might be useful in teaching and learning process at the second year students of SMAN I Kasikan Tapung Hulu, Kampar. First, for the students who have good level in comprehending narrative text; They still expected to improve their ability by reading and practicing more exercise of narrative text. The students should motivate themselves to mastering english vocabulary by open the dictionary more when they find the difficult word. Besides, the students should learn more about generic structure of narrative text, so they can answer the question about generic sturcture correctly.

Second, the teacher should give more exercises and improve the students'ability to comprehend reading texts especially in comprehending generic structure of narrative text. He or she should be more creative to creat the ways for helping the students to improve their ability. The teacher also should be able to make students enjoy their english class by creating interesting ways and various activities.

Finally, writer hoped that this study gives valuable contribution to the students, whether as an exercise on reading or as evaluation on their reading ability especially in comprehending narrative text.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brenda, Smith. 1999. Adapted for Breaking Through to College Reading. ([Http://WWW.marin.cc.ca.us—don/study/ read.html](http://WWW.marin.cc.ca.us—don/study/read.html))
- Burnes, Don, and Glenda Page. (1985). Insights and Strategies for Teaching Reading. Harcourt Grace Jovanovich Group, Sydney.
- Gay, L.R. (1987). Educational Research Merill Publishing Company, Columbus.and Hossein Harmer, Jeremy. 1998. *How to Teach English*. Cambridge. Longman
- Hartono, Rudi, S.S. 2005. Genres of Texts. Semarang State University.
- Hatch, E, and Hossein Farhady. (1982). *Research Design and Statistic for Applied Linguistics* .New Busy House Publisher. Inc, Los Angles.
- Hemming. (1973). English Based on Global Language. Merrill Publishing Co, Ohio.
- Gerot, Linda and Peter Wignell. (1994) *Making sense of Functional Grammar*. Gerd

- Stabler anti Popdean Educational Enterprise. New South Wales.
- Guth, Hans P. (1997). *American English Today*, Wabster Division, Mc Graw Hill Book Company. New York.
- Hornby, As. (1995). *Oxford Advance Learner Dictionary*. Oxford University. Press, London.
- Karkowian, Adrea. (1984). *Comunication Oriented Teaching*. Mc. Milian Publising, New York.
- Kustaryo, S. 1988. *Reading Teaching Techniques for College Students*. Jakarta: Depdikbud.
- Longman. 1098. *Dictionary of Comprehension*. The Up to date Learning Ditionary.
- Manser, H. Martin. (1991). *Oxford Learner's Pocket Dictionary*. Second Edition, Oxford-Oxford Univ. Press.
- Napa, a Pieter. (1991). *Vocabulary Development Skills*. Kanikus.
- Nuttal, Christina. (1982). *Teaching Reading Skills in a Foreign language*. Heinemann. Publisher Ltd, London.
- Wayan, Nur Kencana dan Sumartana, Drs. (1983). *Evaluasi Pendidikan usaha Nasional*. Surabaya.