

## Using Word Mapping Technique to Improve the Students' Speaking Ability on Hortatory Exposition Text At SMAN 3 Merbau

**Dedy Safrizal, Fakhri Ras, Masyhur**

Email: [dedysafrizal@gmail.com](mailto:dedysafrizal@gmail.com)

Student of English Language Education Department  
Faculty of Teacher's Training and Education  
Riau University

**Abstract:** *This classroom action research was aimed to find out if Word Mapping technique in Brainstorming can improve the speaking ability of the students on Hortatory Exposition Text at grade XI Science Class 1 of SMAN 3 Merbau. The participants of this research were all of the students grade XI Science Class 1 of SMAN 3 Merbau (28 students). The procedures applied were: (a) explaining the objective of the learning, the teaching material, material, the text type; hortatory exposition, and the steps in using the technique, (b) dividing students into some groups of discussion and the teacher delivered the learning instruments needed such as flip chart and markers, (c) explaining about Hortatory Exposition Text to the students, (d) choosing the topic together, (e) asking asked to work in their group in limited time to generate ideas related to the topic as many as possible, (f) facilitating students in discussion, and (g) presenting the ideas in front of the class. The data were collected by using tests, observation sheets, and field notes. The level of achievement in this research was 70, based on the standard minimum criteria of achievement of English subject in SMAN 3 Merbau. The research finding showed that the implementation of Word Mapping technique could improve students' speaking ability both at the first and second cycle. Based on the data analysis, the students' score improved from 39,66 in the pre-test, to 56,72 in post-test 1, and up to 72,16 in post-test II. Therefore, the implementation of Word Mapping technique could improve students' speaking ability on Hortatory Exposition text at SMAN 3 Merbau.*

**Keywords:** *Word Mapping Technique, Speaking Ability, Hortatory Exposition Text.*

## Penggunaan Teknik Word Mapping untuk Meningkatkan Kemampuan Berbicara Teks Jenis Hortatory Exposition Siswa di SMAN 3 Merbau

**Dedy Safrizal, Fakhri Ras, Masyhur**

Email: [dedysafrizal@gmail.com](mailto:dedysafrizal@gmail.com)

Mahasiswa Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris  
Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan  
Universitas Riau

**Abstrak:** Penelitian tindakan kelas ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui jika teknik Word Mapping bisa meningkatkan kemampuan berbicara siswa kelas XI IPA 1 SMAN 3 Merbau pada teks jenis Hortatory Exposition. Sample penelitian ini berjumlah 28 orang siswa. Prosedur pengajaran yang digunakan adalah: (a) menjelaskan tujuan pembelajaran, materi, teks hortatory exposition, dan langkah-langkah dalam menggunakan teknik, (b) membagi siswa ke dalam kelompok diskusi dan membagi instrument penelitian yang diperlukan seperti kertas manila dan spidol, (c) menjelaskan teks hortatory exposition, (d) memilih topik bersama, (e) meminta siswa untuk berdiskusi di grup masing-masing (f) memfasilitasi siswa selama berdiskusi, dan (g) meminta siswa mempresentasikan di depan kelas. Data penelitian dikumpulkan dengan menggunakan tes, lembar observasi, dan lembar catatan lapangan. Level pencapaian di dalam penelitian ini adalah 70 berdasarkan KKM mata pelajaran Bahasa Inggris di SMAN 3 Merbau. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa penggunaan teknik Word Mapping bisa meningkatkan kemampuan berbicara siswa baik di siklus pertama maupun siklus kedua. Berdasarkan analisis data, nilai siswa meningkat dari 39,66 di pre-test, menjadi 56,72 di post-test 1, dan meningkat lagi menjadi 72,16 di post-test II. Dengan demikian, penggunaan teknik Word Mapping bisa meningkatkan kemampuan berbicara teks jenis Hortatory Exposition siswa di SMAN 3 Merbau.

**Keywords:** Teknik Word Mapping, Kemampuan Berbicara, Teks Hortatory Exposition.

## INTRODUCTION

For English teachers, teaching speaking is a very important and simultaneously challenging part in the process of language learning and teaching. The teachers are faced with the high expectation of the teaching outcome, which is to make the students be able to speak English. This expectation cannot be neglected since it is one of the main purposes as today's world requirement in teaching speaking that should improve students' communicative skills (Kayi: 2006).

English that is taught at schools is expected to be applied in real life for communicative purposes. In learning English, students of second/foreign language are considered successful if they can use the language to communicate effectively (Riggenback & Lazaraton in Widiati & Cahyono: 2006).

Learning speaking skill is different from other skills. In other skills, learners can do the activities by themselves. For example, learners can listen by themselves in learning listening skill, they can read alone in improving their reading skill, and they can write anything when learning writing. But in learning speaking, the learners need someone to practice with. In addition, speaking, along with writing, is a productive skill that requires the learners to produce the language itself.

The teaching of English includes four skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Since almost every aspect in students' daily life is carried out in writing forms, such as in doing exercise, homework, reports, papers, and even final exam, writing is regarded as one of the most important English skills for being successful in education. To support students' ability in writing, they are not only have to understand the components related to writing but also have to understand how to use that components in correct writing form. The National Commission on Writing in American's Schools and Colleges (2003) states that writing requires students to stretch their minds, sharpen their analytical skills, and determine valid and precise distinctions. During this complex process, students must maintain their focus on important aspects such as organization, form and features, purposes and goals, audience needs and perspective, and evaluation of the communication between the author and reader.

Based on Curriculum 2006 or KTSP, speaking is one of the four skills that are needed to be taught to the students of Senior High Schools. One of the expectations of teaching speaking is that the students are expected to know and understand the function, the generic structure language features of short functional texts and monologues and be able to make a speech or perform the speech. The materials of teaching speaking include short functional texts and monologues. There are several types of text which are included like Recount, Narrative, Procedure, Descriptive, News Item, Spoof, Report, Analytical Exposition, Hortatory Exposition, Explanation, Discussion, and Review.

One of the text types that is taught at Senior High School is Hortatory Exposition Text. In this type of text, the writer gives his opinion to persuade the readers about something (Djuharie, 2007: 31). The text organizations of hortatory exposition are: Thesis, Arguments, and Recommendation. The language features are: abstract noun, jargons or technical terms, modals, evaluative words, passive sentences, thinking verbs. There are three parts of the text that usually discussed in the classroom. They are the social function, the text organization and the language features. These three parts enable students to have better comprehension about the text.

However, many students find themselves difficult to understand about Hortatory Exposition Text. This problem was found when the writer conducted a small survey to find out the students ability in Hortatory Exposition Text. In addition, from a discussion

with the English teacher of SMAN 3 Merbau, it was found that the students get difficulties in developing their ideas when speaking, especially in hortatory exposition text. The writer also got data from the English Teacher of the grade eleventh of social class, second semester, SMAN 3 Merbau which revealed that only 30% of the students can achieve the criteria of the minimum achievement or KKM.

The problems that appear are related to two factors, i.e. the teacher and the students themselves. The former can be connected with the teaching method of the teacher and the teacher's ability of performance while the latter can be connected with students' anxiety, students' knowledge, and the environment.

So far, the English teacher at SMAN 3 Merbau has applied some techniques in teaching English but the techniques used do not work as expected. It may be caused by the techniques are not interested for the students which result in low understanding of the students. Another related factor is the teachers' ability in teaching the students in classroom. It is also connected to the instruments and media used in the classroom.

From the point of the students, the inhibiting factors are related to the feeling of anxious, reluctant, and shy of using English. It might be caused by their feelings of afraid to be mocked and make mistakes in learning English in front of their friends. Another inhibiting factor is that when they speak English, they always get problems in developing their ideas. Because of these phenomena, the writer is interested to find out the solution for the problems, especially related to the teaching technique used in the classroom.

There are many teaching technique that can be applied in teaching speaking. Some of them are Word Mapping, Group Investigation, Debate, Role Playing, and Talking Stick. In this research, the writer would like to apply Word Mapping Technique in Brainstorming to be used in the classroom to deal with the students' difficulty in developing idea.

Word Mapping technique is one of the techniques that can be used in Brainstorming. Cullen (1989) states that there are several techniques in Brainstorming including simple word lists, lists based on a principles, finding alternatives for a blank in a sentence, brainstorming on a picture, brainstorming using a song, word-mapping or phrase mapping around a central theme, changing one word in a sentence in each time, listing different ways of expressing a particular language function, prediction, free association, and group storytelling.

Brainstorming was originally designed by Alex F. Osborn (1930s) to help people in developing ideas. It is very useful especially for teachers to help their students to develop their ideas. It can encourage the students to work in a team. The main purpose of this method is to generate ideas as many as possible about one topic given. This technique has been used in many different field of study and was found as a successful technique. This technique is considered as a suitable technique to deal with the students' problems in comprehending Hortatory Exposition Text.

Some researchers have revealed that brainstorming method is very helpful in teaching. It can be used in different field of study. In writing skill, Widia Rahayu (2009) in her research found that brainstorming is an effective method in guiding the students in writing descriptive text. In listening skill, Veronica Ivone (2010) conducted an action research about teaching listening through brainstorming using a song and found that there was improvement to the students' ability in comprehending language function by applying brainstorming method.

In addition, Brian Cullen (1998) conducted a research study on the use of brainstorming in oral communication classes at a Japanese senior high school. He

introduced the brainstorming as a short warm-up activity that could direct the minds of the students towards the speaking task and maximize their speaking time. This research shows that brainstorming bring significant influence to the atmosphere of the classroom and behavior of the students. Another research was conducted by Siti Hajar (2009). She used brainstorming method to improve speaking ability and found that brainstorming can improve students speaking skill.

According to Balackova (2003), there are several advantages of using Brainstorming method in teaching. They are : (1) Solutions can be found rapidly and it takes a little time. (2) Results and ways of problem-solving that are new and unexpected. (3) A wider picture of the problem or issue can be obtained.(4) The atmosphere within the team is more open. (5) The team shares responsibility for the problem. (6) Responsibility for the outcome is shared. (7) The implementation process is facilitated by the fact that staff shared in the decision-making process.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### ***Participants***

The participants of this research were all of the students grade XI Science Class 1 of SMAN 3 Merbau (28 students). The reason for choosing the eleventh graders was that they were considered as the suitable grade just before moving to the final grade in SMA. In addition, they were considered to have enough background knowledge to learn hortatory exposition text. It was also related to the curriculum that hortatory exposition text was taught at the second semester of the eleventh grade.

### ***Instruments, Techniques and Analysis of Data***

Two methods of collecting data were used in this research. There were quantitative and qualitative data. The quantitative data was collected by giving oral test to the students. The tests were done three times; pre-test, post-test 1 and post-test 2. The writer conducted pre-test to find out the students' speaking ability before applying Word Mapping Technique. After conducting a pre-test, the students were taught by using Word Mapping Technique. After that, the writer conducted post test I and post test II to find difference achievement of students' speaking ability. Besides, the qualitative data was collected through observation sheets and field notes which was collected by a collaborator. Observation sheets were used to record the teacher's and students' activities during teaching and learning process. The observation sheets were divided into teacher's observation sheet and students' observation sheet. Field notes consisted of important data that recorded by the observers. It included all the research activities, comments, suggestions, and advices from the collaborator.

In analyzing and measuring the quantitative data, the writer adapted the Weighting Table system of Hughes (1996). Five aspects assessed in the speaking test were: (a) Pronunciation, (b) Grammar, (c) Vocabulary, (d) Fluency, and (e) Comprehension. The rating of score arranged among 1 up to 6 which were converted by using the weighting table.

## RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Before applying Word Mapping technique, the writer conducted a pre-test to find out the students' speaking ability. The students' pre-test assessed by three raters. After the score from the raters were collected, the writer accumulated the score to obtain the students' speaking ability. Below is the students' score after the writer combined the result of the test from the three raters:

**Table 1. The Level of Students' Speaking Ability in Pre-Test**

Score	Ability	F	P (%)
80 – 100	Good to Excellent	0	0%
60 – 79	Average to Good	3	10.72%
50 – 59	Poor to Average	10	35.72%
0 – 49	Poor	15	53.58%
<b>Total</b>		N=28	100%

Based on the table and the chart above, the writer could point out that no student was able to reach the level of very good. There were only 3 students (10.72%) of the students that could reach score between 60 and 79 in the test. There were 10 students (35.72%) who could reach the level of poor to average. There were 15 students (53.58%) in the poor level. From the explanation above, the students' speaking skill was not satisfied in the Pre Test or, in other word, before was taught by using Word Mapping technique.

The writer also presented the data of the students' speaking ability from average score according to five aspects of speaking as in the following table:

**Table 2. The Students' Ability in Each Aspect of Speaking in Pre-Test**

Aspects of Speaking	Average	Level
Pronunciation	1.86	Level 1
Grammar	1.40	Level 1
Vocabulary	1.93	Level 1
Fluency	1.36	Level 1
Comprehension	1.75	Level 1

According to the table above, the students' speaking ability in five speaking aspects. It was found pronunciation with the average score 1.86, grammar with the average score 1.40, vocabulary with the average score 1.93, fluency with the average score 1.36, and comprehension with the average score 1.75. All the aspects of speaking were at level 1 or at the lowest level, according to Hughes' Classification, (1996).

After giving pre-test, the writer started cycle 1 and applied Word Mapping technique to improve students' speaking ability. The writer asked a collaborator to observe the teaching and learning process during the class. The writer applied Word Mapping technique in the first cycle into four meetings and at the end of cycle 1, the writer conducted a post-test to know the students' speaking ability on Hortatory Exposition Text. Below is the students' speaking score after the writer combined the result of the three raters:

**Table 3. The Students' Post-Test Score in Cycle 1**

Score	Ability	F	P (%)
80 – 100	Good to Excellent	2	7.14%
60 – 79	Average to Good	8	28.57%
50 – 59	Poor to Average	11	39.28%
0 – 49	Poor	7	25%
<b>Total</b>		N=28	100%

From the table above, it can be seen that only 2 students (7.14%) could reach the good to excellent level. There were 8 students (28,57%) of the students that could reach the level of average to good. There were 11 students (39,28%) who could reach the level of poor to average. There were 7 students (25%) in the poor level.

The writer also presented the improvement of the students' average score in post-test 1 based on five aspects of writing as in the following table:

**Table 4. The Students' Ability in Each Aspect of Speaking in Post-Test 1**

Aspects of Speaking	Average	Level
Pronunciation	3.33	Level 3
Grammar	2.93	Level 2
Vocabulary	3.22	Level 3
Fluency	2.78	Level 2
Comprehension	2.90	Level 2

According to the table above, there were slight improvements on the speaking aspects compared to the result of pre test. Pronunciation aspect was at level 3 (with average score 3.33), grammar aspect was at level 2 (with the average score 2.93), vocabulary aspect was at level 3 (with the average score 3.22), fluency aspect was at level 2 (with the average score 2.78), and comprehension aspect was at level 2 (with the average score 2.90).

In conclusion, the students' post-test score in Cycle 1 was not satisfied enough. So, the writer decided to continue the research to Cycle 2 in order to improve the students who got score under the Standard Minimum Criteria of Achievement, 70 and also to gain the students' level ability in speaking.

After the writer finished the last meeting in Cycle 2, the writer conducted post test II to know the students' speaking ability after being taught by using Word Mapping technique. The writer analyzed the score and found the result which is presented in the following table:

**Table 5. The Students' Post-Test Score in Cycle 2**

Score	Ability	F	P (%)
80 – 100	Good to Excellent	10	35.72%
60 – 79	Average to Good	13	46.43%
50 – 59	Poor to Average	5	17.57%
0 – 49	Poor	0	0%
<b>Total</b>		N=28	100%

From the table above, it can be seen that there was an improvement of the students' speaking ability. There were 10 students (35.72%) who reached the level of good to excellent. There were 13 students (46.43%) reached the level of average to good. There

were 5 students (17.57%) who reached the level of poor to average and there were no student in the poor level.

The writer also presented the improvement of the students' average score in post-test 2 based on five aspects of speaking as in the following table:

**Table 6. The Students' Ability in Each Aspect of Writing in Post-Test 2**

Aspects of Speaking	Average	Level
Pronunciation	3.64	Level 3
Grammar	3.75	Level 3
Vocabulary	4.5	Level 4
Fluency	4.40	Level 4
Comprehension	4.40	Level 4

From the explanation above, the students show a significant improvement of their speaking skill after the second treatment was given. Pronunciation aspect was at level 3 (with average score 3.64), grammar aspect was at level 3 (with the average score 3.75), vocabulary aspect was at level 4 (with the average score 4.5), fluency aspect was at level 4 (with the average score 4.40), and comprehension aspect was at level 4 (with the average score 4.40).

Based on the result of Post Test II, there was an improvement on the students' speaking ability with the average score 72.16 (Average to Good Level) while the English Minimum Criteria of Achievement or KKM at SMAN 3 Merbau was 70. It means that the students had achieve the target score. Therefore, the writer decided to discontinue the treatment.

## CONCLUSIONS

Based on the data analysis of Pre-Test, Post-Test 1, and Post-Test 2, it could be concluded that the use of Word Mapping technique gave a better improvement in students' speaking ability on Hortatory Exposition Text at SMAN 3 Merbau. It was proven by the increase of students' average score from 39,66 in the pre-test, to 56,72 in post-test 1, and up to 72,16 in post-test 3. There were some factors influenced the increasing of the students' speaking ability on Hortaroy Exposition text. They were highly motivated and actively involved in following the lesson. This could be seen from their responses during the lesson. They participated actively in sharing their ideas to the topic they chose. By using Word Mapping technique, the students seemed very happy during the lesson. They were not stressful because they can discussed their ideas without being interfered by other. This contributed to a good learning atmosphere. Furthermore, they became confident in delivering their ideas without feeling afraid to forget since they had the outline on the paper they brought while presenting. In addition, using Word Mapping also could reduce their anxiety to deliver their ideas in front of the class. This technique not only helped students to improve their speaking ability on Hortatory Exposition Text but also improve students' motivation in using English in presenting their ideas in front of others since they are not judged for their ideas.



## REFERENCES

- Ali, Zuraidah. 2008. Speaking Skills in ESL Classroom-From Acquisition to Participation. (<http://ezinearticles.com/?Speaking-Skills-in-the-ESLClassroom---From-Acquisition-to-Participation&id=1052583>). (Retrieved on Saturday, Dec 13th 2011).
- Balackova, Halka. 2003. Brainstorming: A Creative Problem Solving Method. Prague: Masaryk Institute of Advanced Studies, Czech Technical University.
- Brown, H. Douglas. and Abeywickrama, Priyanvada. 2010. Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practice. New York: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Burns, Anne. 2009. Doing Action Research in English Language Teaching: A Guide for Practitioners. New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Cullen, Brian. 1998. Brainstorming Before Speaking Tasks. The Internet TESL Journal 4, 7. (<http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Cullen-Brainstorming/>).
- Djuharie, O. Setiawan. 2007. Genre Dilengkapi 700 Soal Uji Pemahaman. Bandung: Yrama Widya.
- Ferrance, Eileen. 2000. Action Research. USA: Brown University.
- Hide, Kimberly. 2005. Brainstorming Information. (<http://www.brainstorming.co.uk/contents.html>). (Retrieved on Saturday, Dec 13th 2011).
- Hughes, Arthur. 1996. Testing for Language Teachers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Isaken, Scoot.G. 1998. A Review of Brainstorming Research: Six Critical Issues for Inquiry. New York: Buffalo.
- Jeffrey, Hire. 2006. The Steps by Steps Guide to Brainstorming. (<http://www.jpb.com/creative/brainstorming.php>). (Retrieved on Saturday, Dec 13th 2011).
- Kayi, Hayriye. 2006. Teaching Speaking: Activities to Promote Speaking in a Second Language. The Internet TESL Journal 12, 11. (<http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Kayi-TeachingSpeaking.html>).
- Mettetal, Gwynn. 2001. The What, Why and How of Classroom Action Research. The Journal of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning 2, 1.
- Mitchell, Olivia. 2008. 4 Reasons brainstorming may sabotage your presentation. (<http://www.speakingaboutpresenting.com/content/brainstorming-sabotage-presentation/>). (Retrieved on Saturday, Dec 13th 2011).
- Nation, I.S.P. and Newton, Jonathan. 2009. Teaching ESL/EFL Listening and Speaking. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis.
- Oxford. 2010. Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary 8th edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Richard, J.C. 1990. New Trends in the Teaching of Writing on ESL/EFL. In Wang Z. (ed) ELT in China. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- Richard, J.C. 2008. Teaching Listening and Speaking: From Theories to Practice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Saleem Saleh Khalaf Ibnian. 2011. Brainstorming and Essay Writing in EFL Class. Theory and Practice in Language Study, Vol 1, No. 3.
- Setiawan, Edi. 2011. The Implementation of "Learning Cycle Model" in Increasing English Speaking Ability of The Second Year Students of SMA YLPI Pekanbaru. Unpublished Thesis. Pekanbaru: Riau University.

- Siti Zuraidah. 2011. Improving the Speaking Skill of the First Year Students of SMA Budi Dharma Dumai Through Simulation Technique. Unpublished Thesis. Pekanbaru: Riau University.
- Taher, Randah. 2007. 10 Guidelines for Effective Brainstorming. (<http://www.changethis.com>). (Retrieved on Friday, December 2nd 2011).
- Ur, Penny. 1997. A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Widiati, Utami., Cahyono, Bambang Yudi. 2006. The Teaching of EFL Speaking in the Indonesian Context: The State of the Art. TEFLIN Journal, 34, No. 2.