# A Comparative Study of The Students' Competence In Finding Figurative And Lexical Meaning To Improve Speaking Ability

## Titin Kustini

English Language Education Department, Universitas Majalengka

Corresponding Email: titinkustini@unma.ac.id

**Abstract:** Students often have difficulty understanding figurative meanings compared to lexical meanings. Figurative meaning refers to the immediate meaning conveyed when a language is spoken in isolation, while the secondary meaning is dependent on the context; this is known as figurative meaning. On the other hand, lexical meaning refers to the literal meaning of language elements as symbols of things. The research aims to assess students' proficiency in identifying figurative and lexical meanings and to compare this between the experiment and control classes. The study involved 46 students from the eleventh year at SMAN 1 Maja. It was a quantitative research study, indicating that the data collected were presented in numerical form and then interpreted using statistical analysis. The research tools included a questionnaire, observation, pre-test, and post-test. The results of the research showed that students' competence in identifying figurative and lexical meanings were 6.57 and 6.92, respectively. The difference between pre-test and post-test scores was analyzed using t-tests, which yielded significant results for both the control class (t=4.84) and the experiment class (t=3.94) for figurative meaning, and for lexical meaning in the control class (t=2.712) and the experiment class (t=3.98). These results demonstrate that students' competence in identifying figurative and students' competence in identifying figurative meaning, and for lexical meaning in the control class (t=2.712) and the experiment class (t=3.98). These results demonstrate that students' competence in identifying figurative and students' competence in identifying figurative and lexical meaning ability.

Keyword: figurative, lexical, meaning.

#### **INTRODUCTION**

Language, being seen from its function, is as a tool of communication. English as international language is very important to be mastered by all people in the world as it will assist them comprehend west people's idea. Learning English not use for any nation purpose but used for international purpose. It means that the purpose of the teaching should refer to the learner's ability to communication with other people come in from overseas. Research on second / foreign language learning has shown that many misconceptions exist about how children learn the language (Musthafa, 2008:84). Learning any language, there must be four skills: listening, reading, speaking and writing. To develop those skills, the students, the students should learnt element of languages such as grammar, vocabulary, syntax, semantics, and the like.

Every country has its own language style with different characteristics and unique features. Indonesia has also many regional languages that have differences in grammatical meaning, figurative meaning, pragmatic meaning, etc. when someone would like to comprehend the meaning of other languages well, he or she must learn the aspects in those alanguages themselves including th e semantics meanings.

In this research, the writer really goes in for semantics. The students often find out difficulties when studying it. Furthermore, the emantics meaning has some unique meannings. That is ofte used in daily convwersation. Semantics is the study of the linguistics meaning of morphemes, words, phrases, and sentences (Victoria Frompkin et al, 1999: 151). Another definition states, semantics is study of a differentiation of language in connection with mental process or symbolism on speaking activity (Ency Britannica, 1965).

Semantics is derived from Greek "Semanein" means "to mean". It develops to be a study of meaning and the originality of word. Verhaar (2004) says, "Semantics is the study of sense or meaning."

Talking about semantics, it has many parts. Two of them are the figurative meaning and lexical meaning. Idiom, simile, and metaphore, are parts of figurative meaning, while lexical meaning is the meaning that refers to a dictionary. The writer would like to compare them. Figurative meaning consist of primary meaning and secondary meaning (Larson, 1984:116). Primary meaning is the meaning that appears in the speaker's mind, if it is spoken alone. The secondary meaning is the meaning that depends on the contexts. The meaning of figurative has the other meaning besides general meaning or textual meaning. Please consider the differences in meaning of the sentences below:

- 1. She has a good head. It means she has a good brain.
- 2. When someone looks angry and lost of control, her/his friens would says "keep your hair on". It means "calm down! Don't get angry!".

The two examples of sentences above not only contain the primary meaning but also secondary meaning.

The lexical meaning is the meaning of language elements as symbol of thing and event. The lexical word is called the primary meaning that is still pure from the dictionary because it can be found on dictionary. For example:

- 1. The word "government" according to Oxford Learners Pocket Dictionary (1995:181) means "group of people who govern a country or state."
- The word "wax" in the dictionary of Kamus Lengkap Inggris-Indonesia (2006:276) has some lexical meaning: n. 1. Lilin (candle), 2. Lak (sealed), 3. Keadaan sedang marah sekali (very angry), vb. 1. Menggosok dengan lilin (rub with wax), 2. Bertambah (add).

The two examples of the sentences above only contain the primary meaning.

In the development of study of language, semantics has developed in 1970s. In linguistics, it has just been developing in Indonesia since 1980s. However, in the level of Senior High Schoool semantics is not learnt specifically, only in the part of reading comprehension discussing about meaning. It is different from university level, semantics is learnt specifically such as grammar, speaking, reading, listening and writing.

However, the research about semantics in senior high school is still less, so the study conducted to answer the questions of research:

- 1. How the students' competence in finding figurative meaning?
- 2. How the students' competence in finding lexical meaning?
- 3. How is the comparison of the students' competence in finding figurative meaning and lexical meaning?

In this paper, the writer using directional hypothesis: the students' competence in finding figurative meaning and lexical meaning will be different after they given treatment and it can improve their speaking ability.

# METHOD

#### The field of research

The field of research on this paper is semantics discussing about the students' competence in finding figiurative mea ning and lexical meaning to improve speaking ability at the eleventh year students of SMAN 1 Maja. The population is all of the eleventh grade of SMAN 1 Maja and the sample are two classes XI IPS 2 and XI IPA 2 consist of 46 students.

#### Design of research

The method of research used by the writer in this paper is quantitative approach. Creswell defines it as "a research approach that emphasizes the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data in numerical form (Creswell, 2012, 2013; John W.).

The kind of research is descriptive research. It is also known as statistical research; describe data and characteristics about the population or phenomenon being studied. Descriptive research answers the questions who, when, what, where, and how. (http: En.Wikipedia.Org/wiki/descriptiveresearch).

### Procedures

To obtain the data of the research, the writer takes the following technique:

1. Questionnaire

The writer gives students 10 questions to know how their interest and motivation in studying English, how their achievement and the factors that influenced to increase their motivation in learnig English.

2. Observation

The students observed along they given pre-test, when they got the treatment until they were given post-test. It used to measure students' speaking activity.

3. Test

The writer gives the students 40 questions lists to find the data about a comparative study of the students' competence in finding figurative meaning and lexical meaning. Firstly, the writer gives students 20 questions of pre-test and secondly gives the students 20 questions of post-test with the purpose of comparing the students' competence in finding figurative and lexical meaning.

In analyzing the data, the writer uses the steps G.E.R Brurroughs on Arikunto (1993:239):

a. The tabulation of data

The data that have collected by administering and scoring research tools scripts are know as "raw data". The row data are meaningless unless certain statistical treatment is given to them. Analysis of data means to make the raw data meanjngful or to draw some results from the data after the proper treatment. It also meant studying the tabulated material in order to determine inherent fatcs or meaning.

b. The summarizing of data

Find out the average score in each class using the formula of average score (Singh, 2006: 286):

M = Mean

 $\Sigma X =$  the number of data

N = the number of respondent

Then, compare the result of step one into table of interpretation Suharsimi Arikunto (2003:245) in the scale of very good, good, sufficient, low, very low.

Next, the writer calculated standard deviation sing the formula (Kothari, 2004:135) below:

$$\sigma = \sqrt{\frac{\sum (X_1 - X_2)^2}{n}}$$

 $\sigma$  = standard deviation

c. Analyze data for testing hypothesis

The writer examined validity of data using the formula of Pearson product moment correlation (Arikunto, 1993: 160):

$$r_{xy} = \frac{N \sum XY - (\sum X) (\sum Y)}{\sqrt{(N \sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2 - (\sum Y)^2}}$$

The reliability of data calculated using ANATES 4.0 version (Wibisono, Karno, To) and Spearmen-Brown formula (Arikunto, 1993:174) below:

$$r = \frac{2 x r_{xy}}{1 + r_{xy}}$$

d. Analyze data to make conclusion

To examined the significance of the mean of sample each class (n = 30), the writer using formula (Kothari, 2004: 160) below:

 $t = \frac{D - 0}{-}$ 

 $\sigma \operatorname{diff} / \sqrt{n}$ Where D = difference

 $\sigma$  diff = standard error of difference worked out as below:

$$\sigma_{\rm diff} = \sqrt{\frac{\sum D l^2 - (D)^2 n}{2}}$$

n - 1 where mean of differences or  $D = \sum D_1$ and degree of freedom = (n-1)

The writer also compute standard error difference between two samples means worked out as follow:

$$\sigma x_{1}-x_{2} = \sqrt{\frac{\sum (X_{1i} - X_{1})^{2} + \sum (X_{2i} - X_{2})^{2}}{n_{1} + n_{2} - 2}} \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_{1}} + \frac{1}{n_{2}}}$$

and the d.f =  $n_1 + n_2 - 2$ 

Then, the writer examined the significant of two samples of independent from the same population that  $n \ge 30$  using the formula (Kothari, 2004: 198):

$$X_1 - X_2$$

$$\sqrt[4]{\sigma_p}^2 \left(\frac{1}{m} + \frac{1}{m^2}\right)$$
In case  $\sigma_p$  is not known, the writer use  $\sigma$  s12 in its place calculating
$$n1(\sigma s1^2 + D1^2) + n2(\sigma s2^2 + D2^2)$$

$$\sigma s12 = \sqrt[4]{m1 + n2}$$
where  $D1 = (X1 - X12)$ 

$$D2 = (X2 - X12)$$

$$n1 + n2 X2$$

$$X12 = \frac{n1 + n2}{n1 + n2}$$

The last steps, after all data calculated, the result was described specifically.

#### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

The sample took two classes, they are XI IPA 1 as an experiment class and XI IPS 1 as a control class. The participants were 46 students consists of 16 male and 30 females.

Table 1. The participants					
Sex	Amount				
Male	16				
Female	30				

a. The result of questionnaire

Total

- 28.26% respondents said that they like to learn English, 0.17% dislike, 41.30% sometime like to learn English.
- 63.04% respondent interest to learn English because they want speak English fluently and 36.96 said that they studied hard to master English. No one said they learn English just want to get good mark in English subject.
- 82.61% agreed and they need to speak English fluently.
- Just 4.32% students satisfied about their achievement in English, its remains said not satisfied and want to increase their achievement.
- 60.87% students said their achievement in English sufficient, 26.09% good, 4.35% excellent and 8.69% less.
- Almost all of students, 97.83% agreed that mastering English, especially in speaking, is very important.
- 21.74% students felt they have big problem in learning vocabulary, 17.39% in grammar, 34.78% in listening and 6.52% in writing.

All of students said they have high motivation in learning English and courage to speak in English, especially after having knowledge about figurative and lexical meaning. They felt it helps them to master English.

b. The results of observation

All samples were observed during the research period. Observation results are recorded in an observation sheet. Observations focus on measuring students' courage and frequency of speaking in English. observation results from before students were given material about figurative and lexical meaning, until after completing the post-test. Observation results show that students' courage to speak English has increased. they stated they were more confident by knowing the meaning of figurative and lexical meaning.

- c. The result of pre-test and post-test
  - a) The students' competence in finding figurative meaning
  - 1) The tabulation of data

The writer used the table to analyze the raw data. The score of pre-test is  $X_1$ , the score of post-test is  $Y_1$ , and then searching the value of squared  $X_1(X_1)^2$ , squared of  $Y_1(Y_1)^2$ , the value of  $X_1 Y_1^2$ .

The differences (D1) got from score of pre-test (X1) less by score of post-test (Y1), the difference squared (D1)<sup>2</sup>, the value of X less by it's mean (X1-X), and the last column is squared of (X1-X)<sup>2</sup>.

The sample divided into two tables, class XI IPA 1 and XI IPS 1.

See the tables below:

$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$				The Student	The Score of s' Compet	Table of Pre-Test a ence in Find Class XI IPS	4.7 and Post-Te ling Figurat 2	st tive Meaning			
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	No.	Nama	Pre-Test (X1)	Post-Test (Y1)	X1 <sup>2</sup>	Y12	XIY1	Differences(Di) (Di=X1-V1)	Differences	Xi-X	(X1-X)2
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		Agus Fauzi	5.5	6	30.25	36	33	0.5	squared Di-		
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	2	At Nina Nuraeni	3.5	4.5	12.25	20.25	15.75	1	0.25	1.59	2.5281
	3	Ating Royani	4	6.5	16	42.25	26	25	6.26	-0.41	0.1681
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	4	Budi Ermana	3.5	2.5	12.25	6.25	8.75		0.23	0.09	0.0081
	5	Cecep Musa	3.5	7	12.25	49	24.5	25	12.26	-0.41	0.1681
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	6	Cita Puji Bestari	2	5	4	25	10	3.5	12.25	-0.41	0.1681
	1	Dede Wida W	3.5	7	12.25	49	24.5	26	9	-1.91	3.6481
	8	Deni Handriani	3	4.5	9	20.25	124.5	3.3	12.25	-0.41	0.1681
	9	Devie Octia M	5.5	7	30.25	10	13.5	1.5	2.25	-0.91	0.8281
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	10	Dian Mulyanti	1.5	4.5	2.25	20.25	58.5	1.5	2.25	1.59	2.5281
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	11	Egi Setia Budi	4	4	16	16	0.75	3	9	-2.41	5.8081
	12	Lia Listanti	5	3.5	25	12.25	10	0	0	0.09	1800.0
14         Meil Hendyati D         5.5         6         30.25         36         28         2         4         0.09         0.006           15         Moh. Abduh         4.5         6.5         20.25         36         33         0.5         0.25         159         252           16         Nining Meilani         3.5         4.5         12.22         20.25         2         4         0.99         0.348           17         Nima Nurmai         3         6         9         36         18         3         9         -0.91         0.828           18         Ristah F         3         3.5         9         12.25         10.5         0.5         0.5         0.25         -0.91         0.828           18         Ristah F         3         3.5         9         12.25         10.5         0.5         0.5         -0.91         0.828           20         Syamsu R         5         6         2.5         36         30         1         1         1.59         2.538           21         Widin Pahia B         2         5.5         4         30.25         11         3.5         12.25         -0.91         3.648	13	Lia Yuliati	4	6	16	36	24	-1.5	2.25	1.09	1.1881
15         Moh. Abduh         4.5         6.5         20.23         42.25         29.23         2         4         0.59         0.34           16         Nining Meilani         3.5         4.5         112.25         20.25         15.75         1         1         -0.41         0.168           17         Nirma Nurani         3         6         9         36         18         3         9         -0.91         0.828           18         Risulab F         3         3.5         9         12.25         10.5         0.5         0.25         -0.91         0.828           20         Syamsul R         5.5         6.5         30.25         42.25         35.75         1         1         1.99         0.828           20         Syamsul R         5.5         6.5         30.25         42.25         35.75         1         1         1.99         1.88           20         Syamsul R         5.5         6.5         30.25         11         3.5         12.25         -1.91         3.648           21         Wilda Pahla B         2         5.5         3.6         30.25         13         -0.5         0.25         2.09         4.368<	14	Meli Hendiyati D	5.5	6	30.25	36	24	4	4	0.09	0.0081
16         Niming Mellani         3.5         4.5         12.25         20.25         12.7         24.23         2.4         0.59         0.348           17         Nima Narani         3         6         9         36         18.5         1         1         0.410         0.168           18         Ristalh F         3         3.5         9         12.25         10.5         0.55         0.251         0.910         0.828           19         Sri Intan J.R S         5.5         6.5         30.25         42.25         35.755         1         1         0.901         0.828           19         Sri Intan J.R S         5.5         6.5         30.25         42.25         35.755         1         1         1         1.99         2.538           20         Syamsuft R         5         6         2.5         3.6         30.0         1         1         1.99         2.538           21         Widia Pahia B         2         5.5         4         30.25         11         3.5         1.2.25         .0101         3.64           22         Yuli Yallanin         6         5.5         3.6         30.25         13.3         .0.5	15	Moh. Abduh	4.5	6.5	20.25	42.25	20.26	0.5	0.25	1.59	2.5281
17         Nima Nurani         3         6         9         36         18.75         1         1         -0.41         0.168           18         Ristah F         3         3.5         9         36         18.8         3         9         -0.91         0.828           18         Ristah F         3         3.5         9         12.25         10.5         0.5         0.25         -0.91         0.828           20         Szamsuł R         5.5         6.5         30.25         42.25         35.75         1         1         1.99         2.528           20         Szamsuł R         5         6         25         36         30         1         1         1.09         1.88           21         Wida Pahla B         2         5.5         4         30.25         11         3.5         12.25         -1.91         3.648           23         Yuni Fazziani         6         5.5         30.25         19.25         2         4         -0.41         0.168           23         Yuni Fazziani         3.5         5.5         12.25         19.25         2         4         -0.41         0.168	16	Nining Meilani	3.5	4.5	12.25	20.25	15.75	2	4	0.59	0.3481
18         Risalah F         3         3.5         9         100         18         3.3         9         -0.91         0.828           19         Sci Intan J R S         5.5         6.5         30.25         42.25         10.5         0.5         0.25         0.91         0.828           29         Sci Intan J R S         5.5         6.5         30.25         42.25         35.75         1         1         1.99         1.2528           20         Syamoul R         5         6         25         36         30         1         1         1.99         1.188           21         Wida Pahla B         2         5.5         4         30.25         11         3.5         12.25         -1.91         3.648           22         Yuli Yaliani         6         5.5         36         30.25         33         -0.5         0.25         2.09         4.368           23         Yuni Fazzianti         3.5         5.5         12.25         30.25         19.25         2         4         -0.41         0.168	17	Nirma Nurani	3	6	9	36	19.75		1	-0.41	0.1681
19         Sri Intan J R S         5.5         6.5         30.25         42.25         10.3         0.0.3         0.25         -0.91         0.828           20         Syamsul R         5         6         25         35.75         1         1         1.59         2.528           20         Syamsul R         5         6         25         36         30         1         1         1.09         1.183           21         Widin Pahla B         2         5.5         4         30.25         11         3.5         12.25         -1.91         3.648           22         Yuli Yullanti         6         5.5         36         30.25         13.5         0.25         2.09         4.368           23         Yuni Fazzianti         3.5         5.5         12.25         30.25         19.25         2         4         -0.41         0.168	18	Risalah F	3	3.5	9	12.25	10.5	3	9	-0.91	0.8281
20         Syamoul R         5         6         25         36         30.75         1         1         1.59         2.528           21         Wida Pahla B         2         5.5         4         30.25         11         3.5         12.25         -1.09         1.488           22         You Yulianti         6         5.5         36         30.25         11         3.5         12.25         -1.91         3.648           23         Yuni Fazzianti         3.5         5.5         12.25         30.25         19.25         2.09         4.368           23         Yuni Fazzianti         3.5         5.5         12.25         30.25         19.25         2         4         -0.41         0.168	19	Sri Intan J R S	5.5	6.5	30.25	42.25	35.75	0.5	0.25	-0.91	0.8281
21         Wida Pahla B         2         5.5         4         3.0         1         1         1.09         1.188           22         Yuly Hullani         6         5.5         36         30.25         31         3.5         12.25         -1.91         3.648           23         Yuly Hullani         6         5.5         36         30.25         10.25         2.25         2.09         4.368           23         Yuni Fazziani         3.5         5.5         12.25         30.25         12.25         2         4         -0.41         0.168	20	Syamsul R	5	6	25	26	33.73	1	1	1.59	2.5281
22         Yuli Yullanti         6         5.5         36         30.25         33         40.5         0.25         2.09         4.368           23         Yuni Fazrianti         3.5         5.5         12.25         30.25         19.25         2.09         4.368           24         -0.41         0.165         19.25         2         4         -0.41         0.164	21	Widia Pahla B	2	5.5	4	30.25	30	1	1	1.09	1.1881
Z3         Yuni Fazzianti         3.5         5.5         12.25         30.25         19.25         2         4         -0.41         0.1681	22	Yuli Yulianti	6	5.5	36	30.25	22	3.3	12.25	-1.91	3.6481
00 123.6 30.25 19.25 2 4 -0.41 0.1681	23	Yuni Fazrianti	3.5	5.5	12.25	30.25	10.26	-0.5	0.25	2.09	4.3681
			90	123.5	386	697.25	19.25	-	4	-0.41	0.1681

Figure 1. The score of pre-test and post-test of figurative meaning in XI IPS 2

2) The summarizing data

The average score of pre-test in finding figurative meaning in class XI IPS 2 is 3.91 and score of post-test is 5.37. The average score of pre-test in class XI IPA 2 is 6.54 and score of post-test is 7.76. The average of score of pre-test all samples is 5.23 and score of post-test is 6.57.

Then, standard deviation in XI IPS 2 is 1.213 and standard deviation class XI IPA 2 is 1.031. After all of data calculated, then the writer categorized it on the table below.

i the table below.

		Cl	ass	Total	Sample
No	Result	XI IPS 2	XI IPA 2	sample	category
		(X1)	(X2)	(X12)	
1	The average score of	3.91	6.54	5.23	Low
	pre-test				
2	The highest score of	6	8	7	Good
	pre-test				
3	The lowest score of	1.5	4.5	3	Very low
	pre-test				
4	The average score of	5.37	8.76	6.57	Sufficient
	post-test				
5	The highest score of	7	9	8	Very good
	post-test				
6	The lowest score of	3.5	4.5	4	Very low
	post-test				

Table 2. The result of students' competence in finding figurative meaning

3) Analyze data for testing hypothesis.

The validity of data tested using formula of Pearson product moment correlation and the result for figurative meaning is 0.635. r table = 0.288. so the data is valid/significant because rxy>rtable.

And the reliability is 0.776, so the data is reliable because rxy>rtable.

4) Analyze data to make conclusion

#### The significance of mean of sample in XI IPS 2

The writer takes the null hypothesis that mean of difference is zero.

Ho :  $\mu 1 = \mu 2$  which is equivalent to test Ho: D = 0.

Ha :  $\mu 1 < \mu 2$  as the writer wants to conclude that differences between pre-test and post-test is significance. Means od difference or D = 1.457.

Degrees of freedom = (n-1)=22.

 $\sigma$  diff = 4.84.

As Ha is one sided, the writer shall apply a one-tailed test for determining the rejection area at 5% level using the table of distribution for 22 degrees of freedom:

R : t  $\leq$  1.717. The observed value of t is 4.84 which is in the rejection area and thus, the writer accepts Ha and conclude that the difference in score pre-test and post-test is significance i.e. it is not only due to sampling fluctuation.

#### The significance of mean of sample in XI IPA 2

The writer takes the null hypothesis that mean of difference is zero.

Ho :  $\mu 1 = \mu 2$  which is equivalent to test Ho: D = 0.

Ha :  $\mu 1 < \mu 2$  as the writer wants to conclude that differences between pre-test and post-test is significance.

Means od difference or D = 1.217.

Degrees of freedom = (n-1)=22.

 $\sigma$  diff = 3.94.

As Ha is one sided, the writer shall apply a one-tailed test for determining the rejection area at 5% level using the table of distribution for 22 degrees of freedom:

R : t  $\leq$  1.717. The observed value of t is 3.94 which is in the rejection area and thus, the writer accepts Ha and conclude that the difference in score pre-test and post-test is significance i.e. it is not only due to sampling fluctuation.

- b) The students' competence in finding lexical meaning
- 1) Tabulation of data

The result of pre-test and post-test of students' competence in finding lexical meaning in XI IPA 2 described in the table below:

			The Student	s' Compete	nce in Find	ling Lexic	al Meaning			
				Cla	ISS XI IPA	2			-	
No.	Nama	Pre-Test	Post-Test (Y1)	X2	Y²	XY	Differences(Di) (Di=X1-Y1)	Differences squared Di <sup>2</sup>	X1-X	(X1-X
1101		(X1)	0	00.25	81	85.5	-0.5	0.25	1.83	3.348
1	Ade Ridwan	9.5	. 9	90.25	40	56	-1	1	0.33	0.108
2	Agus Dwiyana	8	1	72.25	49 01	76.5	0.5	0.25	0.83	0.6889
3	Agy Mugni M	8.5	9	72.25	01	76.5	0.5	0.25	0.83	0.6889
4	Anis Atun Zahro I	8.5	9	72.25	64	68	-0.5	0.25	0.83	0.6889
5	Astri Damayan S	8.5	8	12.25	25	35	-2	4	-0.67	0.4489
6	Ayang M	7	5	49	72.25	63 75	1	1	-0.17	0.0289
7	Dicki Zulkifli	7.5	8.5	56.25	91	67.5	15	2.25	-0.17	0.0289
8	Ema Sri Rahayu	7.5	9	36.25	81	62	2	4	-0.67	0.4489
9	Fahmi Arief F	7	9	49	81	63	2	4	-0.67	0.4489
10	Fanni Farianti	1	9	49	36	42		1	-0.67	0.4489
11	Fenti Ramdani	1	0	72.25	90.25	80.75	-1	1	0.83	0.6889
12	lis Ismawati	8.2	9,5	64	36	48	-2	4	0.33	0.1089
13	Irvan Setyadi S	8	10	72.25	100	85	15	2.25	0.83	0.6889
14	Lela Leviana Sari	8.5	0	12.25	81	63	2	4	-0.67	0.4489
15	Mila Permata Sari	65	5	42.25	36	39	-0.5	0.25	-1.17	1 3689
16	Mutia Agisni M	0.5	8	64	64	64	0	0	0.33	0.1089
1/	Nandar Iskandar	6	0	36	81	54	3	9	-1.67	2 7889
18	Poppy Nabila N	6.5	9	42.25	81	58.5	2.5	6.25	-1.17	1.3689
19	Kyan Muqit	0.5	9	64	81	72	1	1	0.33	0.1089
20	Hara Dwi Nintani	0	6	64	36	48	-2	4	0.33	0.1089
21	Vini Nopitasari	8	95	64	90.25	76	1.5	2.25	0.33	0.1089
22	Widi Dea K	7.5	75	56.25	56.25	56.25	0	0	-0.17	0.0289
23	wildan M	176.5	187	1369.75	1565	1441.25	10.5	52.25	0.09	15 3047

Figure 4. The score of pre-test and post-test of lexical meaning in XI IPA 2

2) Summarizing the data

- Based on the formula of mean, the average score of pre-test students in finding lexical meaning in XI IPS 2, M=4.46.
- The average score of post-test students in finding lexical meaning in XI IPS 2, M=5.72.
- The average score of post-test students in finding lexical meaning in XI IPS 2, M=7.67.
- The average score of post-test students in finding lexical meaning in XI IPA 2, M=8.13.
- The average score of the pre-test for all of the samples in finding lexical meaning, M=6.07.
- The average score of post-test all of the sample in finding lexical meaning, M=6.92.

After all of data calculated, then the writer categorized it on the table below.

Table 3. The result of students' competence in finding lexical meaning

		Cla	ass	Total	Sample
No	Result	XI IPS 2	XI IPA 2	sample	category
		(X1)	(X2)	(X12)	
1	The average score of	4.6	7.67	6.07	Low
	pre-test				
2	The highest score of	7	9.5	8.25	Very good

	pre-test				
3	The lowest score of pre-test	2	6.5	4.25	Very low
4	The average score of post-test	5.72	8.13	6.92	Sufficient
5	The highest score of post-test	8	10	9	Very good
6	The lowest score of post-test	3	5	4	Very low

- Standard deviation of the students' competence in finding lexical meaning in class XI IPS 2,  $\sigma = 1.473$ .
- Standard deviation of the students' competence in finding lexical meaning in class XI IPA 2,  $\sigma = 0.813$ .
- 3) Analyze data for testing hypothesis The validity of item questions of lexical meaning is rxy = 0.562.

 $d.f = n-1 = 46-1 = 45, \alpha = 0.05$ 

r table = 0.288

r xy >r table, so, the data is valid / significance.

And the reliability is :

r = 0.719

 $r > r_{table}$ , so the data is reliable.

# 4) Analyze data to make conclusionThe significance of mean of sample in XI IPS 2

The writer takes the null hypothesis that mean of difference is zero.

Ho :  $\mu 1 = \mu 2$  which is equivalent to test Ho: D = 0.

Ha :  $\mu 1 < \mu 2$  as the writer wants to conclude that differences between pre-test and post-test is significance.

Means of difference or D = 1.261.

Degrees of freedom = (n-1)=22.

 $\sigma$  diff = 2.712.

As Ha is one sided, the writer shall apply a one-tailed test for determining the rejection area at 5% level using the table of distribution for 22 degrees of freedom:

 $R: t \le 1.717.$ 

The observed value of t is 2.712 which is in the rejection area and thus, the writer accepts Ha and conclude that the difference in score pre-test and post-test is significance i.e. it is not only due to sampling fluctuation.

### The significance of mean of sample in XI IPA 2

The writer takes the null hypothesis that mean of difference is zero. Ho :  $\mu 1=\mu 2$  which is equivalent to test Ho: D = 0.

Ha :  $\mu 1 < \mu 2$  as the writer wants to conclude that differences between pre-test and post-test is significance. Means od difference or D = 0.457.

Degrees of freedom = (n-1)=22.

 $\sigma$  diff = 1.469.

t = 3.977

As Ha is one sided, the writer shall apply a one-tailed test for determining the rejection area at 5% level using the table of distribution for 22 degrees of freedom:

 $R: t \le 1.717.$ 

The observed value of t is 3.977 which is in the rejection area and thus, the writer accepts Ha and conclude that the difference in score pre-test and post-test is significance i.e. it is not only due to sampling fluctuation.

c) A comparative of students' competence in finding figurative and lexical meaning

- From all of the sample, the standard deviation in finding figurative meaning is 0.359 ( $\sigma x1-x2 = 0.309$ ).

- The significance of two sample of independent from the same population that  $n \ge 30$  using formula Kothari (2004:198).

Figurative meaning

 $\sigma_{s12} = 1.748$ 

The z-test used because  $n \ge 30$ .

z = -5.107

as Ha is two-sided, the writer shall apply a two tailed test for determining the rejection area at 5% level of significance using normal curve area table:

r : |z| > -1.96

The observed value of z is -5.107 which falls in the rejection area and thus the writer rejects Ho and concludes that the difference between mean of two samples is statistically significant and not due to sampling fluctuations.

Lexical meaning

 $\sigma_{s12}=2.015$ 

z = -5.404

As Ha is two-sided, the writer shall apply a two tailed test for determining the rejection area at 5% level of significance using normal curve area table:

r : |z| > -1.96

The observed value of z is -5.404 which falls in the rejection area and thus the writer rejects Ho and concludes that the difference between mean of two samples is statistically significant and not due to sampling fluctuations.

### CONCLUSION

Based on a comparative study of students' ability to find figurative and lexical meaning, it can be concluded that the standard deviation for figurative meaning is 0.34 and for lexical meaning is 0.36, indicating that students have better competence in finding lexical meaning than figurative meaning.

The results from the pre-test and post-test show that students in class XI IPA 2 have better competence than those in class XI IPS 2. The test's significance indicates differences in students' competence between the pre-test and post-test, which is statistically significant. This is expected to motivate students to improve their English speaking ability.

Students' confidence in speaking English improves after given explaining figurative and lexical meanings, which is a good initial step for enhancing their speaking ability. Teachers should explain to students the semantic meaning of vocabulary so that students understand and can apply it in English sentences. It's also helpful to compare semantic meanings in Indonesian and English. Additionally, teachers should take advantage of theoretical and practical applications in teaching English by incorporating semantic meaning into English materials.

#### References

Arikunto, Suharsimi. 1996. Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktek. PT. Rineka Cipta Jakarta.

- Bloomfield, Leonard. 1995. Language. PT. Gramedia utama pustaka. Jakarta.
- Broughton, Geoffrey et al. 2003. Teaching English As A Foreign Language. University Of London Institute Of Education, Rotledge 29 West 35<sup>th</sup> Street, New York.
- Bungin, Burhan. 2009. Metodologi Penelitian Kuantitatif. Prenada Media Group Jakarta.
- Chaer, Abdul. 2006. Telaah Semantik. PT Rineka Cipta Jakarta.
- Djajasudarma, T. Fatimah. 1993. Semantik 1. PT Eresco, bandung.
- Fanani, Achmad And Sabrina Jasmine. 2008. Smart English Vocabulary. Book Marks Yogyakarta.
- Fromkin, Victoria. 1999. Introduction To Language. Hor Court. London.
- Grondlund, Norman. 1976. Measurement And Evaluation In Teaching. Macmillan Publishing Co. Inc. New York.
- Kreidler, W. Charles. 1998. Introducing Semantics. New Fetter Lane. London.
- Larson, L. Mildred. 1984. Meaning Based Translation, A Guide To Cross Language Equivalence. University Press Of America.
- Oxford Learner's Pocket Dictionary. 1995. Oxrord University Press. Oxford.
- Parera. Jos Daniel. 1991. Kajian Linguistik Umum Historis Komparative Dan Tipologi Struktural. Erlangga. Jakarta.

Saccd, l. John. 1998. Semantics. Blackwell Publisher Ltd. USA.

Seidl, Jennifer. 1980. English Idioms And How To Use Them. Oxford University Press. London.

Sudjana. 1985. Statistika. Remaja Rosdakarya. Bandung.

Verhaar. J.W.M. 2004. Asa-Asas Linguistik Umum. Gadjah Mada University Press. Yogyakarta.

Webster New World College Dictionary. 2010. Wiley Publishing. Inc. Cleveland. Ohio.

Wojowasito, W.J.S Poerwadarminta. 2006. Kamus Lengkap Inggris-Indoesia Indnesia-Inggris. Hasta. Bandung.