The Effect of Synectics Learning Model and Vocabulary Mastering to Students Writing Poetry Skill in Grade V SDN 066041 Medan Academic Year 2016/2017

Sri Ramadhani[1] Khairil Ansari[2] Wisman Hadi[2]
[1](Postgraduate Students at State University of Medan, Indonesia)
[2](Postgraduate Lecturer at State University of Medan, Indonesia)

Abstract : *The purpose of this research is to know: (1) To describe the effect of writing skill of grade V student SDN 066041 Medan which is taught with synectics learning model and CTL. (2) To describe the effect of skilled in writing poetry of grade V SDN 066041 Medan who have high vocabulary mastering and low vocabulary. (3) To describe the interaction between learning model and vocabulary mastering of writing poetry skills of grade V SDN 066041 Medan. This type of research is a quasi experiment. The population of this study is all students of class V SDN 066041 Medan, amounting to 153 students. The sample selection was done by cluster random sampling. The V-1 class of 30 people as an experimental class is taught using a synectics learning model and a V-4 class of 30 people as control class is taught by using CTL model. The instruments used consist of: (1) test of poetry writing ability, (2) instrument of vocabulary mastering obtained by using objective test. The instrument is said to have fulfilled the validity and reliability requirements. Data analysis was performed by two-lane T and ANAVA test analysis. Result of research indicate that: (1) There is difference of poetry writing skill which is taught by synectics and CTL learning model in grade V student SDN 066041 Medan. (2) There is a difference of poetry writing skill which has high vocabulary mastering and low vocabulary in grade V students SDN 066041 Medan. (3) There is an interaction between the synectic learning model and vocabulary mastering of poetry writing skills of grade V students SDN 066041 Medan.*

Keywords - *a synectics learning model, vocabulary mastering, writing poetry skill*

I. INTRODUCTION

Writing is a language skill that is used to communicate indirectly, not face-to-face with others. In this activity a writer must be skilled in using graphology, language structure and vocabulary. This writing skill will not come automatically but has to go through many and regular practice and practice [1]. Writing is also a whole series of activities a person to express his thoughts through written language to be read and understood by others. The fruit of his thoughts that can be experiences, opinions, knowledge, desires, feelings until a person's heart turmoil.

The development of writing skills, especially those related to literary works such as poetry, needs to be taken seriously because writing poetry can not be formed automatically and is not as easy as the students imagine, students are required to play well with words and have many word references so as to produce a poem which is beautiful and interesting to read. In other words, learning to write poetry done in schools is not meant to print poets, but learning to write poetry is intended to train students to be accustomed to develop their ability to write creatively in this case writing poetry.

In learning Indonesian language especially in learning to write poetry, there are still many students who are less creative thinking so that students are not able to express ideas, opinions, and feelings in writing poetry. Writing skills in learning is an important thing. This is as revealed by Tarigan [2] that writing skills serve as a means of communication indirectly, not face to face with others. In this writing activity, the writer must be skilled in utilizing graphology, language structure and vocabulary. In addition, this writing skill will not come automatically, but must be through practice and practice that is neat and orderly. However, in practice in schools has not been maximized, especially the learning of writing poetry.

The skill of writing poetry is a learning activity that is productive-creative. That is, learning is done so that students are able to produce works in the form of poetry and use it in everyday life. To arrive at the process of producing poetry, a creative process is needed. According to Suntari [3] the creative process will develop if the four related elements are trained optimally, namely 1) potential, knowledge, and personal experience; 2) internal and external encouragement according to the needs of the learner; 3) learning process supported by learning climate, full student engagement, and meaningfulness of learning; and 4) products that are valuable or valuable to students and others.

One's writing skills are not talent, but are skills that can be developed through continuous practice. Writing skills require continuous training intensity to produce a beautiful writing and aesthetic value. Writing skills need to be nurtured in education because it can train students to think critically in response to everything. Writing can also make it easier for us to feel and enjoy relationships, deepen our perceptions or perceptions, solve problems, and arrange sequences of experiences. Training elementary school students with poetry writing activities is very important. Although learning to write poetry is not meant to print poets, poetry writing can be used by students to express their feelings and thoughts. In addition, poetry writing activities can also be used to train students' creativity and train their sensitivity to literary arts.

According to Paryono in literary learning, especially creative writing, one of the weaknesses of literary learning in schools is a literary learning material that emphasizes more on literary theory than students' familiarity with literary works [4]. Such literary learning conditions and less familiarize the students on literary works make students do not love the literature, which resulted in students will have a sense of lazy to write. In addition, the process of delivering monotonous and non-innovative literary materials makes students lazy to study literature.

There are several problems of literary learning. One is the issue of the pattern of literary teaching and its evaluation. Jamaluddin said that the pattern of literary learning has not been entirely oriented to efforts to foster and develop students' appreciation for literary works [5]. More students are given material related to literary theory and history, such as the periodization of literary history, the names of writers and the works they write, the streams that exist, and so on. Though theory and history are basically as theoretical supporters in order to increase the ability of literature appreciation in children. The question of evaluation in learning literature is also more about the theory and history of literature that is cognitive compared with the affective appreciation. Research on the low writing of student poetry can be described through Journal Turofingah, Suhartono, and Susiani (2015) entitled Improving Poetry Writing Skill through the Use of Audiovisual Media on Grade V Students SDN Keleng 01. From the results of this study, it was found in the field that in learning to write poetry , many students have difficulty in pouring ideas or ideas to pour in poetry and their lack of enthusiasm in writing poems, consequently many students score below KKM 70. For some students, poetry writing lessons are considered less attractive because of the lack of vocabulary possessed by students and difficult diction processing so that the resulting work is less imaginative. In addition, the learning model applied by teachers in the classroom is conventional and directly assigns the task to the students at the end of the meeting. This resulted in students lacking understanding and a good step in writing poetry.

Furthermore, in the journal Chodijah entitled Improving Poetry Writing Skills through Contextual Approach it is known that learning to write poetry is less attention and less motivate students to be creative according to interest [6]. This is evident from the results of preliminary tests that indicate that students are at a less successful interpretation in writing poetry with the figure shown at 46%. Then, from the observation it is known that many students assume that poetry writing skills are less important than other lessons (linguistic), which ultimately have a direct impact on the ability of students who have difficulty when given the task of writing poetry. Difficulties faced by students is to determine the theme and choice of the right words in learning to write poetry. Therefore students need to be given a view or description of the theme. Another factor is the parents who expect their children to master the lessons of the exact field compared with language, because according to the parent's perceptions of intelligence in the measure of the ability in the exact field. The weakness of writing poetry is also expressed by Saadia, Ali, and Efendi (2014) in his journal entitled Improving Students' Poetry Writing Skills through Exercise Method in Class V SD Inpres 1 Siney. From the results of research in the school found the fact that shows there are still many students who have difficulty in writing poetry. These difficulties include: students are difficult to pour ideas or ideas in the form of poetry, learning activities that are less varied, causing the interest and enthusiasm of students in learning becomes less and the results are not optimal [7].

Based on the above three journals, it can be concluded that students' difficulties in writing poetry is the lack of interest of students in learning to write poetry, the lack of imaginative power in poetry writing activities, lack of vocabulary possessed by students, difficult diction processing, learning model, difficulty determine the theme, ideas or ideas that will be poured in poetry.

This difficulty was also found in the early observation that the learning of poetry writing is boring, less attention and less motivate students to be creative according to interest. It is caused by less complete, boring, monotonous learning, and lack of variation of poetic writing learning approach. Meanwhile, from the interview with the Indonesian language teacher, Ibu Farida Rahmah who teaches in grade V SDN 066041 Medan who said that the grade V students have low writing poetry value. He showed the results of the monthly exams of students who still get a lot of 55 when the KKM to be achieved by students is 70. In addition, the low information value of writing poetry because students are still less attention to the elements of poetry builders such as theme (sense), feeling, tone or attitude of the poet to the reader (tone), and the mandate (intention).

The low ability of students in writing poetry certainly gives a bad effect for the Indonesian language in school. Therefore, the need for an innovative learning model that can generate students' creativity in expressing ideas, opinions, and feelings so that the meaning of poetry can touch the feelings of people who hear. Teaching poetry in school often gives students a sense of boredom. This is because students are only requested as listeners or recipients of information from teachers, carrying out tasks assigned by teachers, passive, teaching and learning processes are theoretical, and student interaction is so poor that the teaching of poetry does not provide much progress to students' poetry writing skills.

Seeing the phenomenon, the activity of writing poetry has not been done as expected, it is necessary to use a model of learning that is able to develop the creativity of students in writing poetry is a model of learning sinektik. This learning model focuses on teaching and learning process by developing creativity. The synoptic learning model is one model that belongs to a personal family or private model that is non-directive teaching, awareness exercises, conceptual systems and classroom meetings. It is intended to create a self-oriented teaching model that focuses on individual psychology and creativity development through self-actualization, mental health, and creativity development.

Joyce points out that the synoptic model is one of the teaching models that belong to the personal models of the model [8]. It is intended that the synoptic learning model is designed so that students are able to solve the problem (problem solver) and to develop the production (product development) so that students' creativities grow in overcoming the problems that occur. It is intended that with the synoptic learning model, students are able to think creatively to make better learning outcomes in this case poetry writing skill through direct analogy, personal analogy, and ability conflict.

Synoptic learning model is an effort done to stimulate student creativity. Application of learning to write poetry with a synectics model has the purpose and purpose of digging the imagination and creativity of students in literature (writing poetry). This is in line with Wellek and Warren's opinion that literature is a creative activity of a work of art. From these statements, it should be that literary learning, especially writing poetry in the classroom, is aimed at developing the process of student creativity in the literary arts by teachers [9]. The literature should also be directed to cultivate students' interest in literature so that students will be interested in the literary learning of writing poetry. Using a synoptic learning model, students are able to think creatively to express their ideas, opinions, and feelings in writing poetry better. In addition to the students' thinking creativity in expressing ideas, opinions, and feelings in writing poetry, students also find it difficult to find appropriate words to appreciate the imagined. Student confusion is an obstacle of learning to write poetry in school, we can see through the poems that they make and collected when the process of learning creative writing poetry to teachers. Kurniandari finds in his research that in fact, there are still many students who have difficulty in writing poetry [10]. These difficulties include: students are difficult to pour ideas or ideas in the form of poetry, less varied learning activities that cause interest and the use of vocabulary that does not fit to make the results of poetry did not give good results.

Most of the poems indicate that the vocabulary used by the students is not so well suited to the message to be conveyed in the poem that the result is less expressive and less natural impressed. Vocabulary mastering is the appropriate and harmonious use of the word in its use to express the idea so as to obtain a certain effect (as expected). Aulina defines vocabulary as a word or group of words that have a certain meaning [11]. In poetry writing skills, a good vocabulary will cause a reaction when read. Therefore, in improving the skills of writing poetry, vocabulary mastering will give the feel of the meaning of the idea to be conveyed, the ability to find a form that suits the situation and taste value.

In addition to the synoptic model, Contextual Teaching and Learning learning models can assist students in writing poetry skills through the experience possessed by students. According to Nurhadi, CTL learning is a learning concept that helps teachers connect learning materials with students' real-world situations and encourages students to make connections between their knowledge and application in their daily lives [12]. In the context of CTL, vocabulary acquisition is not only derived from listening and recording, but through a process of experiencing it directly. Through the process of experienced it is expected that the vocabulary mastering of students will be better and can develop not only in the cognitive aspects, but also the affective and psychomotor aspects. By making connections between the knowledge already possessed by the student and its application in everyday life, the vocabulary students who have learned from the experience received by the students will be easy to put in writing poetry. With the CTL learning model, students will work and experience, not transfer knowledge from teacher to student only. CTL approach is a strategy developed with the aim that learning goes more productive and meaningful, especially in improving the skills of writing poetry.

Based on the above explanation, it can be concluded that the synoptic learning model and mastering of vocabulary will affect the skills of writing poetry students. It is therefore very important to discuss this research further as important information for teachers in solving student problems in schools, especially learning Indonesian.

II. METHOD

This research is a quasi experimental research with 2 x 2 factorial design. The research population is the students of grade V SDN 066041 Medan. The sample in this research is taken by cluster random sampling, that is class V-1 and class V-4. Being a class of treatment with a V class synectics model V-1 amounted to 30 and became a class with CTL model is class V-4 which amounted to 30. This research instrument using objective test with vocabulary test form as many as 25 items that have been validated. The resulting data were analyzed using an anava 2 pathway with the help of SPSS.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

Based on data of research result and analysis about poetry writing skill with synectics obtained highest score is 44, lowest score 27, so range 27-44 score. the ability to write poetry in this group has a mean score of 35.13; mode score of 37.5; median score of 35.5 and standard deviation (standard deviation) of 4.64. in Table 1.

Table 1. Frequency Distribution of Poetry Writing Skill Scores with Synectics

Class	Interval	f	xi (%)
1	27-29	4	13
2	30-32	5	17
3	33-35	6	20
4	36-38	7	23
5	39-41	5	17
6	42-44	3	10
	Total	30	100

Based on data result of research known that result of student learning which dibelajarkan with model skill writing poetry with CTL highest score = 39 and lowest score = 28 so the span 28-39. The skill of writing poetry in this group has a mean score of 33.17; mode score of 34.5; median score of 35.7 and standard deviation (standard deviation) of 2.64 Table 2.

Table 2 Frequency Distribution of Poetry Writing Skills with poetry writing skill model with CTL

Class	Interval	f	xi (%)
1	28-29	2	7
2	30-31	6	20
3	32-33	10	33
4	34-35	6	20
5	36-37	4	13
6	38-39	2	7
	Total	30	100

Based on data of research result known that student learning result of poetry writing skill with high vocabulary mastering known that: n = 40, highest score = 44 and lowest score = 30 so the span = 30-44. The skill of writing poetry in this group has a mean score of 36.8; score mode of 38.5; median score of 38.28 and standard deviation (standard deviation) of 3.52. Table 3.

Table 3 Frequency Distribution of Poetry Writing Skills with High Vocabulary Mastering

No	Class Interval	Frequency	Percentage
1.	66-70	2	7,69
2.	71-75	2	7,69
3.	76-80	3	11,54
4.	81-85	5	19,23
5.	86-90	8	30,77
6.	91-95	6	23,08
	Total	26	100,00

Based on data of research result known that poetry writing skill in student group with low vocabulary mastering known that: n = 20, highest score = 37 and lowest score = 27 so the range = 27-37. The skill of writing poetry in this group has a mean score of 31.9; the mode score of 33.36; median score of 31.17 and standard deviation (standard deviation) of 2.54 Table 4.

Table 4 Frequency Distribution of Poetry Writing Skills with Low Vocabulary Mastering

Class	Interval	f	xi (%)
1	27-28	3	10
2	29-30	6	20
3	31-32	8	27
4	33-34	9	30
5	35-36	3	10
6	37-38	1	3
	Total	30	100

Based on the data of the research result, it is known that the Poetry Writing Skill with synectics on students who have high vocabulary mastering known that: n = 20, highest score = 44 and lowest score = 36 so the range = 44-36. The skill of writing poetry in this group has a mean score of 40.57; a mode score of 40.83; median score of 42 and standard deviation (standard deviation) of 2.37. The frequency distribution of the skill of writing poetry with the syntax of students with high vocabulary mastering can be seen in Table 5.

Table 5 Frequency Distribution of Poetry Writing Skills with Sinektik to students with high vocabulary mastering

Class	Interval	f	xi (%)
1	36-37	3	20
2	38-39	5	33
3	40-41	4	27
4	42-43	2	13
5	44-45	1	7
	Total	15	100

Based on data of research result known that skill writing skill with CTL in student with low vocabulary knowledge is known that: n = 30, highest score = 36 and lowest score = 27 so the range = 27-36. The skill of writing poetry in this group has a mean score of 43.23; mode score of 34.5; a median score of 37 and standard deviation (standard deviation) of 2.6. Frequency distribution of poetry writing skill score with CTL in students with low vocabulary mastering can be seen Table 6.

Table 6 Frequency distribution of poetry writing skills with CTL in students with low vocabulary mastering

Class	Interval	f	xi (%)
1	30-31	2	13,3
2	32-33	5	33,3
3	34-35	3	20
4	36-37	3	20
5	38-39	2	13,3
	Total	15	100

Based on the data of the research results, it is known that the skill of writing poetry with CTL in students who have high vocabulary mastering known that: n = 30, highest score = 39 and lowest score = 30 so the range = 30-39. The skill of writing poetry in this group has a mean score of 31.5; score mode of 33; the median score of 36 and standard deviation (standard deviation) of 2.51. Frequency distribution of poetry writing skills scores with CTL in students who have high vocabulary mastering in Table 7.

Table 7 Frequency distribution of poetry writing skills with CTL in students with high vocabulary Mastering

Class	Interval	f	xi (%)
1	27-28	2	13,3
2	29-30	3	20
3	31-32	5	33,3
4	33-34	3	20
5	35-36	2	13,3
	Total	15	100

Based on data of research result known that skill writing skill with CTL at student who have low vocabulary mastering known that: n = 30, highest score = 37 and lowest score = 28 so the span = 28-37. The skill of writing poetry in this group has a mean score of 32.1; mode score of 33.17; median score of 33; and standard deviation (standard deviation) of 2.29. The frequency distribution of poetry writing skills scores with CTL in students with low vocabulary mastering can be seen in Table 8 as follows.

Table 8 Distribution Frequency of writing poetry skills with CTL in students with low vocabulary mastering

Class	Interval	f	xi (%)
1	28-29	2	13
2	30-31	4	27
3	32-33	5	33
4	34-35	3	20
5	36-37	1	7
	Total	30	100

Testing of data normality is done by using Liliefors statistic test. The overall normality test of data can be presented in Table 9.

Table 9. Test Result of Data Normality with Liliefors Test

Group	N	L_0	L_{tabel}	Conclusion
Results of Poetry Writing Skills Students are taught with Sinektik	30	0,081	0,161	Normal
Results of Poetry Writing Skills Students are dated with CTL	30	0,124	0,161	Normal
Results of Student Poetry Writing Skill with High Vocabulary Mastering	30	0,084	0,161	Normal
Results of Student Poetry Writing Skill with Low Vocabulary Mastering	30	0,084	0,161	Normal
Results of Poetry Writing Skills Students are taught by Sinektik with High Vocabulary Mastering	15	0,082	0,161	Normal
Results of Poetry	15	0,101	0,161	Normal

Writing Skills Students who are taught by Sinektik with Low Vocabulary Mastering				
Results of Poetry Writing Skills Students are taught by CTL with High Vocabulary Mastering	15	0,144	0,161	Normal
Results of Poetry Writing Skills Students are taught by CTL with Low Vocabulary Mastering	15	0,093	0,161	Normal

In Table 9 shows the results of the test data normality test of Poetry Writing Skill it turns out that the Lhitung value is smaller than Ltabel for all groups in the normality test. So it can be concluded that the sample of this study comes from a population that is normally distributed.

Furthermore, homogeneity test is intended to know the difference of data variance of each class. The homogeneity test was done by comparing the data variance of poetry writing skill result between treatment with Sinektik and CTL, homegensity test of variance was done by using barttet test for the whole treatment group:
1) Homogeneity test results for Sinektik and CTL obtained price data as listed Table 10

Table 10. Summary of Test Results Homogeneity test results for Synectics and CTL

Group	Varians	dk	Chi_{acc}	Chi_{table}	α	Conclusion
Sinektik	21,84	29	1,857	3,841	0,05	Homogen
Lecture	12,131	29				

1) Homogeneous test of Variance of Poetry Writing Skill with High Vocabulary Mastering and Low Vocabulary Mastering

Table 11. Summary of Homogenistas Test Results Variance of Poetry Writing Skill with High Vocabulary Mastering and Low Vocabulary Mastering

Group	Varians	Dk	Chi_{acc}	Chi_{tabel}	α	Conclusion
High Vocabulary Mastering	7,109	29	0,235	3,841	0,05	Homogen
Low Vocabulary Mastering	5,937	29				

1) Result of Homogeneity Testing of Sinarian and CTL Variance on each Vocabulary Groups.

Table 12. Summary of Homogeneity Test Results of Sinarian and CTL Variance in each Vocabulary Mastering Group

Group	Varians	Dk	Chi_{acc}	Chi_{tabel}	α	Conclusion
P1	5,971	14				
P2	6,410	14				
P3	6,734	14	0,118	7,815	0,05	Homogen
P4	5,695	14				

From Table 10 it is seen by comparing the values with dk = 1 at a significant level. 5% is 3,841 meaning (1,857) <(3,841) hence there is no difference of variance between student group taught by model of learning. So it can be concluded that the data of writing skills of the two groups is Homogeneous

From Table 11 it can be seen that by comparing values with dk = 1 at 5% significant level is 3,841 meaning (0,235) <(3,841) hence there is no difference of variance between group of students taught by model of learning. So it can be concluded that the data of writing skills of the two groups is Homogeneous. From Table 12 it can be seen that by comparing values with dk = 3 at 5% significant level is 7,815 meaning (0,118) <(7,815) hence there is no difference of variance between group of students taught by model of learning and possessing high vocabulary mastering and mastering of vocabulary low. It can be concluded that the data of poetry writing skill of both groups is Homogen.

Further examination The results of the test data of poetry writing skills obtained then calculated the total score and the average score of each cell according to the ANAVA table. Summary of Summary of Research Data Results in Table 13 as follows:

Table 13 Summary of Results of Research Data

Vocabulary Mastering	Statistic	Learning Model		Total
		Sinektik	CTL	
High	N	15	15	30
	$\sum x$	591	513	1104
	$\sum x2$	23369	17639	41008
	M	39,400	34,200	73,600
Low	N	15	15	30
	$\sum x$	473	482	955
	$\sum x2$	15005	15568	30573
	M	31,533	32,133	63,666
Total	N	30	30	60
	$\sum x$	1064	995	2059
	$\sum x2$	38374	33207	71581
	M	70,933	66,333	137,7266

Based on the calculation of Table 14, it is calculated factorial anava 2 x2 and obtained a summary of factorial 2 x 2 anava used to test the research hypothesis as follows.

Table 14 Summary of Anova Factorial Calculation 2 x 2

Source Varians	JK	Dk	RJK	F_0	F_t
Learning Model	369,98	1	369,98	59,67	4,02
Vocabulary Mastering	79,34	1	79,34	12,8	4,02
Learning Model and Vocabulary Mastering (Interaction)	126,16	1	126,16	20,35	4,02
In the Group of Errors	347,4	56	6,2		
Total	922,98	59	-	-	--

From Table 13 then for the influence of the column obtained by Fcount = 12.8 while testing for% with dk = 1.56 = 4.02 so it can be stated that Fhitung = 12.8> 4.02. finally it can be said that the test results reject H0 and receive Ha in a significant level of 5%. with demikain research hypothesis that said that there are differences in results Poetry Writing Skills are taught with Sinektik and CTL is tested truth.

From Table 14 then for the influence of the column obtained by Fcount = 59.67 while testing for% with dk = 1.56 = 4.02 so it can be stated that Fhitung = 59.67> 4.02. finally it can be said that the test results reject H0 and receive Ha in a significant level of 5%. With demikain hypothesis of research that says that there is difference of result of Writing Skill of Poetry which has Mastering of High Vocabulary and Mastering of Vocabulary Low tested its truth.

Discussion

Poetry Writing Skills use higher poetic writing skills than synthesized using the CTL learning model. The result of research data analysis through two-track anava test was decided to reject Ho and accept Ha. This shows that in other words, the synoptic learning model has a positive effect on the improvement of students' poetry writing abilities in which the synoptic model helps the students to be used as patterns, references, and guidelines to solve problems in improving poetry writing skill by describing situation, direct analogy, analogy personal, solid conflicts, early direct analogies, and re-examine the tasks students have done in writing poetry. By karean it can be concluded that the model of learning sinektik very help students write poetry with the development of student creativity through analogy.

This is supported by Endraswara saying that the synoptic model as an attempt to understand the work of poetry because it has a metaphorical process and analogies. This suggests that this model is very suitable to be applied in writing poetry [13]. Vocabulary mastering is the ability of students in expressing or conveying appropriate sentences according to the situation and where the words are used. Mastering of words is not just the activity of choosing the right words, but also choosing the right words. Match in this case means according to the context in which the word is located, and its meaning is not contrary to the user's sense of community.

The result of the analysis about the influence of vocabulary mastering of poetry writing skill can be known through two groups of students that are students who have high and low vocabulary mastering. Students who have high vocabulary mastering will be more skilled in the language. Conversely students who have low vocabulary mastering will not be skilled in the language. In other words, the vocabulary that students have will affect the skills of writing poetry. The result of hypothesis test shows that the group of students who have high vocabulary mastering proved to have a better influence in the achievement of poetry writing skills compared with the group of students who

have low vocabulary mastering. The result of the analysis shows that the group of students with high vocabulary mastering of the average score of poetry writing skill is 36.8 while the average score of poetry writing ability with low vocabulary mastering is 31.83. This means that vocabulary mastering proved to have a significant influence on the achievement of poetry writing skills.

Waluyo said that poetry is a compressed literary work, shortened, and rhythmic with a unified sound and the choice of the word kias (imaginative) [14]. This quote explains that poetry writing skills are better when the poet (student) is able to explore the analogies to be developed in writing poetry. In other words, the exploration of analogies taught in the synoptic learning model greatly helps the student in improving poetry writing skills. Poetry Writing Skills have higher cooperative social interactions than students have a competitive social interaction. Based on the analysis of research data using anava two lines decided to reject Ho and accept Ha. This means that Poetry Writing Skills have a higher cooperative social interaction than students having a competitive social interaction.

Based on the further test of Tuckey test, it can be seen that there are differences in the result of poetry writing skill in the group of students who have high vocabulary mastering taught using sinektik which has an average of 39.4 and the result of poetry writing skills taught by synectics and CTL models which have flat 3rd grade 4.2. This proves that the mastering of high vocabulary with a cinematic model will make it easier for students to improve their poetry writing skills. This is because the application of synoptic model with high vocabulary will make it easier for students to express the exact sentence where the student can match the sentence according to the context and meaning in poetry by the poet (student).

Limitations of Research

This study still has many limitations although done various efforts for research to get maximum result, but still there are some factors that are difficult to be controlled so make this research have limitations, among as follows.

1. This research is only done on 60 students in SDN 066041 class V as sample, so the result of research can only generalize to population having same characteristic with research sample in other area.
2. This research uses experimental research design that requires the control of all research variables outside the predefined variable so as not to interfere with the treatment in the experiment. While there is a tendency of research subjects to interact outside of research. This resulted in the control of the treatment addressed to the student becoming difficult.
3. Research is limited to the instrument of treatment of the use of synoptic learning model and CTL model as well as high and low learning motivation from the students, while there are still many other factors that influence students' writing poetry skills, such as learning styles, learning supporting facilities and infrastructure, teacher competence, teacher skills in classroom management. Thus the various factors and conditions affect the improvement of students' poetry writing skills, so the results of writing poetry students in this study are not solely influenced by the use of learning models in the process of teaching and learning in the classroom.
4. The collection of research data collected through questionnaires given to the students as respondents in the implementation of the study allegedly there are respondents gave the choice of option questionnaire statement is not in accordance with the actual circumstances. To overcome this, in the implementation of the questionnaire required assistance during the filling of questionnaires.
5. The impact of experiences experienced by previous students and the social, economic, residential, family, environmental and cultural conditions received by students outside the school can also affect student learning outcomes that have different creativity. Therefore in the study should thoroughly check the control of special occurrences in students relating to experience and the environment.

IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of data analysis research, it can be put forward the following conclusions:

1. There are differences in poetry writing skills taught by the model of learning Sinektik and CTL on students of grade V SDN 066041 Medan.
2. There is a difference in the skills of writing poetry that has a high vocabulary mastering and low vocabulary in grade V students SDN 066041 Medan.
3. There is an interaction between the synoptic learning model and the mastering of vocabulary on the skills of writing poetry students of class V SDN 066041 Medan.

REFERENCES

[1] Tarigan, Henry Guntur. 2010. *Menulis Sebagai Suatu Keterampilan Berbahasa*. Bandung: Angkasa.
[2] Tarigan, Djago. 2013. *Membina Keterampilan Menulis Paragraf dan Pengembangannya*. Bandung: Angkasa
[3] Sofyan, M. 2011. *Anatomi Cara menulis*. Bandung: Angkasa Raya.
[4] Paryono, Nunik. 2008. *Pembelajaran Sastara*. Jakarta: Gramedia.
[5] Jamaluddin, Bambang. 2013. *Peningkatan keterampilan sastra siswa*. Jogyakarta: *pustaka Beajar*.
[6] Chodijah, Siti. 2013. *Peningkatan Keterampilan Menulis Puisi melalui Pendekatan Kontekstual (Penelitian Tindakan pada Siswa Kelas VIII SMP Harapan Taruna, Bogor)*. Dosen Program Studi PBS Indonesia, FKIP, Universitas Pakuan, Bogor
[7] Saadia, Ali, dan Efendi. 2014. *Peningkatan Kemampuan Siswa Menulis Puisi Melalui Metode Latihan di Kelas V SD Inpres 1 Siney* . Jurnal Kreatif Tadulako Online Vol. 4 No. 6 ISSN 2354-614X.
[8] Joyce, B dkk. 2011. *Models of Teaching Edisi Kedelapan*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
[9] Welleck dan Warren. 2014. *Teori Kesusateraan.* Jakarta: Gramedia.
[10] Kurniandari, Tri Ratna. 2014. *Peningkatan Keterampilan Menulis Puisi Siswa Kelas V Sd Negeri 3 Limbangan Dengan Teknik Latihan Terbimbing Melalui Media Lagu*. Jurnal Pendidikan. Semarang : Universitas Negeri Semarang
[11] Aulia, Gina. 2012. *Kosakata Siswa. Penelitian*: FIP UNY.
[12] Muslich, Masnur. 2009. *KTSP Pembelajaran Berbasis Kompetensi dan Kontekstual.* Jakarta: Bumi Aksara
[13] Endraswara, Suwardi. 2010. *Metodologi Penelitian dalam Sastra*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Widyatama.
[14] Waluyo, Herman. 2009. *Apresiasi Puisi untuk Pelajar dan Mahasiswa*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka.