CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the data that was collected during the experimental research. First analysis focuses on the homogeneity of the sample; second analysis focuses on the validity, reliability, index difficulty, and discriminating power of instruments. And the third analysis represents the result of pre-test and post-test that was done both in experimental and control group.

A. First Analysis

This study was divided in two classes, class X A as the experiment class and class X B as control class. Learning speaking narrative text in the experiment class by using scrambled pictures as media. While the control class by conventional learning.

Before analysis was done, the first test given before and after the students follows learning process that was provided by the writer (pre-test and post-test). After the data are collected, the writer was scored the result of data from the test that has been given to the students.

To analysis the data of test result, the first known the beginning of data from experiment class and control class that is taken from the pre-test value. And after the control and experiment conduct the learning process, then both of the class is given a test to obtain the data that will be analyzed.

Table. I. Test of Homogeneity

Variant Sources	Experimental G	Control G
Sum	1564,00	1524,00
N	25	25
$\overline{X}$	62,56	60,95
Variants (s2)	69,1733	73,7067
Standart deviation (s)	8,32	8,59

By knowing the mean and the variance, the researcher was able to test the similarity of the two variants with the homogeneity test from students' pre

test score between X A and X B. The computation of the test of homogeneity as follows:

$$\boxed{F = \frac{\text{Biggest Variant}}{\text{Smallest Variant}}}$$

$$F = \frac{73{,}7067}{69{,}1733} = 1{,}066$$

On a 5% with df numerator (nb - 1) = 25 – 1 = 24 and df denominator (nk – 1) = 25 – 1 = 24, it was found F_{table} = 1,98. Because of $F_{score} \leq F_{table}$ /1,0655 ≤ 1,98, so it could be concluded that both X A and X B had no differences. The result showed both groups had similar variants (homogenous).

B. Second Analysis

1. Validity of Try Out Test

The speaking items consist of five items. They are pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, fluency, and comprehension. From the try out test that was conducted, it was obtained that all speaking items were valid. For example, the item analysis of relevance was obtained (r_{xy}) 0,564 for α = 5 % with N = 20. It would be obtained 0,444. Since the result of the instruments validity was higher than the critical score, it was considered that the instruments were valid. The complete computation and the sample of computation are as below.

The Computation of Item Validity Using Scrambled Pictures

Formula:

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

Criteria:

The item is valid if $r_{xy} > r_{table}$

Calculation:

Below is the example of the item validity of number 3.

NO	CODE	X	Y	X^2	Y^2	XY
1	T – 12	4	23	16	529	92
2	T – 20	4	19	25	361	76
3	T – 11	4	19	25	361	76
4	T – 9	4	19	16	361	76
5	T- 16	4	18	16	324	72
6	T- 2	2	18	16	324	36
7	T – 4	4	18	16	324	72
8	T – 5	4	18	16	324	72
9	T- 3	4	17	16	289	68
10	T- 15	4	17	25	289	68
11	T –1	3	16	16	256	48
12	T – 13	3	16	25	256	48
13	T – 19	4	16	16	256	64
14	T – 14	3	15	16	225	45
15	T- 18	3	14	16	196	42
16	T- 17	3	14	25	196	42
17	T- 8	2	14	16	196	28
18	T-10	2	14	25	196	28
19	T- 6	2	13	16	169	26
20	T- 7	4	13	16	169	52
Sum		67	331	237	5601	2679

Where: N = 20 X^2 = 237 X = 67 Y^2 = 5601 Y = 331 Σ XY = 1131

$$r_{xy} = \frac{(20\times1131)-(67)(331)}{\sqrt{\{(20\times237)-(67)^2\}\{(20\times5601)-(684)^2\}}}$$

= 0.564

Because of $r_{xy} > r_{table}$, so item number 3 is valid.

2. Reliability of Try Out Test

After validity items had done, the next analysis was to test the reliability of instrument. It was done to find out whether a test had higher critical score and gave the stability or consistency of the test scores or not. From the computation of reliability of the try out instruments using scrambled pictures, it was obtained 0,531, for α 5 % with N = 20. It was obtained 0,444. It could be concluded that the instruments that were used in this research was reliable. The complete analysis and the computation as follow:

The Computation of Reliability Using Scrambled Pictures

Formula:

$$r_{11} = \left(\frac{k}{k-1}\right)\left(1 - \frac{\sum \sigma_{b^2}}{\sigma_{t^2}}\right)$$

Criteria:

The try out is reliable if $r_{11} > r_{table}$

Calculation:

$$\sigma_t^2 = \frac{\sum Y^2 - \frac{(Y)^2}{N}}{N}$$

$$\sigma_t^2 = \frac{5601 - \frac{(331)^2}{20}}{20}$$
$$= 6{,}15$$

Variance

$$\sigma_b^2 = \frac{\sum X^2 - \frac{(\Sigma X)^2}{N}}{N}$$

$$\sigma_{b1}^2 = \frac{237 - \frac{(67)^2}{20}}{20} = 0{,}63$$

$$\sigma_{b2}^2 = \frac{237 - \frac{(67)^2}{20}}{20} = 0{,}63$$

$$\sigma_{b3}^2 = \frac{278 - \frac{(72)^2}{20}}{20} = 0{,}94$$

$$\sigma_{b3}^2 = \frac{214 - \frac{(64)^2}{20}}{20} = 0{,}46$$

$$\sigma_{b3}^2 = \frac{197 - \frac{(61)^2}{20}}{20} = 0{,}53$$

$$\Sigma b_b^2 = 3{,}19$$

Index Reliability

$$r_{11} = \left(\frac{5}{5-1}\right)\left(1-\frac{3{,}19}{6{,}15}\right)$$

$$= 0{,}598$$

3. Discriminating Power of Try Out Test

The discriminating power of the five items analysis of speaking was satisfied. It showed that all speaking items had strong discrimination. The complete analysis and the sample of computation as follow.

The Computation of Discriminating Power

Formula:

$$D = \frac{B_A}{J_A} - \frac{B_B}{J_B} = P_A - P_B$$

Criteria:

D = 0,00 – 0,20 : Poor

D = 0,21 – 0,40 : Satisfactory

D = 0,41 – 0,70 : Good

D = 0,71 – 1,00 : Excellent

Calculation:

Below is the example of the computation of discriminating power on item number 1.

$$D = \frac{9}{10} - \frac{8}{10} = 1 - 0{,}100 = 0{,}900$$

The result obtained D = 0,900

Because of the result is between 0,71 – 1,00. So the item number 1 is Excellent.

4. Difficulty Level of Try Out Test

From the computation of difficulty level of the five items analysis of speaking, it was found that the difficulty level is easy. So, it could be concluded that the final total items analysis for the instruments were categorized satisfactory. The sample of computation is as follow.

The Computation of Difficulty Index

Formula:

$$P = \frac{B}{JS}$$

Criteria:

$0.00 \leq P < 0.30$ is difficult

$0.30 \leq P < 0.70$ is medium

$0.70 \leq P < 1.00$ is easy

Calculation:

Below is the example of the computation of difficulty level on item number 1.

B = 18

JS = 20

So:

$$P = \frac{18}{20} = 0{,}900$$

The result obtained P = 0,900

Because of the result is between 0,70 – 100, so the item number 1 is easy.

C. Third Analysis

The next analysis represents the result of pre-test and post-test that was done both in experimental and control group. This analysis will answer the research question "How effective is scrambled pictures to improve the students' ability in speaking narrative text?." We can conclude scrambled pictures is effective when the result of post test of the experimental class (using scrambled pictures technique) and control class (using conventional technique) has differences or the assumption that those classes is equal is not fulfilled.

Before the researcher tested the hypothesis, the researcher analyzed and tested hypothesis prerequisites which contained of normality test and

homogeneity test. Second analysis dealt with normality test, homogeneity test, and t-test (test of difference two variants) in pre-test and post-test.

1. Analysis of Pre-test

The control group (X B) was given a pre-test on October 7, 2010 and also the experimental group (X A) was given a pre-test on October 7, 2010 too. They were asked to speak narrative based on the topic that was given to them.

a. Test of Normality

Test of normality was used to find out whether data of control and experimental group which had been collected from the research come from normal distribution normal or not. The result computation of Chi-quadrate (X^2_{score}) then was compared with table of Chi-quadrate (X^2_{table}) by using 5% alpha of significance. If $X^2_{score} < X^2_{table}$ meant that the data spread of research result distributed normally.

Based on the research result of X B students in the control group before they were taught narrative text without scrambled pictures, they reached the maximum score 76 and minimum score 48.

The stretches of score were 28. So, there were 6 classes with length of classes 5. From the computation of frequency distribution, it was found ($\Sigma f_i . x_i$) = 1445 and ($\Sigma f_i . x_i^2$) = 88725. So, the average score ($\overline{X}$) was 60,208 and the standard deviation (S) was 8,6576. After counting the average score and standard deviation, table of observation frequency was needed to measure Chi-quadrate (X^2_{score}).

Table IV. 1 Table of the Observation Frequency of Control Group

TEST OF THE NORMALITY DATA OF PRE TEST CONTROL GROUP (CLASS X B)

List of the Observation Frequency of Control Group

Class	Bk	Z_i	$P(Z_i)$	Ld	Ei	Oi	$\frac{(O_i - E_i)^2}{E_i}$
	47,5	-1,47	-0,4289				

48 _ 52				0,1156	2,9	6	3,3492
	52,5	-0,89	-0,3134				
53 _ 57				0,1906	4,8	5	0,0117
	57,5	-0,31	-0,1228				
58 _ 62				0,2272	5,7	4	0,4966
	62,5	0,26	0,1044				
63 _ 67				0,1958	4,9	2	1,7119
	67,5	0,84	0,3002				
68 _ 72				0,1220	3,0	5	1,2471
	72,5	1,42	0,4222				
73 _ 77				0,0549	1,4	2	0,2857
	77,5	2,00	0,4771				
					X^2	=	7,1022

For a = 5%, with dk = 6 - 3 = 3 it is obtained X^2 tabel = 7,81
Because of $X^2 < X^2$ tabel, so the data is in the normal distribution

Based on the Chi-quadrate table (X^2_{table}) for 5% alpha of significance with df 6– 3 = 3, it was found X^2_{table} = 7,81. Because of $X^2_{score} < X^2_{table}$, so the initial data of control group distributed normally.

While from the result of X A students in experimental group, before they were taught speaking narrative text by using scrambled pictures, was found that the maximum score was 76 and minimal score was 48. The stretches of score were 28. So, there were 6 classes with length of classes 5. From the computation of frequency distribution, it was found ($\Sigma f_{i.} x_i$) = 1560 and ($\Sigma f_{i.} x_i^2$) = 98950. So, the average score ($\overline{X}$) was 62,4 and the standard deviation (S) was 8,1803. After counting the average score and standard deviation, table of observation frequency was needed to measure Chi-quadrate (X^2_{score}).

Table IV. 2 Table of the Observation Frequency of Experimental Group

List of the Observation Frequency of Experimental Group

Class	Bk	Z_i	$P(Z_i)$	Ld	Ei	Oi	$\frac{(O_i - E_i)^2}{E_i}$
	47,5	-1,82	-0,4657				
48 _ 52				0,0788	2,0	4	2,0898
	52,5	-1,21	-0,3869				
53 _ 57				0,1615	4,0	4	0,0003
	57,5	-0,60	-0,2254				
58 _ 62				0,2303	5,8	4	0,5364
	62,5	0,01	0,0049				
63 _ 67				0,2286	5,7	4	0,5150
	67,5	0,62	0,2335				
68 _ 72				0,1580	4,0	7	2,3541
	72,5	1,23	0,3915				
73 _ 77				0,0760	1,9	2	0,0052
	77,5	1,85	0,4675				
						X^2 =	5,5008

For a = 5%, with dk = 6 - 3 = 3 it is obtained X^2 tabel =
Because of $X^2 < X^2$ tabel, so the data is in the normal distribution 7,81

Based on the Chi-quadrate table (X^2_{table}) for 5% alpha of significance with df 6 – 3 = 3, it was found X^2_{table} =7,81. Because of $X^2_{score} < X^2_{table}$, so the initial data of experimental group distributed normally.

b. Test of Homogeneity

Test of homogeneity was done to know whether sample in the research come from population that had same variance or not. In this study, the homogeneity of the test was measured by comparing the obtained score (F_{score}) with F_{table}. Thus, if the obtained score (F_{score}) was lower than the F_{table} or equal, it could be said that the Ho was accepted. It meant that the variance was homogeneous. The analysis of homogeneity test could be seen in table IV. 3.

Table. IV. 3 Test of Homogeneity (Pre-test)

Variant Sources	Experimental G	Control G
Sum	1564,00	1524,00
N	25	25
$\bar{x}$	62,56	60,96
Variants (s2)	69,1733	73,7067
Standart deviation (s)	8,32	8,59

By knowing the mean and the variance, the writer was able to test the similarity of the two variants in the pre-test between experimental and control group. The computation of the test of homogeneity as follows:

$$F = \frac{Biggest\ Variance}{Smallest\ Variance}$$

$$= \frac{73,7067}{69,1733} = 1,066$$

On a 5% with df numerator (nb - 1) = 25– 1 = 24 and df denominator (nk – 1) = 25 – 1 = 24, it was found F_{table} = 1,98. Because of $F_{score} \leq F_{table}$, so it could be concluded that both experimental and control group had no differences. The result showed both groups had similar variants (homogenous).

c. Test of difference two variants in pre-test between experiment and control group

After counting standard deviation and variance, it could be concluded that both group have no differences in the test of similarity between two variances in pre-test score. So, to differentiate whether the students' results of speaking narrative text in experimental and control group were significant or not, the writer used t-test to test the hypothesis that had been mentioned in the chapter two. The writer used formula:

$$t = \frac{\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2}{s\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}}}$$

Where:

$$S = \sqrt{\frac{(n_1 - 1)s_1^2 + (n_2 - 1)s_2^2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2}}$$

Based on table IV. 3, first the writer had to find out S by using the formula above:

$$S = \sqrt{\frac{(25-1)69{,}1733 + (25-1)73{,}7067}{25 + 25 - 2}}$$

$$= 8{,}45222$$

After S was found, the next step was to measure t-test:

$$t = \frac{62{,}56 - 60{,}96}{8{,}45222\sqrt{\frac{1}{25} + \frac{1}{25}}}$$

$$= 0{,}669$$

After getting t-test result, then it would be consulted to the critical score of t_{table} to check whether the difference is significant or not. For a = 5% with df 24 + 24 – 2 = 46, it was found $t_{table(0{,}975)(46)}$ = 2,01063472. Because of $t_{score} < t_{table}$, so it could be concluded that there was no significance of difference between the experimental and control group. It meant that both experimental and control group had same condition before getting treatments.

2. Analysis of Post-test

The experimental group and control group was given post test on October 21, 2010. Post-test was conducted after that. Scrambled pictures were used as technique in the teaching speaking narrative text to students in experimental group. While for students in control group, they were

given treatments without scrambled pictures. Post-test was aimed to measure students' ability after they got treatments.

a. Test of Normality

Test of normality was used to find out whether data of control and experimental group, which had been collected after they got treatments, come from normal distribution normal or not. The formula, that was used, was Chi-quadrate. The result computation of Chi-quadrate (X^2_{score}) then was compared with table of Chi-quadrate (X^2_{table}) by using 5% alpha of significance. If $X^2_{score} < X^2_{table}$ meant that the data spread of research result distributed normally.

Based on the research result in X B students of the control group after they got usual treatments in the teaching speaking narrative text, they reached the maximum score 84 and minimum score 56. The stretches of score were 28. So, there were 6 classes with length of classes 5. From the computation of frequency distribution, it was found ($\Sigma f_i x_i$) =1755 and ($\Sigma f_i x_i^2$) = 124605. So, the average score ($\overline{X}$) was 70,2 and the standard deviation (S) was 7,64853. It meant that there was an improvement of students' score after they got treatments. After counting the average score and standard deviation, table of observation frequency was needed to measure Chi-quadrate (X^2_{score}).

Table IV. 4 Table of the Observation Frequency of Control Group

Class	Class Limit	Z_i	$P(Z_i)$	Ld	Ei	Oi	$\frac{(O_i - E_i)^2}{E_i}$
	55,5	-1,92	-0,4727				
56 – 60				0,0751	1,9	3	0,6729
	60,5	-1,27	-0,3976				
61 - 65				0,1671	4,2	3	0,3317
	65,5	-0,61	-0,2306				
66 – 70				0,2462	6,2	5	0,2167
	70,5	0,04	0,0156				
71 – 75				0,2402	6,0	7	0,1650
	75,5	0,69	0,2558				
76 – 80				0,1551	3,9	5	3,3245
	80,5	1,35	0,4110				

81 – 85				0,0663	1,7	1	0,2611
	85,5	2,00	0,4773				
					X^2 =		1,9719

For a = 5%, with dk = 6 - 3 = 3 it is obtained X^2 tabel = 7,81
Because of $X^2 < X^2$ tabel, so the data is in the normal distribution

Based on the Chi-quadrate table (X^2_{table}) for 5% alpha of significance with dk 6 – 3 = 3, it was found X^2_{table} = 7,81. Because of $X^2_{score} < X^2_{table}$, so the data of control group after getting treatments distributed normally.

From the result of X A students in experimental group, after they were taught by using scrambled pictures, was found that the maximum score was 92 and minimal score was 52.

The stretches of score were 40. So, there were 6 classes with length of classes 7. From the computation of frequency distribution, it was found ($\Sigma f_{i.} x_i$) = 1879, and ($\Sigma f_{i.} x_i^2$) = 144491. So, the average score ($\overline{X}$) was 75,16 and the standard deviation (S) was 11,6643. By seeing the average score of students in experimental group, it could be concluded that there was an improvement of students' score after they got treatments by using scrambled pictures. After counting the average score and standard deviation, table of observation frequency was needed to measure Chi-quadrate (X^2_{score}).

Table IV. 5 Table of the Observation Frequency of Experimental Group

Class	Class Limit	Z_i	$P(Z_i)$	Ld	Ei	Oi	$\frac{(O_i - E_i)^2}{E_i}$
	51,5	-2,03	-0,4787				
52 _ 58				0,0553	1,4	3	1,8882
	58,5	-1,43	-0,4234				
59 _ 65				0,1272	3,2	2	0,4376

	65,5	-0,83	-0,0962				
66 _ 72				0,2060	5,2	6	0,1401
	72,5	0,23	-0,0902				
73 _ 79				0,2353	5,9	3	1,4120
	79,5	0,37	0,1451				
80 _ 86				0,1894	4,7	6	0,3373
	86,5	0,97	0,3345				
87 _ 93				0,1075	2,7	5	1,9875
	93,5	1,57	0,4421				
						X^2 =	6,2028

For a = 5%, with dk = 6 - 3 = 3 it is obtained X^2 tabel =
Because of $X^2 < X^2$ tabel, so the data is in the normal distribution

7,81

Based on the Chi-quadrate table (X^2_{table}) for 5% alpha of significance with df 6 – 3 = 3, it was found X^2_{table} = 7,81. Because of $X^2_{score} < X^2_{table}$, so the data of experimental group after getting treatments distributed normally.

b. Test of Homogeneity

The writer determined the mean and variance of the students' score either in experimental or control group. By knowing the mean and variance, the writer was able to test the similarity of the two variance in the post-test between experimental and control group.

Table. IV. 6 Test of Homogeneity (Post-test)

Varians Sources	Experimental G	Control G
Sum	1896,0	1744,0
N	25	25
$\bar{X}$	75,84	69,76
Variants (S^2)	147,31	52,11
Standart deviation (S)	12,14	7,22

The computation of the test of homogeneity as follows:

$$F = \frac{Biggest\ Variance}{Smallest\ Variance}$$

$$F = \frac{147,3067}{52,1067} = 2,827$$

On a 5% with df numerator (nb - 1) = 25 – 1 = 24 and df denominator (nk – 1) = 25 – 1 = 24, it was found $F_{table\ (0.025)(40:40)}$ = 2,27. Because of $F_{score} \leq F_{table}$, so it could be concluded that both experimental and control group had no differences. The result showed both groups had similar variance (homogenous).

c. Test of difference two variants in post-test between experiment and control group

After counting standard deviation and variance, it could be concluded that both group have no differences in the test of similarity between two variances in post-test score. So, to differentiate if the students' results speaking narrative text in experimental and control group after getting treatments were significant or not, the writer used t-test to test the hypothesis that had been mentioned in the chapter two. To see the difference between the experimental and control group, the writer used formula:

$$t = \frac{\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2}{s\sqrt{\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}}}$$

Where:

$$S = \sqrt{\frac{(n_1 - 1)s_1^2 + (n_2 - 1)s_2^2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2}}$$

Based on table IV. 6, first the writer had to find out S by using the formula above:

$$S = \sqrt{\frac{(25-1)147,3067 + (25-1)52.1067}{25+25-2}}$$

$$= 9,98532$$

After S was found, the next step was to measure t-test:

$$t = \frac{75{,}84 - 69{,}76}{9{,}98532\sqrt{\frac{1}{25}+\frac{1}{25}}}$$

$$= 2{,}153$$

After getting t-test result, then it would be consulted to the critical score of t_{table} to check whether the difference is significant or not. For a = 5% with df 25 + 25 – 2 = 48, it was found $t_{table(0,95)(48)}$ = 1,68. Because of $t_{score} > t_{table}$, so it could be concluded that there was significance of difference between the experimental and control group. It meant that experimental group was better that control group after getting treatments.

Since the obtained t-score was higher than the critical score on the table, the difference was statistically significance. Therefore, based on the computation there was a significance difference between the teaching speaking narrative text using scrambled pictures and the teaching speaking narrative text without scrambled pictures for the eighth grade students of SMK Bhakti Kencana Subah Batang. Teaching speaking narrative text using scrambled pictures technique seemed to be more effective than teaching speaking narrative text without using scrambled pictures. It can be seen from the result of the test where the students taught speaking narrative text by using scrambled pictures got higher scores than the students taught speaking narrative text without scrambled picture.

D. Discussions

The data were obtained from the students' ability scores of the test of speaking narrative text. They were pre-test and post-test scores from the experimental and control group. The average score for experimental group was 60,208 (pre-test) and 75,84 (post-test). The average score for control group was 62.4 (pre-test) and 69,76 (post-test). The following was the simple

tables of pre and post-test students' average score and students' average score of each speaking components.

Table IV. 7 The Pre-test and Post-test Students' Average Scores of the Experimental and Control Group

No	Group	The Average Percentage of Pre-test	The Average Percentage of Post-test
1	Experimental	62,56	75,84
2	Control	60,96	69,76

Table IV. 8 The Pre-test and Post-test Students' Average Scores of the Experimental and Control Group

No	Component of Speaking	Group	The Average Score of Pre-test	The Average Score of Post-test
1	Pronunciation	Experimental	3,2	3,5
		Control	3,0	3,1
2	Grammar	Experimental	3,0	3,6
		Control	2,9	3,5
3	Vocabulary	Experimental	3,0	3,8
		Control	2,8	3,7
4	Fluency	Experimental	3,0	3,8
		Control	3,1	3,2
5	Comprehension	Experimental	3,0	3,8
		Control	3,3	3,3

1. Students' Condition in Control Group

In this study, source of data that become as control group was class X B. In the control group, there was not a new treatment in a teaching learning process. They were given a usual treatment. They were taught speaking narrative text using conventional method. Teacher had used a grammar translation method that could not increase students' speaking skill in narrative text. Students could not enjoy in practicing their skill in speaking because they only make and memorize their experience. It was

proven with the control group's average in the post-test: 69,76 which was lower than the experimental group with average score:75,84.

2. Students' Condition in Experimental Group

a. Analysis Students' Speaking Before Treatment (Pre-test)

In the pre-test, students' ability in speaking narrative text was low. Pre-test was conducted before the treatment. From the result of pre-test, it was known that students faced many difficulties in speaking narrative text. Sentences, which were used by students to convey their ideas, were influenced by Indonesian language.

Moreover they don't know what should they say when they want to convey their meaning. Students' ability was in low level when they had to arrange words to be a good sentence that comprehensible by considering main function. It meant that the idea was not clearly stated and the sentences were not well-organized to support the transformation of meaning. Students' word voice (pronunciation and fluency) was also far from being perfect.

There were many difficulties in grammar and vocabulary especially in speak their idea, therefore, students' ability of speaking narrative text was hard to be understood. So, the researcher collected students' speaking in writing form before they do their work.

b. Analysis Students' Speaking After Treatment (Post-test)

Based on the analysis of students' ability, it was found that students' ability after getting treatment was improved. In the treatment, students reach the vocabulary and speak easily. Their speaking was still comprehensible however; there were some mistakes in grammar and pronunciation.

The finding that shows students' ability is namely the increasing of students' average score. There were still some mistakes that students had made like grammar and pronunciation. But it was very command as a students for tenth grade. So, it could be concluded that scrambled picturess as a media in the teaching of speaking

narrative text was effective. It was proven with students' average score in experimental group was higher than control group. By considering the students' final score after getting treatment, the teaching of speaking narrative text using scrambled pictures as method was better than without scrambled pictures.

Based on t-test analysis that was done, it was found that the t-score (2,153) was higher than t-table by using 5% alpha of significance (1,68). Since $t_{score} > t_{table}$, it proved that there was a significant difference between the improvement of students ability that was given a new treatment (scrambled pictures) and the improvement of students ability that was given a usual treatment.

3. The Advantages and Disadvantages of Using Scrambled Pictures in the Teaching of Speaking Narrative Text

a. The Advantages of Using Scrambled pictures in the Teaching Speaking narrative Text.

After conducting the research, there were some advantages of using scrambled pictures technique in the teaching speaking narrative text:

1. Scrambled pictures made students practice speaking easily. It will be very wasting time when the students only learn lots of narrative text or learn how to make narrative text without using it.
2. This technique could be avoided students' boredom in learning speaking. The treatment made students interested in following the lesson. Scrambled pictures that give students chance to show up their speaking in group could build their confidence to try to speak.

b. The Disadvantages of Using scrambled pictures in the Teaching Speaking narrative text

The disadvantages were described below:

1. It was not easy enough to manage the class, because sometime the students will be very noisy when they practicing in the class and so their voice can disturb another class.

2. Too much students who lossed control from the teacher controlled, bacause too much groups.

E. Limitation of Research

The writer realized that there were some hindrances and barriers in doing this research. The hindrances and barriers occurred was not caused by inability of the researcher but caused by the limitation of the research like time, fund, and equipment of research.