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; the 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

The first analysis was homogeneity test of the sample. That was previous summative score of students of VIII A as experimental group and students of VIII C as control group. The analysis was meant to get the homogeneous class of VIII A and VIII C. In this research, 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 those the classes were homogeneous. The analysis of homogeneity test could be seen in table I.

Table. I. Test of Homogeneity

Variant Sources	Experimental G	Control G
Sum	1626	1572
N	24	24
$\overline{X}$	67,75	65,50
Variants (s2)	83,59	66,52
Standart deviation (s)	9,14	8.16

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' previous score between VIII A and VIII C. The computation of the test of homogeneity as follows:

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

$$= 83.5900/66.5200$$

$$= 1.257$$

On a 5% with df numerator (nb - 1) = 24 – 1 = 23 and df denominator (nk – 1) = 24 – 1 = 23, it was found F_{table} = 2.31. Because of $F_{score} \leq F_{table}$ /1.257≤ 2.31, so it could be concluded that both VIII A and VIII C had no differences. The result showed both groups had similar variants (homogenous).

B. Second Analysis

The second analysis was meant to get a valid and reliable instrument for investigation. Try out tests were conducted for VIII B of SMP H. Isriati Semarang. Class VIII B consisted of 40 respondents. They were given a try out using the instrument that will be used in control and experiment class. The following is the interpretation of the try out test to find out the validity and reliability of the instrument.

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}) 0.5 for α = 5 % with N = 40. It would be obtained 0.403. 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 Describing Picture

Formula:

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

Criteria:

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

Calculation:

Below is the example of the item validity of number 1.

NO	CODE	X	Y	X^2	Y^2	XY
1	T – 31	3	17	16	289	51
2	T – 1	4	18	16	324	72
3	T – 4	3	15	9	225	45
4	T – 6	3	17	9	289	51
5	T- 40	3	18	9	324	54
6	T- 25	4	20	16	400	80
7	T – 27	4	16	16	256	64
8	T – 23	3	19	9	361	57
9	T- 3	3	17	9	289	51
10	T- 15	3	19	9	361	57
11	T – 2	3	19	9	361	57
12	T – 19	3	18	9	324	54
13	T – 26	3	19	9	361	57
14	T – 32	4	20	16	400	80
15	T- 22	4	20	16	400	80
16	T- 7	3	20	9	400	60
17	T- 17	3	16	9	256	48
18	T- 39	3	15	9	225	45
19	T – 24	3	18	9	324	54
20	T – 36	3	17	9	289	51
21	T – 9	4	20	16	400	80
22	T – 35	3	20	9	400	60
23	T – 10	3	20	9	400	60
24	T- 37	3	16	9	256	48
25	T – 20	3	17	9	289	51
26	T- 21	4	20	16	400	80
27	T – 5	4	18	16	324	72
28	T- 29	3	19	9	361	57
29	T- 8	4	20	16	400	80
30	T– 14	3	18	9	324	54
31	T-18	2	18	4	324	36
32	T-11	3	19	9	361	57
33	T-28	3	17	9	289	51
34	T-38	2	16	4	256	32
35	T-12	4	18	16	324	72
36	T-30	4	20	16	400	80
37	T-34	3	17	9	289	51

38	T-13	3	16	9	256	48
39	T-33	2	15	4	225	30
40	T-16	3	16	9	256	48
Sum		128	718	422	12992	2315

Where: $N = 40$ $X^2 = 422$ $X = 128$ $Y^2 = 12992$ $Y = 718$ $\Sigma\,XY = 2315$

$$r_{xy} = \frac{(40 \times 2315) - (128)(718)}{\sqrt{\{(40 \times 422) - (128)^2\}\{(40 \times 12992) - (718)^2\}}}$$
$$= 0.5$$

Because of $r_{xy} > r_{table}$, $0.5 > 0.403$ so item number 1 is valid.

2. **Reliability of Try Out Test**

    After validity items had been 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 describing picture, it was obtained 0.5, for α 5 % with $N = 40$. It was obtained 0.312. 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 Describing Picture

    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:

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

    $$\sigma_t^2 = \frac{12992 - \frac{(718)^2}{40}}{40}$$

$$= 3$$

Variance

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

$$\sigma_{b1}^2 = \frac{422 - \frac{(128)^2}{40}}{40} = 0{,}3$$

$$\sigma_{b2}^2 = \frac{564 - \frac{(148)^2}{40}}{40} = 0{,}4$$

$$\sigma_{b3}^2 = \frac{581 - \frac{(149)^2}{40}}{40} = 0{,}65$$

$$\sigma_{b3}^2 = \frac{559 - \frac{(147)^2}{40}}{40} = 0{,}4$$

$$\sigma_{b3}^2 = \frac{547 - \frac{(145)^2}{40}}{40} = 0{,}5$$

$$\Sigma b_b^2 = 2{,}25$$

Index Reliability

$$r_{11} = \left(\frac{5}{5-1}\right)\left(1 - \frac{2.25}{3}\right)$$

$$= 0.313$$

The result shows that 0.313 is more than 0.312, it meant that the items of instrument were valid.

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.

$$D = \frac{10}{24} - \frac{1}{26} = 0.42 - 0.04 = 0{,}38$$

The result obtained D = 0,38

Because of the result is between 0.21 – 0,40. So the item number 1 is satisfactory.

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 medium. 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   = 15

JS   = 40

So:

$$P = \frac{15}{40} = 0.375$$

The result obtained P = 0.375. Because of the result is between 0.30 – 0.70, so the item number 1 is medium.

C. Third Analysis

The third 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 describing picture to improve students' speaking skill in descriptive text?". We can conclude describing picture is effective when the result of post test of the experimental class (using describing picture) and control class (using conventional technique) has significant differences or the assumption that those classes is equal is not fulfilled.

Before the researcher tested the hypothesis that had been mentioned in the chapter three, the researcher analyzed and tested hypothesis prerequisites which contained of normality test and homogeneity test. Third 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 experimental group (VIII A) was given a pre-test on October 5, 2010 and control group (class VIII C) was given a pre-test

also on October 5, 2010. They were asked to make a conversation based on situations that were 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-square(X^2_{score}) then was compared with table of Chi-square (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 VIII C students in the control group before they were taught speaking in descriptive text without describing picture, 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 ($\Sigma f_i x_i$) = 1567, and ($\Sigma f_i x_i^2$) = 103511. So, the average score ($\overline{X}$) was 65,3 and the standard deviation (S) was 7,22. After counting the average score and standard deviation, table of observation frequency was needed to measure Chi-square (X^2_{score}).

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

Kelas			Bk	Zi	P(Zi)	Luas Daerah	Ei	Oi	$\dfrac{(O_i - E_i)^2}{E_i}$
			55.5	-1.36	-0.4125				
56	–	60				0.1659	4.0	8	4.0532
			60.5	-0.66	-0.2465				
61		65				0.2581	6.2	6	0.0060
			65.5	0.03	0.0115				
66	–	70				0.2532	6.1	4	0.7091
			70.5	0.72	0.2647				
71	–	75				0.1566	3.8	4	0.0154
			75.5	1.41	0.4213				
76	–	80				0.0611	1.5	1	0.1485
			80.5	2.11	0.4824				

81	–	85				0.0150	0.4	1	1.1345
			85.5	2.80	0.4974				
							X^2	=	6.0667

Based on the Chi-square table (X^2_{table}) for 5% alpha of significance with df 6 - 3 = 3, it was found X^2_{table} = 7.82. Because of $X^2_{score} < X^2_{table}$, so the initial data of control group distributed normally.

While from the result of VIII A students in experimental group, before they were taught speaking in descriptive text by using describing picture, was found that the maximum score was 80 and minimal score was 52. 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 ($\Sigma f_i x_i$) =1556, and ($\Sigma f_i x_i^2$)= 102664. So, the average score ($\overline{X}$) was 64.833 and the standard deviation (S) was 8.805. After counting the average score and standard deviation, table of observation frequency was needed to measure Chi-square (X^2_{score}).

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

Kelas			Bk	Zi	P(Zi)	Luas daerah	Ei	Oi	$\dfrac{(O_i - E_i)^2}{E_i}$
			51.5	-1.51	-0.4350				
52	–	56				0.1070	2.6	6	4.5877
			56.5	-0.95	-0.3280				
57	–	61				0.1805	4.3	4	0.0256
			61.5	-0.38	-0.1475				
62	–	66				0.2226	5.3	3	1.0262
			66.5	0.19	0.0751				
67	–	71				0.2004	4.8	5	0.0075
			71.5	0.76	0.2755				
72	–	76				0.1319	3.2	3	0.0087
			76.5	1.32	0.4074				
77		81				0.0634	1.5	3	1.4363

	–							
		81.5	1.89	0.4708				
							X² =	7.0919

Based on the Chi-square table (X^2_{table}) for 5% alpha of significance with df $6 - 3 = 3$, it was found $X^2_{table} = 7,82$. 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	1556	1576
N	24	24
$\overline{X}$	64.83	65.67
Variants (s2)	70.9275	62.4928
Standart deviation (s)	8.42	7,91

By knowing the mean and the variance, the researcher 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:

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

$$= 70.9275/62.4928$$

$$= 1.135$$

On a 5% with df numerator (nb - 1) = 24 – 1 = 23 and df denominator (nk – 1) = 24 – 1 = 23, it was found F_{table} = 2.31. 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 in descriptive text in experimental and control group were significant or not, the researcher used t-test to test the hypothesis that had been mentioned in the chapter three. The researcher used formula:

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

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 researcher had to find out S by using the formula above:

$$S = \sqrt{\frac{(24-1)70.9275 + (24-1)62.4900}{24 + 24 - 2}}$$

$$= 8$$

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

$$t = \frac{64.83 - 65.67}{8\sqrt{\frac{1}{24} + \frac{1}{24}}}$$

$$= -0.353$$

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 $t_{table(0.975)(46)} = 2.01$. 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 was given post test on October 23, 2010 and control group was given a post test also on October 23, 2010. Post-test was conducted after all treatments were done. Describing picture was used as technique in the teaching of speaking in descriptive text to students in experimental group. While for students in control group, they were given treatments without describing picture. Post-test was aimed to measure students' ability after they got treatments. They were asked to describe the picture after they get the picture and the couple must draw the picture when the couple describes the picture.

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-square. The result computation of Chi-square (X^2_{score}) then was compared with table of Chi-square (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 VIII C students in the control group after they got usual treatments in the teaching of speaking in descriptive 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 ($\Sigma f_{i.} x_i$) = 1602, and ($\Sigma f_{i.} x_i^2$) = 108296. So, the average score ($\overline{X}$) was 66.75 and the standard deviation (S) was 7.69. 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-square (X^2_{score}).

Table IV. 4 Table of the Observation Frequency of

Control Group

Kelas			Bk	Zi	P(Zi)	Luas daerah	Ei	Oi	$\dfrac{(O_i - E_i)^2}{E_i}$
			55.5	-1.46	-0.4281				
56	–	60				0.1365	3.3	6	2.2668
			60.5	-0.81	-0.2916				
61		65				0.2271	5.5	6	0.0554
			65.5	-0.16	-0.0645				
66	–	70				0.2515	6.0	6	0.0002
			70.5	0.49	0.1869				
71	–	75				0.1853	4.4	1	2.6709
			75.5	1.14	0.3722				
76	–	80				0.0908	2.2	4	1.5219
			80.5	1.79	0.4630				
81	–	85				0.0296	0.7	1	0.1183
			85.5	2.44	0.4926				
							X²	=	6.6336

Based on the Chi-square table (X^2_{table}) for 5% alpha of significance with dk $6 - 3 = 3$, it was found $X^2_{table} = 7.82$. Because of $X^2_{score} < X^2_{table}$ $6.63 < 7.82$, so the data of control group after getting treatments distributed normally.

While from the result of VIII A students in experimental group, after they were taught by using describing picture, was found that the maximum score was 92 and minimal score was 64. 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 $(\Sigma f_i x_i) = 1834$, and $(\Sigma f_i x_i^2) = 141694$. So, the average score $(\overline{X})$ was 76,42 and the standard deviation (S) was 8,1982. 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 describing picture. After counting the average score and standard deviation, table of observation frequency was needed to measure Chi-square(X^2_{score}).

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

Kelas			Bk	Zi	P(Zi)	Luas Daerah	Ei	Oi	$\frac{(O_i - E_i)^2}{E_i}$
			63.5	-1.58	-0.4424				
64	–	68				0.1095	2.6	5	2.1383
			68.5	-0.97	-0.3329				
69	–	73				0.1939	4.7	5	0.0258
			73.5	-0.36	-0.1390				
74	–	78				0.2393	5.7	5	0.0961
			78.5	0.25	0.1003				
79	–	83				0.2059	4.9	3	0.7630
			83.5	0.86	0.3062				
84	–	88				0.1235	3.0	3	0.0004
			88.5	1.47	0.4297				

89	–	93				0.0517	1.2	3	2.4983
			93.5	2.08	0.4814				
							X^2	=	5.5220

Based on the Chi-square table (X^2_{table}) for 5% alpha of significance with df 6 – 3 = 3, it was found X^2_{table} = 7.82. Because of $X^2_{score} < X^2_{table}$ 5.52 < 7.82, so the data of experimental group after getting treatments distributed normally.

b. Test of Homogeneity

The researcher 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	1844	1608
N	24	24
$\overline{X}$	76.83	76.00
Variants (S^2)	69.5362	53.2174
Standart deviation (S)	8,34	7.30

The computation of the test of homogeneity as follows:

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

$$= 69.5362/53.2174$$

$$= 1.307$$

On a 5% with df numerator (nb - 1) = 24 – 1 = 23 and df denominator (nk – 1) = 24 – 1 = 23, it was found F*table* (0.025)(23:23) = 2.31. Because of $F_{score} \leq F_{table}$ 1.31 < 2.31, 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 of speaking in descriptive text in experimental and control group after getting treatments were significant or not, the researcher used t-test to test the hypothesis that had been mentioned in the chapter three. To see the difference between the experimental and control group, the researcher used formula:

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

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 researcher had to find out S by using the formula above:

$$S = \sqrt{\frac{(24 - 1)69.5362 + (24 - 1)53.2174}{24 + 24 - 2}}$$

$$= 7.83434$$

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

$$t = \frac{76.83 - 76.00}{7.83434\sqrt{\dfrac{1}{24} + \dfrac{1}{24}}}$$

$$= 4.348$$

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 $t_{table(0.95)(46)}$ = 2.01. 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 of speaking in descriptive text using describing picture and the teaching of speaking in descriptive text without describing picture for the eighth grade students of SMP H. Isriati Semarang. Teaching speaking in descriptive text using describing picture seemed to be more effective than teaching speaking in descriptive text without using describing picture. It can be seen from the result of the test where the students taught speaking in descriptive text by using describing picture got higher scores than the students taught speaking in descriptive text without describing picture.

D. **Discussions**

The data were obtained from the students' achievement scores of the test of speaking in descriptive text. They were pre-test and post-test scores from the experimental and control group. The average score for experimental group was 64.833 (pre-test) and 76.833 (post-test). The average score for control group was 65.67 (pre-test) and 67.00 (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	64.83	76.83
2	Control	65.67	67.00

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	3,3	3,6
		Control	3,3	3,3
2	Grammar	Experimental	3,3	3,9
		Control	3,4	3,5
3	Vocabulary	Experimental	3,3	4,1
		Control	3,5	3,6
4	Fluency	Experimental	2,9	3,6
		Control	3,1	3,0
5	Comprehension	Experimental	3,4	3,9
		Control	3,3	3,2

1. **Students' Condition in Control Group**

   In this study, source of data that become as control group was class VIII C. 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 in descriptive text using conventional method. By making and memorizing the expressions of daily life in the teaching learning process, teacher had used a grammar translation method that

could not increase students' speaking skill in descriptive text. Students could not enjoy in practicing their skill in speaking because they only make and memorize those expression that usually used in daily life without practice to use it as its function. It was proven with the control group's average in the post-test (67.00) which was lower than the experimental group (76.83).

2. **Students' Condition in Experimental Group**

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

   In the pre-test, students' ability in speaking in descriptive 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 descriptive text. Sentences, which were used by students to convey the idea, 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. Not only the way they convey their idea was not clear but also there were many difficulties in grammar and vocabulary; therefore, students' ability of speaking in descriptive text was hard to be understood. To minimize the number of students' mistakes in their speaking, the researcher collected students' speaking in writing form after they do their describing, gave correction, and returned the paper to them in the next day. From the correction of their mistakes, students' were supposed to learn more and improve their ability in speaking descriptive text.

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 were describing something using describing picture that was in line with the function of some expressions they learn. The vocabulary choice, sentences' arrangement, and the way they produce the word were good and relevance to the topic or (their meaning) so the meaning were easy to be understood. Their speaking was still comprehensible however; there were some mistakes in fluency 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 fluency and pronunciation. But it was very human. So, it could be concluded that the implementation of using describing picture in the teaching of speaking in descriptive 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 in descriptive text using describing picture as method was better than without describing picture.

Based on t-test analysis that was done, it was found that the t-score (4.348) was higher than t-table by using 5% alpha of significance (2.01). Since $t_{score} > t_{table}$, it proved that there was a significant difference between the improvement of students achievement that was given a new treatment (describing picture) and the improvement of students achievement that was given a usual treatment.

3. **The Advantages and Disadvantages of Using Describing Picture to Improve Students' Speaking Skill in Descriptive Text**

a. The Advantages of Using Describing Picture to Improve Students' Speaking Skill in Descriptive Text.

After conducting the research, there were some advantages of using describing picture to improve students' speaking skill in descriptive text:

1) Describing picture make learning becomes more interactive.

2) Describing picture make learning becomes more active, because pictures help the students to focus attention to the subject and make students active.

3) Describing picture can help prevent misunderstanding. It means by using pictures, teacher can explain the new vocabularies to his or her students easily, so it prevents misunderstanding between students' perception and teachers' perception

4) Studying is process doing something. Study can be maximum if students more of using the five senses, because they can more attractive to express something with their five senses. Describing picture is a method, that very easy to do it. And this method very suitable to students in Junior High School. If the students are given describing picture, they used their five senses more maximum, because they used eyes to saw the pictures, used ears to listen what their partner said, used mouth to describe the picture and also used hand to draw the picture.

5) Most of Indonesian students are lack of idea for what they should say and bravery to speak, because of that they are afraid for doing mistakes. Describing picture help students to be brave to speak up and express their idea through speaking. Because in describing picture, students can describe something with their friends. And it can help students build their confidences.

6) Speaking in descriptive text is students' ability need to be able to convey their idea. Describing picture provides students to be easy to describe something, because they can see what will describe. And it can be familiarized through doing describing picture.

7) Describing picture is very helpful in teaching English speaking. Textbook is one of most important technique in succeeding the process of teaching learning and describing picture means helping teacher and student to get the aim or objective of the learning a certain language.

b. The Disadvantages of Using Describing Picture to Improve Students' Speaking Skill in Descriptive Text.

The disadvantages were described below:

1) It spent a lot of time, because the students' skill was too low, they can't directly describe the picture after getting the picture that distributed by the teacher. They need time to prepare their descriptive text.

2) It was not easy enough to manage the class, because sometime the students will be very hysteric when they see their friends practicing in front of them. Their voice can disturb another class.

3) Teacher needs an extra time to prepare pictures and should give handout the photocopied pictures to the students.

E. Limitation of Research

The researcher 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.