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**ABSTRACT**

The objective of this study was conducted to find out whether significantly effective or not to taught reading descriptive text to the seventh grade students of SMP Negeri 7 OKU by using talking drawing strategy. To analyzed the data writer used test as an instrument. The methodology of this study was experimental research and the writer used pre-experimental design. From the population, the writer took class VIIIB as a sample, and the total number of sample was 34. The samples were taken by using cluster random sampling. The students’ mean score in pre-test was 60.47 and students’ mean score in post-test was 73.65. Based on the distribution of students’ score in pre-test and post-test talking drawing strategy was effective to taught reading decriptive text to the seventh grade students of SMP Negeri 7 OKU because the students’ score in post-test was better than pre-test. The minimum score in pre-test was 44 and the maximum score was 80, while the minimum score in post-test was 52 and the maximum score was 92. Based on the the result of the statistical calculated using sample paired t-test found in SPSS 20, it was found that tobtain was 8.804 higher than ttable was 1.699. It means that there were significantly effective to teach reading comprehension to the seventh Grade Students of SMP Negeri 7 OKU by using talking drawing strategy.
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1. **Introduction**

Reading can develop the mind of the readers, from reading we could discover new things and explore our imagination. Understanding the written word is one the way of mind grows in its ability. Beside that, reading can give the information, knowledge and also increases the ability especially in reading skill. Reading is one of the four language skills takes much portion of time and teaching learning process. According to Pang, Muaka, Bernhard & Kamil (2003, p.6) reading is about understanding written texts. It is complex activity that involves both perception and thought. Based on Zare & Othman (2013, p. 188) reading is a cognitive activity in which the reader takes part in conversation with the author through the text. Student considered that reading is not more difficult than other language skills.

According to Pang ‘et al’ (2003, p. 6) reading consisted of two related process; word recognition and comprehension. Word recognition refers to the process of perceiving how to written symbols correspond to one’s spoken language. Comprehension is the process of making sense of words, sentence and connected text. Based on Pardo (as cited in Sahin 2013) reading comprehension is the process meaning construction as a result of blending content and massage of the text with the readers existing knowledge and skills during reader text interaction.

Artha (2014, p. 1) mentioned in his research there were some problems faced by the students in reading comprehension. First, they just read a text without understanding the meaning of the content. Second, student did not watch when the teacher explained the material in front of the class. Third, students still poor in vocabulary, so it was very hard for them to understand the text. Fourth, the students made a noise in the class and they did not make a note when the teacher writes down on the white board. As a result, they could not comprehend the text and answer the questions correctly that given to them.

Talking drawing strategy was one of strategy used to teaching reading skill that help the students to comprehend the text helped by the teacher and students could enjoy draw what their imagination about the content of the text. Paquette, Fello & Jalongo (2007, p. 73) mention talking drawings is an effective strategy for both teachers and students. This strategy met the teachers’ need to assess prior knowledge and post-instruction learning on topic. talking drawing strategy begin by inviting children to create pre-learning drawing. These initial drawings are a way of taking inventory of a child’s current content knowledge about a particular topic. In pre-learning drawing phase, students were introduced to the topic of study. Before introducing the text, students were asked to create mental pictures based on their think and their know about that topic.

During the reading comprehension phase, students were exposed to new information about the text. As teacher read portions of the text and pause periodically to share key comprehension (decriptive informations), students’ knowledge bases broadened and their comprehension skills were enhanced.

In the after-reading portion of the topic, the existing drawing needs to be modified or reconfigured to accommodate the new learning. Students revisit their pre-learning drawing and compare the visual representations with the newly-learned information. This comparison accomplished in a small group or with a partner. Students determine whether to modify their original illustrations or recreate new drawing that more accurately reflect their learning. They become accurately aware of the contrast between the first pre-learning drawing and the post-learning drawing.

Below were an example of talking drawing strategy in pre-learning drawing and post-learning drawing:



Steps in a talking drawings lesson were shown below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Step | Action |
|  | Select a content area concept or topic. |
|  | Ask students to represent the concept or topic in a pictorial fashion. |
|  | Invite students to share and discuss their work with a partner |
|  | Instruct on a concept or topic |
|  | Encourage students to modify the original drawing and label or discribe the ilustration with text |
|  | Facilitate discussion among students comparing and contrasting their drawings |

*Source : Paquette, Fello, & Jalongo (2007, p. 66)*

There are the explanation of the steps of talking drawing strategy above :

* + - * 1. Select a content area concept or topic.

Introduce the topic by asking questions of the students to activate their prior knowledge.

* + - * 1. Ask students to represent the concept or topic in a pictorial fashion.

Distribute drawing topic and have the students represents what they think and they know about the topic in a pictorial fashion. This can be done in pencil or crayon.

* + - * 1. Invite students to share and to discuss their work with a partner.

Teacher invite the students to share and discuss their work with the pair and then invite some students to show and share their work at the front of class.

* + - * 1. Instruct on a concept or topic.

Share the text about the topic and begin from the explain the material as detaile. Guide the students to comprehend the text by find out the good decriptive information of the text.

* + - * 1. Encourage students to modify the original drawing and label or describe the ilustration with text.

Then encourage students to add details to modify or reconfigure the original drawing to accommodate the new learning about the topic then label or describe the ilustration with the text.

* + - * 1. Facilitate discussion among students comparing and contrasting their drawings.

And the last facilitate a students-centered discussion that compares and contrast pre-learning drawings and post- learning drawings, so as to identify newly acquired fact.

According to Paquette, Fello, & Jalongo (2007, p. 66) there are the advantages of using talking drawing strategy :

1. First, teacher can gain an immediate perspective on the students’ previous familiarity with a particular idea by simply looking at what each child has produced.
2. Second, by capitalizing on children’s ability to represent ideas pictorially and discuss them with peers, talking drawings strategy often is more motivating to students than an assignment such as ‘ write a paragraph about...’.

Finally, the talking drawing strategy is particularly well-suited to differentiated instruction goals because much of the task depends upon the emergent literacy skill of talk and drawing, thus enabling children who struggle with reading to experience success.

1. **Research methodology**

The method of research used in this study was pre-experimental. The pre-experimental method was to find out and compare the students’ reading comprehension skill before and after being given the treatment.

1. **Findings**

The result of students pre-test was decribe in pre-test score distribution below:

**Pre-Test Score Distribution**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Score Interval** | **Criteria** | **Score** | |
| **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
| **1** | >80 | Very Good | 1 | 2,94% |
| **2** | 66 – 79 | Good | 8 | 23,52% |
| **3** | 56 – 65 | Average | 10 | 29,41% |
| **4** | 46 – 56 | Poor | 14 | 41,17% |
| **5** | <45 | Fail | 1 | 2,94% |
| **Total** | | | **34** | **100%** |
| **Minimum Score** | | | **44** |  |
| **Maximum Score** | | | **80** |  |
| **Mean** | | | **60,47** |  |

Based on the table above, the minimum score was 44 and the maximum score was 80 the average score or mean was 60,47 from 34 students in their pre-test there was 1 students (2,94%) who got very good, 8 students (23,52%) who got good score, 10 students (29,41%) who got average score,14 students (41,17%) who got poor score, and 1 students (2,94%) who got fail score.

The post-test score of reading descriptive text was described on the following table:

**Post-Test Score Distribution**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Score Interval** | **Criteria** | **Score** | |
| **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
| **1** | >80 | Very Good | 14 | 41,17% |
| **2** | 66 – 79 | Good | 13 | 38,23% |
| **3** | 57 – 65 | Average | 3 | 8,82% |
| **4** | 46 – 56 | Poor | 4 | 11,76% |
| **5** | <45 | Fail | 0 | 0 |
| **Total** | | | **34** | **100%** |
| **Minimum Score** | | | **52** |  |
| **Maximum Score** | | | **92** |  |
| **Mean** | | | **73,65** |  |

Based on the table above, the minimum score was 52 and the maximum score was 92 the average score or mean was 73,65 from 34 students in their pre-test there was 14 students (41,17%) who got very good, 13 students (38,23%) who got good score, 3 students (8,82%) who got average score, 4 students (11,76%) who got poor score, and no one students who got fail score.

Table score distribution pre-test and post-test of instrument test was described in table 3 below :

**Score Distribution Pre-Test and Post-Test**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Score**  **Interval** | **Criteria** | **Score Distributio**  **Pre-Test** | | **Score Distribution**  **Post-Test** | |
| **Frequency** | **Percentage** | **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
| **1** | >80 | Very Good | 1 | 2,94% | 14 | 41,17% |
| **2** | 66 – 79 | Good | 8 | 23,52% | 13 | 38,23% |
| **3** | 56 – 65 | Average | 10 | 29,41% | 3 | 8,82% |
| **4** | 46 – 56 | Poor | 14 | 41,17% | 4 | 11,76% |
| **5** | <45 | Fail | 1 | 2,94% | 0 | 0 |
| **Total** | | | **34** | **100%** | **34** | **100%** |

Based on the table 3 from 34 in their pre-test there was 1 students (2,94%) who got very good, 8 students (23,52%) who got good score, 10 students (29,41%) who got average score,14 students (41,17%) who got poor score, and 1 students (2,94%) who got fail score.

And in their post-test there was 14 students (41,17%) who got very good, 13 students (38,23%) who got good score, 3 students (8,82%) who got average score, 4 students (11,76%) who got poor score, and no one students who got fail score.

**Paired Sample t-test**

To found whether or not there was significance difference in reading comprehension before and after the treatment, the writer calculated the result of pre-test and post-test by using Paired Sample t-test, the result was as follow :

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Paired Samples Test** | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Paired Differences | | | | | t | Df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
| Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| Lower | Upper |
| Pair 1 | Post-test – Pre-test | 13.176 | 8.726 | 1.497 | 10.132 | 16.221 | 8.804 | 33 | .000 |

Based on the table 4 above, the mean score of pre-test and post-test was 13.176. The value of tobtained  was 8.804, more than the value of ttable was 1.699 with df = 33. Since the value of tobtained was higher than the value of ttable.

From the result of finding, there was significance difference in reading comprehension before and after the treatment. It could be seen from value of mean that gotten by students. There were increasing between score of the pre-test and post-test, the minimum score of pre-test was 44 and maximum score was 80, the minimum score of post-test was 52 and maximum score was 92 and the mean score of pre-test was 60.47 and the mean score of post-test was 73.65. According to the result of data analyzed through paired sample t-test was shown 8.804 in the level of α = 0.05 and df= N-1 = 33 and t-table was 1.699 as a critical value. It meant that the talking drawing strategy was effective to taught reading comprehension.

1. **Conclusions**

Based on the discussions in the previous chapter, the writer concluded that there were significances between the score pre-test and post-test. Where, the students’ score in the post-test was more than students’ score in pre-test. Based on the result of the data analyzed through paired semple t-test was tobtain more than ttable  so the alternative hypothesis (Ha) was accepted and null hypothesis (Ho) was rejected where the question have been answer: it was significantly effective to taught reading comprehension to the seventh Grade Students of SMP Negeri 7 OKU by using talking drawing strategy.
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