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ABSTRACT

DEVELOPED ROUNDTABLE TECHNIQUE BASED ON PROCESS APPROACH TO ENHANCE STUDENTS’ WRITING SKILL AND LEARNING MOTIVATION

Dimas Sukma Cahyadi

The present study aims to investigate whether developed roundtable technique based on process approach improves the students’ writing skill better than conventional roundtable technique, and to find out whether there is any significant improvement on the students’ learning motivations after being taught by using developed roundtable technique based on process approach. The samples of this research were 42 students at the tenth grade of SMAN 1 Pekalongan, East Lampung which were divided into two classes namely 21 students of X MIA 1 as experimental class and 21 students of X MIA 2 as the control. The data were obtained from the writing test and questionnaire. Independent sample t-test and Paired sample t-test in SPSS (Statistical Program for Social Science) 17.0 was used to analyze the data.

The results show that developed roundtable technique based on process approach improves the students’ writing skill better than conventional roundtable, since there is significant difference of Normalized Gain between experimental and control class. It is revealed that t-observed is higher than t-table (3.103>2.021) with the significance level less than 0.05 (0.004<0.05). As a result, the first hypothesis is accepted. Moreover, the students’ writing skills in both experimental and control class increase respectively in all writing aspects. However, the students in experimental class who are taught by using developed roundtable have a better improvement in the aspect of organization and language use than control class who are taught by using conventional roundtable. It can be inferred that developed roundtable technique based on process approach improves the students’ writing skills better than conventional roundtable technique especially in the aspect of organization and language use. Furthermore, the other result reveals that there is significant improvement on the students’ learning motivations after being taught by using developed roundtable technique based on process approach. It is revealed that t-observed is higher than t-table (10.507>2.086) with the significance level less than 0.05 (0.000<0.05). Thus, the second hypothesis is accepted. Moreover, the result also shows that the students’ intrinsic motivation more improves than extrinsic motivation. It can be concluded that developed roundtable technique based on process approach is also effective to enhance the students’ learning motivations particularly intrinsic motivation.
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I. INTRODUCTION

This chapter begins with the background that elaborates the problem and judgment as the appropriate reason in conducting this research. The research questions, objectives, and uses are also presented in this chapter. As the end of this chapter, the scope and definitions of terms are explained clearly by researcher.

1.1. Background

Basically, there are two skills in English that must be mastered by students namely receptive and productive skills. Receptive skills are listening (understanding the spoken language) and reading (understanding the written language), while productive skills are speaking and writing (Haycraft, 1978:8). Especially for writing, Brown (2001:339) states that in school, writing is like the way of life because it has the important function. It is needed for passing the course and mastering the subject matter. As the EFL learners, it is also necessary to be taught from junior high school until university level in Indonesia. Based on Indonesian curriculum, the learners have a duty to master academic writing such as making a text, essay or project paper. However, writing is still considered as the difficult skill to be mastered by students although they have stayed at senior high school level.
Based on the result of pre survey on February 4th, 2019 in SMA N 1 Pekalongan through interview with the English teacher, most of the tenth grade students still have low skill in writing although they have studied simple tenses and mastered adequate vocabularies. The students get difficulties in generating and organizing ideas for writing, constructing sentence with the correct grammar, and composing a text with appropriate content and structure. It is relevant to the assumption from Richards and Renandya (2002:303) that the difficulty of writing lies not only in generating and organizing ideas, but also in translating their ideas into readable text. Therefore, this presented problem should be a concern for English teacher and researcher to find an appropriate solution by applying, developing or creating a good technique in teaching writing skill.

Dealing with the problems above, the use of group learning is believed to be a suitable way to stimulate the learners to increase their language skills especially in writing. It is also assumed that it can increase the students’ motivation in learning. Slavin (1985:2) argues that if humans are to learn to live cooperatively, they must experience the living process of cooperation in school. Moreover, the classroom life should embody democracy, not only in how students learn to make choices and carry out academic projects together, but also in how they learn to relate to one another. Related to group learning, Damon and Phelps as cited in Luzzatto (2010:199) argue that three types of group learning may be distinguished: Tutoring, cooperative learning, and collaborative learning.
In recent years, studies involving cooperative learning, which belongs to one kind of students’ center learning approach have emerged as an internationally important area of English teaching research among researchers. For example, Siddique and Singh (2016) concluded that the employment of cooperative learning approach for the instruction of essay writing is very effective than the conventional methods especially rote learning under the strict discipline of the lecturer. It makes the class a student-centred where they can discuss, share and construct their own sentences of varied structures. Furthermore, Mahmoud (2014) used cooperative language learning (CLL) to encourage second-year university students to learn from their peers so that they could develop their writing skills. The findings of the study supported the use of the CLL approach to enhance students’ EFL writing skills. The use of this approach creates more interesting, comfortable, and funny learning environment in which students could share and exchange ideas to achieve their intended purpose. The significant improvement on the students’ EFL writing skills was resulted from the processes that students experience while working together in small groups. In another investigation of the effects of cooperative learning strategies on vocabulary skills of 4th grade students, Bilen and Tavil (2015) implemented cooperative learning strategies (Kagan Structures) to teach the selected vocabulary items in the experimental group. Moreover, Zarifi and Taghavi (2016) provided empirical evidence to argue that CL is an effective approach for teaching grammar. The effectiveness of the CL approach might be attributed to the fact that students act as investigators and discoverers in CL contexts. They actively participate in activities through asking
questions, making predictions, analyzing, discussing, assessing their strengths and weaknesses, interacting together, and trying to learn.

Actually, there are various types of cooperative learning techniques that have developed in teaching. Keshavarz et. al. (2014) investigated the effect of cooperative learning techniques on promoting writing skill of Iranian EFL learners. They implemented two cooperative learning techniques namely student team–achievement divisions (STAD) and group investigation (GI). Then, the implementation both cooperative learning techniques has been proven to produce positive effects in students’ learning of writing. Also, Marashi and Kathami (2017) investigated the effect of cooperative learning on EFL learners’ creativity and motivation. They applied several cooperative learning techniques namely think-pair-share, three-stay one-stray, roundtable, and three-step-interview. The result clarified that the use of CL techniques improved EFL students’ creativity and motivation.

It can be noted that cooperative learning is effective for English teaching. It is able to create interactive teaching that potentially increases the students’ motivation and gives the opportunity for the students to work and help one each other in learning academic content. Although it has character works in groups, the evaluation in cooperative learning is allocated individually. Besides that, the empirical studies implied that there are several types of cooperative learning techniques that are able to be applied in language teaching. Kagan (1994) and Slavin (1995) as cited in Al-Yaseen (2014) point out that some of these methods
which have been successfully applied in the classroom are ‘Round Table’ for writing, ‘Jigsaw’ in reading, and ‘Think-Pair-Share’ to develop oral and aural skills.

Roundtable is considered as one kind of cooperative learning techniques that is created by Spencer Kagan in teaching and learning activity. Kagan (2009:10.21) states that, “roundtable and roundrobin are extremely important cooperative learning structures. In essence, students take turns contributing to the group in an oral form for roundrobin and in a written form for roundtable. For roundtable, there is usually one piece of paper and one pen for the team. One student makes a contribution and then passes the paper and pen to the student on his or her left. The paper or pen literally goes around the table, thus the name: roundtable. If the contributions are oral rather than written, it is called roundrobin”.

Several previous studies have proved the effectiveness of roundtable in teaching EFL students. Ningsih et. al. (2017) concluded that rally coach and round table model of cooperative learning can increase the activity and student learning outcomes. Urunami et. al. (2017) also found the effectiveness of the combination of two techniques namely group grid and round table technique in teaching writing descriptive text. Furthermore, Norzang (2017) investigated whether the use of roundtable structure supplemented by peer editing technique enhances students’ essay writing skills. The study revealed that the roundtable structure which is supplemented by peer editing technique enhances students’ essay writing skills. Deeply, Astuti and Kumalarini (2013) found that roundtable brainstorming
can improve the writing ability of grade ten students in writing descriptive texts. It can improve all the components of the students’ composition except “mechanics”.

Actually, several previous researches above have investigated the effectiveness of using roundtable in teaching writing of EFL learners. However, it was still limited on the implementation which was commonly applied only in pre-writing process as the group brainstorming to share writing ideas each other in a group. Hence, several researchers above combined roundtable technique with the other techniques. It means that roundtable technique also cannot stand alone implemented because it still has limited procedure to solve students’ problems writing. Moreover, Kagan (2009: 1.16) also asserts that if cooperative learning were students working together with no input or direction from the teacher, it would be the blind leading the blind. It means that the specific direction modeled by teacher is important in implementing roundtable technique.

Recalling the theory from Richards and Renandya (2002:303) which points out that the difficulty of writing lies not only in generating and organizing ideas, but also in translating these ideas into readable text, it means that the difficulties are not only faced at the pre-writing, but also at the other processes. Therefore, it needs to be explored the implementation of roundtable technique not only in pre-writing but also in producing text in order to completely and effectively solve all of the problems in every writing process. On the other word, it indicates that the development of this technique is needed.
In this case, the researcher aims to develop roundtable technique based on process approach in order to support this technique can be applied appropriately in all of writing processes. The role of process approach in roundtable technique is as the systematic direction for students to write cooperatively in a group. Related to process approach, it emphasizes the importance of a recursive procedure of pre-writing, drafting, evaluating and revising (Rusinovci, 2015:700). Basically, process approach is a cyclical approach. In this approach, students are needed to move back and forth while going from one stage to another stage and taking part in the writing activities, (Palpanadan, et.al, 2014: 790). Since the teaching English is focused on written or spoken text. The process approach is believed as a better approach than product and genre approach. By providing modeling process to write text, the product and genre have been covered in process approach. Meanwhile, the development of roundtable technique based on process approach is aimed to solve students’ entire problem in each writing process through learning pairs. It believes that through working cooperatively in each writing process, the student can help each other to create mutual success. Therefore, it needs to be investigated.

On the other case, Kagan (2009: 3.6) states that cooperative learning also builds communication skills, develops self-esteem and internal locus of control, increases student motivation, reduces discipline problems, and promotes cognitive development. Related to motivation, it is the attitudes and affective states that influence the degree of effort that learners make to learn an L2 (Ellis, 1997:75). Since it determines the students’ level of effort in learning, it is believed as an
important psychological factor which affects the students’ learning achievement. It means that this aspect is also necessary to be identified.

Focused in writing, there are several previous researches which have investigated the role of learning motivation in writing skill. For example, Hashemian and Heidari (2013) found that there was a significant relationship between the students’ integrative motivation and the writing skill. Moreover, Nasihah and Cahyono (2017) concluded that there was a statistically significant correlation between students’ motivation and their writing achievement. The finding also revealed the positive point on the significant value of its correlation which indicated that the more motivated the students, the higher their writing achievement. In addition, a study conducted by Yuan-bing (2011) revealed that motivation, especially intrinsic motivation plays an important role in second language writing process. Consequently, it is necessary to conduct a research that focuses not only on improving the students’ writing skills but also on improving the students’ motivation in writing.

Based on the elaborations above, the study aims to investigate the effectiveness of developed roundtable technique based on process approach to enhance the students’ writing skills. Moreover, the researcher also identify whether the implementation of developed roundtable technique can increase the students’ learning motivations. As stated at the previous discussion that cooperative learning is believed can improve the students’ motivation.
1.2. Research Questions

Dealing with the issues presented above, this study formulates the research questions:

1. Does developed roundtable technique based on process approach improve the students’ writing skill better than conventional roundtable technique?

2. Is there any significant improvement on the students’ learning motivations after being taught by using developed roundtable technique based on process approach?

1.3. Objectives

The objectives of the study are as follows:

1. To investigate whether developed roundtable technique based on process approach improves the students’ writing skill better than conventional roundtable technique.

2. To find out whether there is any significant improvement on the students’ learning motivations after being taught by using developed roundtable technique based on process approach.

1.4. Uses

Hopefully, this research will be able to bring some expected benefits as follows:

1. Theoretical Uses:

The result of this research can be useful input and scientific reference for English teaching and research.
2. Practical Uses:

In terms of practical benefit, the researcher hopes that the result of this research can be useful for several elements of education as follows:

a. The students can solve their problems in writing skill through the implementation of developed roundtable technique based on process approach instructed by the teacher.

b. The teachers can use developed roundtable technique based on process approach as the alternative teaching technique to enhance students’ writing skills and learning motivation.

c. The school can take the result of this research as the positive inspiration for their curriculum design or teacher training program.

1.5. Scope

The scope is very useful to determine the focus point and limitation of research. In this case, the researcher tries to develop conventional roundtable as one of cooperative learning techniques created by Kagan (2009) based on process approach modeled by Richards and Renandya (2002: 304). The development of roundtable technique based on process approach is aimed to solve the students’ problem in every writing process and to enhance their motivations through working cooperatively in group. However, before implementing this developed technique, the materials involve definition, social function, generic structure, and language features of text have to be delivered clearly to the students. The writing skill in this research is focused on writing descriptive text. This research is
addressed to the tenth grade of senior high school students in Pekalongan, East Lampung as the participants.

1.6. Definition of Terms

Briefly, the definition of terms in this research can be elaborated as follows:

1. Roundtable technique based on process approach is the development of conventional roundtable technique as one of model cooperative learning technique from Kagan (2009) based on process approach.

2. Process approach is the teaching approach which is oriented on the process of writing itself. It comprises four basic stages namely planning, drafting, revising, and editing.

3. Writing skill is a productive skill to deliver information and express the ideas from the writer to the reader through written language.

4. Motivation is an interest, need, or reason for doing something which determines the students’ level of effort in learning.

Briefly, this chapter has explained the introduction involved background, research questions, objectives, uses, scope and definitions of terms. It will be continued by the literature reviews for the next chapter.
II. LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter elaborates the concepts, theories, and previous researches which are related to the present research. It begins with the concept of writing which consists of its definition, composition and process. The next elaboration is types of writing, descriptive text, teaching writing, and types of writing approach. The final theories elaborate the concept of roundtable technique, roundtable technique based on process approach and learning motivation. Furthermore, theoretical assumption and hypothesis are stated clearly at the end of this chapter.

2.1. The Concept of Writing

Theoretically, Siahaan (2008:2) defines that writing is a skill of a writer to communicate information to reader or group of readers. Moreover, Byrne (1988:1) states that writing is clearly much more than the production of graphic symbols, just as speech is more than the production of sounds. The symbols have to be arranged, according to certain conventions, to form words, and words have to be arranged to form sentences. In addition, Hyland (2003: 3) defines writing as a product constructed from the writer’s command of grammatical and lexical knowledge, and writing development is considered to be the result of imitating and manipulating models provided by the teacher. It can be inferred that writing is the skill to deliver information through written language. The product of writing is
the construction of language units from the smallest to the larger forms which has to be accepted with the rule of language itself.

Furthermore, Brown (2001: 335) states that the upshot of the compositional nature of writing has produced writing pedagogy that focuses students on how to generate ideas, how to organize them coherently, how to use discourse markers, and rhetorical conventions to put them cohesively into a written text, how to revise text for clearer meaning, how to edit text for appropriate grammar, and how to produce final product. Related to the final product, Brown also asserts that a good deal of attention was placed on “model” compositions that students would emulate and on how well a student’s final product measured up against a list of criteria that include:

1) Content

In writing, content refers to the topic, idea, information or message in the text. A good writing must have rich, qualify, and contextual content related to the writing topic.

2) Organization

In writing, organization refers to arrangement or form of the text. Writing is good in which the idea is arranged coherently. Coherent means the idea is connected in logical sequence. Moreover, a good writing must have a good organization based on the required structure of text.
3) Grammar

In writing, grammar refers to a set of language rules to help writers construct sentences systematically. A good writing must agree with the rules of language based on the required language features of text.

4) Vocabulary

In writing, vocabulary refers to the choice of word used in the text. A good writing should use appropriate vocabulary in capturing the ideas or information. So, the writing can be clearly understood by the readers.

5) Mechanics

Mechanics is the use of particular conventions in written language. It refers to the rules of the written language, such as capitalization, punctuation and spelling.

Briefly, writing is considered as the skill to deliver information and express the ideas from the writer to the reader through written language. In delivering information through written language, a good writer has to use grammatical, systematic, and meaningful languages which are easy to be learned by the readers. Therefore, the final product of writing should agree with some criteria which are placed in writing compositions that are, content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics.

Furthermore, writing process is also considered has a significant role in determining the final product of writing. Concerning about the cognitive process in writing, Allan (2009: 21) states that there are three process in the model of
writing namely planning, producing text, and reviewing. Much deeper, Graves (1983) in Johnson (2008: 179-180) organizes several writing processes as follows:

1) Pre-writing

The purpose of pre-writing is to generate ideas. The process includes listing, brainstorming, outlining, silent thinking, or making a conversation with another person.

2) Drafting

Drafting is the writer’s first attempt to capture ideas on paper. Quantity here is valued over quality. If done correctly, the draft is a rambling, disconnected accumulation of ideas.

3) Revising

It is considered as the core of the writing process. In this stage our writing is revised and reshaped in many times. The writer is shaping, adding parts, taking parts away, and continually molding and changing by considering the flow and structure.

4) Editing

Editing is the process to correct the grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors.

5) Publishing and sharing

This is the final process to share the result of writing to the audience. Publishing can involve putting together class books, collections of writing, school or class newspapers, school or class magazines, or displaying short samples of writing in the hall or out in the community.
2.2. Types of Writing

Generally, there are some types of writing namely academic writing, personal writing, and creative writing. Oshima (2007: 3) explains that “academic writing is the kind of writing used in high school and college classes. Academic writing is different from creative writing and personal writing”. Creative writing is a writing such as stories, poetries etc. Then, personal writing is such as letters or e-mails. Essentially, there are several types of writing that are usually used in high school and college classes as follows:

1) Descriptive

Kane (2000: 351) elaborates that description is about sensory experience how something looks, sounds, tastes. Mostly it is about visual experience, but description also deals with other kinds of perception.

2) Narrative

According to Jordan (1999: 27), narration is an account or description of events in the past which entails following a time sequence or chronological order. It can refer to a past story because it is purposed to describe events in the past chronologically.

3) Exposition

Kane (2000: 89) explains that an expository paragraph is related to facts, ideas, and beliefs. It explains, analyzes, defines, compares, and illustrates. It answers the questions such as what? why?, how?, what was the cause?, the effect?, like what?, unlike what?. The writer just tries to show the fact of an object in order to make the readers believe or disbelieve something related to
the object. It means that exposition only elaborates the fact of an object without a goal to make the reader agree with the writer’s opinion.

4) Argumentative

While in argumentation type, in addition to only convincing the readers to believe or disbelieve something the truth of the fact of an object, it also has a goal to persuade the readers in order to take a certain course of action related to the new truth exposed to them (Siahaan, 2008: 217). So, argumentation is a text in which you agree or disagree with a problem, using reasons to support your opinion, your goal is to convince your reader that your opinion is right. It means that argumentation is used to make a case or to prove or disprove a statement or proposition.

5) Report

Kennedy (2003: 334) explains that report is one kinds of writing that has purpose to provide generalized information about whole class of things. It means that this text is used to elaborate of the object in general way. It doesn’t have purpose to tell a stories, procedure or arguments.

Essentially, those are some types of academic writings which are necessary to be taught in Indonesian senior high school based on curriculum 2013. The students should be able to write some types of text based on its social functions, generic structures and language features. However, this research will be focused in writing descriptive text.
2.3. Descriptive Text

According to Oshima (2007: 61), Descriptive writing appeals to the senses, so it tells how something looks, feels, smells, tastes, and/or sounds. A good description is a word picture; the reader can imagine the object, place, or person in his or her mind. It means that descriptive text is purposed to describe the visual appearances and personalities of the object (person, thing, or place) to encourage the reader can imagine the object in their mind based on the writer's description in the text. To find all of characters of the object, the writer can look at the appearance or looking for the factual data of the object.

1) Generic Structure of Descriptive Text

Certainly, every text has a structure. It is defined as a web of meaning relationships which relate the sentences to each other give direction to the text and make it hold together (Kennedy, 2003:321). It means that structure stands as a direction to write a text with a good coherence or meaning relationship. Wardhani, et.al (2014:3) organize that there are two generic structures of descriptive text namely:

a. Identification

Identification is about introducing subject or thing that will be described.

b. Description

Description is brief details about who, or what of the subject.

Supporting the elaboration above, below is the structure of descriptive text that is applied in the example:
I have a toy. It is a doll, a bear doll, and I call it Teddy. Teddy bear is an American origin. My dad bought it as a present for my tenth birthday last year.

The doll is small, fluffy, and cute. It has thick brown fur. When I cuddle it, the fur feels soft. Because my Teddy bear is a doll, I don’t need to feed it. I wash it at laundry at least once a month. Every night Teddy accompanies me sleeping. When I am at school, Teddy stays in my bed. Teddy bear is really nice, adorable, and charming toy. I love my Teddy bear very much.

2) Language Features of Descriptive Text

There are several language features of descriptive text concluded by Noprianto (2017:67) which can be organized as follows:

a. Focus on specific participants as the main character.

b. Use present tense as dominant tenses.

c. Use linking verbs or relational process frequently (is, are, has, have, belongs to) in order to classify and describe appearance or qualities and parts or functions of the participant).
d. Use action verbs or material process and behavioral process in giving additional description regarding action and behavior done by the participants in text.

e. Use mental verb or mental process when describing feelings.

f. Use adjectives and adverbs to add information to nouns (participant) and add information to verbs (actions) to provide more detailed description about the topic.

g. Use adverbial phrases to add more information about manner, place, or time and sometimes realized in embedded clause which functions as circumstances.

2.4. Teaching Writing

Actually, speaking and writing skills are productive skills in English but do not have the same similarities when teaching. Broadly speaking, writing is more formal. It requires more accuracy, with the emphasis on spelling and punctuation (Riddel, 2010:15). They are different in both compositions and the way of teaching. The compositions of speaking which are taught by teacher more focus on pronunciation, accuracy, and fluency. The activities that are usually used are conversations, monologue, role play, speech, etc. While the compositions in teaching writing are grammar, punctuation and paragraph structure. Then, the way which is used in teaching such as write a simple sentence, long paragraph, or essay.
2.5. Types of Teaching Writing Approach

Actually, there are a number of different approaches to the practice of writing skills both in and outside the classroom. It will determine the way of teaching writing itself. There are three common approaches that are product, process, and genre. According to Harmer (2007: 325), in teaching writing teachers can either focus on the product of that writing or on the writing process itself. When concentrating on the product, teachers are only interested in the aim of a task and in the end product.

1) Product Approach

Related to the product approach, it was used in order to highlight form and syntax and the emphasis was on rhetorical drills (Silva, 1990 in Rusinovci 2015: 699). In product approach, students are normally asked to write an essay by imitating a given pattern. The objective or the focus of writing approach is on the written product rather than process. It considers writing as mainly concerned with the knowledge about the structure of language, and writing development is mainly the result of the imitation input, in the form of texts provided by the teacher (Badger and White, 2000: 154). It is also considered as the teacher-centered.

2) Process Approach

Recently, teaching writing has begun to move away from a concentration on the written product to an emphasis on the process of writing (Raimes, 1983: 10). According to Palpanadan, et.al (2014:790), process approach is a cyclical approach. In this approach, students are needed to move back and forth while going from one stage to another stage and taking part in the writing activities.
During the activity, they may return to pre-writing activities even after reaching the revising stage (final stage). Different from product, the focus point of this approach is the writer and the writing process. It is also considered as the students-centered which position a teacher as the facilitator.

3) Genre Approach

As the last approach discussed here is genre approach. Badger and White (2000:155) notes that genre approaches are relative newcomers to ELT. However, there are strong similarities with product approaches and, in some ways, genre approaches can be regarded as an extension of product approaches. The genre approach like the product approach considers writing as predominantly linguistic. However, the genre approach places a greater emphasis on the social context in which writing is produced. This approach sees writing as essentially concerned with knowledge of language, and as being tied closely to a social purpose (Badger and White, 2000:156). On other hand, Harmer (2007: 327) elaborates that genre represents the norms of different kinds of writing. When teachers concentrate on genre, students study texts in the genre in which they are going to be writing before they embark on their own work. Thus, if we want them to write business letters of various kinds, we let them look at typical models of such letters before starting to compose their own. If we want them to write newspaper articles, we have them study real examples to discover facts about construction and specific language use which are common to that genre. This forms part of the pre-writing phase.
2.6. Process Approach

Especially for process approach, it is believed as a better approach than product and genre approach. By providing modeling process to write text, the product and genre can be covered in process approach. Actually, the main concept of process approach is teaching writing based on the process of writing itself. As stated by Richards and Renandya (2002: 304), it comprises four basic stages namely planning, drafting, revising, and editing. Three other stages could be inserted after the drafting stage; these are responding, evaluating, and post-writing. For each stage, suggestions are provided as to the kinds of classroom activities that support the learning of specific writing skills. For example, at the planning stage, teachers can help students generate ideas through such activities as brainstorming, clustering, and rapid free writing. In addition, Badger and White (2000:155) concludes that we can say that process approaches see writing primarily as the exercise of linguistic skills, and writing development as an unconscious process which happens when teachers facilitate the exercise of writing skills.

Honestly, this research aims to develop roundtable technique based on process approach in order to support this technique can be applied appropriately in all of writing processes. The role of process approach in roundtable technique is as the cyclical approach and systematic direction for students to write cooperatively in a group.
2.7. The Concept of Roundtable Technique

Roundtable is one type of cooperative learning techniques which is structured by Spencer Kagan (2009). Related to the concept of cooperative learning, Slavin (2011) as cited in Tran (2014:131) states that it comprises instructional methods in which teachers organize students into small groups, which then work together to help one another learn academic content. In addition, Richard and Renandya (2002: 52) assert that it is more than just asking students in groups and giving them a certain task to do. The principles and techniques are tools which teachers use to encourage mutual helpfulness in the groups and the active participation of all members.

According to Kagan (2009: 10.21), there are two extremely important cooperative learning structures that are roundtable and roundrobin. Essentially, those techniques are purposed to have students take turns contributing to the group in an oral form for roundrobin and in a written form for roundtable. In implementing roundtable, one pen and one paper are distributed for each group. One student makes a contribution and then passes the paper and pen to the student on his or her left. The paper or pen literally goes around the table, thus the name: roundtable. If the contributions are oral rather than written, it is called roundrobin. Moreover, Kagan elaborate that it can be used repeatedly in many subject areas, at a variety of places in the lesson plan such as to create an anticipatory set for a lesson, to check for acquisition of information, or to liven up drill and practice. In addition, roundtable is a technique which can be used for brainstorming,
reviewing, or practicing skill while also serving as a team builder (Sinaga, 2017:71).

In detail, Barkley, et al. (2005: 241-242) describe the procedures of roundtable technique which can be described are as follows:

1) Form groups of five students and tell groups the prompt or distribute the handout.

2) Identify (or have students identify) which group member will begin and inform students that they will circulate the paper clockwise.

3) Ask the student to write his or her words, phrases, or sentences as rapidly as possible and then read the response aloud so that other students have an opportunity to think about and build upon each other’s responses.

4) Ask the student to pass the paper to the next student, who follows the same steps.

5) Inform students when time is up, or tell them in your instructions that the process is complete when all members have participated and all ideas are on the paper.

Actually, several previous researches have investigated the effectiveness of using roundtable in teaching writing of EFL learners. Marashi and Kathami (2017) investigated the effect of cooperative learning on EFL learners’ creativity and motivation. They applied several cooperative learning techniques namely think-pair-share, three-stay one-stray, roundtable, and three-step-interview. The result clarified that the use of CL techniques improved EFL students’ creativity and
motivation. Furthermore, Ningsih et. al. (2017) concluded that rally coach and round table model of cooperative learning can increase the activity and student learning outcomes. Urunami et. al. (2017) also found the effectiveness of the combination of two techniques namely group grid and round table technique in teaching writing descriptive text. Furthermore, Norzang (2017) investigated whether the use of roundtable structure supplemented by peer editing technique enhances students’ essay writing skills. The study revealed that the roundtable structure which is supplemented by peer editing technique enhances students’ essay writing skills. Deeply, Astuti and Kumalarini (2013) found that roundtable brainstorming can improve the writing ability of grade ten students in writing descriptive texts.

Based on the presented theories above, it can be inferred that Kagan’s roundtable technique potentially can create interactive teaching in the class. Especially in teaching writing, it is also useful to help students to generate and organize their ideas at pre-writing process through group brainstorming. By taking turn in contributing their ideas in a piece of paper, students can share their ideas each other as the prior knowledge before producing a text. Moreover, it is also believed can increase the students’ creativity and motivation.

2.8. The Concept of Developed Roundtable Technique Based on Process Approach

In this case, the researcher aims to develop Kagan’s roundtable technique based on process approach in order to support this technique can be applied and solve
students’ problem in each writing process by learning pairs. The used process approach involves four main writing stages that are pre-writing, drafting, revising, and editing. Therefore, the developed roundtable based on process approach will be different with Kagan’s conventional roundtable. The differences can be organized as follows:

**Table 2.1. The differences between Kagan’s Roundtable Technique and Developed Roundtable Technique Based on Process Approach**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kagan’s Roundtable Technique</th>
<th>Developed Roundtable Technique Based on Process Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) The students are divided into some groups which consist of five students for one team.</td>
<td>1) The students are divided into some groups which consist of five students for one team. The teacher also determines the leader and writing topic for each team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) One pen and a piece of paper are distributed for each group.</td>
<td>2) One pencil, eraser and four papers are distributed for each group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) In applying roundtable, one student writes a contribution in their group paper and then passes it to the student on his or her left. The paper or pen literally goes around the table.</td>
<td>3) There are four roundtable developed based on process approach:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>a. Roundtable pre-writing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>b. Roundtable drafting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>c. Roundtable revising</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>d. Roundtable editing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Publishing and sharing as the teacher’s feedback.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In roundtable based on process approach, there will be four papers for each group because there are four roundtable namely roundtable pre-writing, roundtable
drafting, roundtable revising, and roundtable editing. The procedures can be illustrated and elaborated as follows:

**Figure 2.2. Developed Roundtable Technique Based on Process Approach**

Before implementing roundtable pre-writing, the students are divided into several groups which consist of five students for one team. The teacher also determines the leader and writing topic for each team. Furthermore, the teacher explains clearly the definition, generic structure, language features, example of descriptive text, and modeling how to write descriptive text correctly. The stages and rules to work cooperatively in roundtable group are also described by teacher.

1) **Roundtable Pre-writing**

The first stage is roundtable pre-writing. Roundtable pre-writing is purposed for group brainstorming. Each group is given the mind mapping paper and the members write their ideas in there related to the writing topic. The first
student notes his idea in simple words or phrases on the first mind mapping list. Then, the paper is passed to the next student on the left. The next student continues to note his own idea. This step is continued until the last student and the moving of paper is instructed by the teacher. Each member can note more than one idea on mind mapping paper. However, the written ideas must be different one each other.

2) **Roundtable Drafting**

Actually, drafting is the writer’s first attempt to capture ideas on paper. Quantity here is valued over quality. In roundtable drafting, the teacher gives a drafting paper for each group and it will go around the table followed by mind mapping paper. This is the stage where the students in roundtable group try to produce many sentences list alternately. The first student produces one sentence or more at the first list by considering mind mapping note and then passes the drafting paper to the next student. The next student has to read aloud the first student’s writing and continue to write sentences at the next list. This process is held in two rounds.

3) **Roundtable Revising**

Revising is the core of the writing process. In this stage the writing is revised and reshaped in many times. In this stage, the teacher control students’ writing by showing the outline and provided conjunction on LCD. Then, the students in roundtable group are instructed to produce a final text cooperatively by considering text structure. The previous drafting paper is used as the supporting material in this stage. The teacher only gives each student to write one sentence. As the opening, the first students write the first
sentence of the text by looking at the previous drafting paper and the next students in the left stands as the mentor. Then, the paper is passed to the next. The second student has the opportunities to recheck and revise the first student's writing before he continues to write the next sentence. When the second students write, the third guides him. This process is continued until two rounds. If there is one who runs out the ideas to write, the paper can be passed to the next students.

4) Roundtable Editing

Roundtable editing is the stage when the students in groups work through roundtable way to correct the grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors. The members of group take turn correct their final writing by erasing and repairing.

After implementing the four stages of roundtable above, the last stage is publishing and sharing. This process is focused to correct the final writing project of each group. All groups submit their final writing to the teacher. In giving the feedback, the teacher corrects the each group’s writing and notes the writing errors of every group on the whiteboard. Especially for the group which has fewest errors gets the reward.

2.9. Learning Motivation

According to (Ellis, 1997:75), motivation is the attitudes and affective states that influence the degree of effort that learners make to learn an L2. Moreover, Harmer (2007:98) describes motivation as some kind of internal drive which forces
someone to do things in order to achieve something. Motivation is essential to success because the basic thing is we have to want to do something to succeed at it and without motivation, we will almost certainly fail to do the necessary effort. In addition, Troike (2006:178) asserts that motivation largely determines the level of effort which learners expend at various stages in their L2 development, and it is often a key to ultimate level of proficiency.

Based on the elaborations above, it can be inferred that motivation is an interest for doing something and the need or reason for doing something. It determines the students’ level of effort in learning. Therefore, it is believed as an important psychological factor in affecting the students’ learning achievement.

Basically, there are various motivation identified in Second Language Acquisition. Ellis (1997:75) states that there are four types of motivation namely instrumental, integrative, resultative, and intrinsic. On the other hand, Brown (2000:162-164) concluded that there are two different issues in motivation namely instrumental and integrative with intrinsic and extrinsic. It can be elaborated as follows:

1) Instrumental and Integrative

The instrumental side of the dichotomy referred to acquiring a language as mean as for attaining instrumental goals: furthering a career, reading technical material, translation, and so forth. It means that instrumental motivation comes from the functional reasons.
While, integrative motivation comes from the students’ interest in the people and culture presented by the target language group. Integrative side described learners who wished to integrate themselves into the culture of the second language group and become involved in social interchange in that group.

2) Intrinsic and extrinsic

Intrinsic motivation is generally characterized by people having personal interest in doing something. Therefore, they do activities for their own sake and not because of an extrinsic reward. Intrinsically-motivated behaviors bring about internally rewarding consequences such as satisfactory feelings, improved competence and self-determination. In addition, Ellis (1997:76) asserts that intrinsic is the motivation involves the arousal and maintenance of curiosity and can ebb and flow as a result of such factors as learners' particular interests and the extent to which they feel personally involved in learning activities. It means that this motivation is closely related to learning activities.

On the other hand, extrinsic motivation derives from an anticipation of external rewards such as praise, awards, prizes, and evaluation. Extrinsically-motivated students do activities because of some rewards or avoidance of punishment.

Related to the importance of motivation to learn and to master writing, there are several previous researches which have investigated the relationship between motivation and writing skill. For example, Hashemian and Heidari (2013) found that there was a significant relationship between the students’ integrative
motivation and the writing skill. Moreover, Nasihah and Cahyono (2017) concluded that there was a statistically significant correlation between students’ motivation and their writing achievement. The finding also revealed the positive point on the significant value of its correlation which indicated that the more motivated the students, the higher their writing achievement. In addition, a study conducted by Yuan-bing (2011) revealed that motivation, especially intrinsic motivation plays an important role in second language writing process.

2.10. Theoretical Assumption

As formulated on the literature review above, Kagan’s roundtable technique potentially can create interactive teaching in the class. Especially in teaching writing, it is also useful to help students to generate and organize their ideas at pre-writing process through group brainstorming. By taking turn in contributing their ideas in a piece of paper, students can share their ideas each other as the prior knowledge before producing a text. However, it still has limited procedure to solve students’ entire problem in all writing process namely planning, drafting, revising, and editing. In other word, the development of this technique is needed to be explored as purposed in this present research. The development of roundtable technique based on process approach is aimed to solve students’ entire problem in each writing process through learning pairs. Through working cooperatively in each writing process, the student can help each other to create mutual success. Meanwhile, the role of process approach is as the cyclical direction that support roundtable technique can be applied in all of writing processes. Therefore, the development of roundtable technique based on process
approach is believed can works better in teaching writing skill. In other word, it can solve the presented problems in this research.

Furthermore, Kagan (2009: 3.6) states that cooperative learning also builds communication skills, develops self-esteem and internal locus of control, increases student motivation, reduces discipline problems, and promotes cognitive development. Moreover, Marashi and Kathami (2017) also found that the use of CL techniques improved EFL students’ creativity and motivation. Therefore, the researcher also aims to identify whether the implementation of developed roundtable technique can increase the students’ motivation in learning and mastering writing skill. Since writing is considered as the skill which still needs a learning process.

2.11. Hypotheses

Based on the research questions formulated in this research, there are two hypotheses stated. The hypotheses are constructed based on null and alternative hypothesis. The first hypothesis is addressed to answer the first research question which is drawn as follows:

- $H_{01}$: Developed roundtable technique based on process approach doesn’t improve the students’ writing skill better than conventional roundtable technique.
- $H_{1}$: Developed roundtable technique based on process approach improves the students’ writing skill better than conventional roundtable technique.
As the last hypothesis, it is aimed to answer the third research question which is drawn as follows:

- $H_0$: There is no significant improvement on the students’ learning motivations after being taught by using developed roundtable technique based on process approach.
- $H_2$: There is any significant improvement on the students’ learning motivations after being taught by using developed roundtable technique based on process approach.

Completely, the literature review has been elaborated well in this chapter. Then, the next chapter will deal with the methods of this research.
III. RESEARCH METHODS

This chapter deals with the research method under the study. The elaborations of this chapter involve research design, population, sample, and variables. Moreover it also clearly explains the data collecting techniques, instrument of the research, validity of the instrument, reliability of the instrument, research procedures, data analysis, and hypothesis testing.

3.1. Research Design

In order to answer research questions formulated in this research, the researcher used a quantitative approach in a form experimental design. According to Muijs (2004:13), the experimental design is a test under controlled conditions that is made to demonstrate a known truth or examine the validity of a hypothesis. Actually, there are several types of experimental designs can be used in quantitative study. In this research, the researcher applied true experimental design. True experimental designs (also called randomized designs) use randomization and provide maximum control of extraneous variables (Ary, et. al., 2010: 302). Moreover, the researcher applied Pretest–Posttest Control Group Design which can be presented as follows:
Table 3.1. Research Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group/Class</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Y₁</td>
<td>X₁</td>
<td>Y₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Y₁</td>
<td>X₂</td>
<td>Y₂</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Adapted from Ary, et.al, 2010)

While:

E  : Experimental Class
C  : Control Class
Y₁ : Pretest
Y₂ : Posttest
X₁ : Developed Roundtable Technique Based on Process Approach
X₂ : Conventional Roundtable Technique

The pretest was conducted in both of classes to measure students’ writing skills before the treatment was given. Related to the treatment at the presented designs above, Ary, et. al. (2010: 307) states that the treatment is introduced only to the experimental subjects (unless two different treatments are being compared), after which the two classes are measured on the dependent variable. In this research, there were two different treatments implemented and compared in experimental and control class after the pretest. The first treatment was developed roundtable technique based on process approach for experimental class, and the second was conventional roundtable for control class. The posttest was also conducted to evaluate the students’ writing score after the treatments were given to both classes. Besides that, Learning Motivation Questionnaire was also administered in
twice followed the pretest and posttest in experimental class to evaluate the students’ learning motivations before and after the implementation of developed roundtable technique based on process approach.

3.2. Population and Sample

1) Population

According to Fraenkel (2009:105), the term population refers to all the members of a particular group. It is the interesting group that is to be generalized by researcher in the result of study. In this research, the population was all the students at the tenth grade of SMA N 1 Pekalongan. There are 111 students at the tenth grade of SMA N 1 Pekalongan which are divided into five classes. The tenth grade was chosen based on the curriculum. At this level, the students must have studied English grammar (simple tenses) and adequate vocabularies. Therefore, roundtable technique based on process approach could be implemented.

However, although they had studied simple tenses and adequate vocabularies, the students at the tenth grade of SMA N 1 Pekalongan still had several problems in writing a text. Therefore the development of roundtable technique based on process approach was aimed to solve this problem.
2) Sample

A sample can be defined as small group that is observed or portion of a population (Ary, et.al, 2010:148). The samples of this research were grouped into experimental and control. Purposive sampling based on the class was employed in this research. Two classes were purposively chosen from five classes at the tenth grade of SMA N 1 Pekalongan based on their low and homogeneity writing skill. The researcher took two classes namely X MIA 1 as experimental and X MIA 2 as the control. There were 21 students for each class. So, there were 42 students as the research samples.

3.3. Variables

There were two following variables in this research:

1) Independent Variable (X)

Independent variables are those that (probably) cause, influence or affect outcomes. They are also called treatment, manipulated, antecedent, or predictor variable (Creswell, 2009:50). In this research, there were two independent variable employed as the treatment. The first independent variable was developed roundtable technique based on process approach which was implemented in experimental class. It was the development of Kagan’s roundtable technique which had been developed or restructured based on process approach. Then, the second independent variable was conventional roundtable itself which was applied in control class.
2) Dependent Variable (Y).

In experimental studies, the treatment is the independent variable and the outcome is the dependent variable (Ary, et.al, 2010:37). It means that dependent variable is the outcomes or result from the influence of the independent variables. In this research, there were also two dependent variables. The first dependent variable was the students’ writing skills. It was evaluated from both experimental and control classes. Meanwhile, as the second variable was the students’ learning motivations which was evaluated in experimental class only. It was evaluated only in experimental class because the researcher focuses to investigate whether roundtable as one of cooperative learning technique which had been developed based on process approach also can improve the students’ learning motivations.

3.4. Data Collecting Techniques

In this research, there were two techniques employed in collecting the data. It can be elaborated as follows:

1) Administering Writing test

Writing test was administered to collect the data of the first dependent variable in this research namely students’ writing skills. The researcher got students to write a descriptive text individually with a given topic during the test. This written test was given twice as the pretest before the treatment and posttest after the treatment. The test was administered for each group, experimental and control.
2) Administering Questionnaire

A questionnaire was administered to gain the data of students’ learning motivations as the second dependent variable in this research. It was administered in twice along with pretest and posttest in experimental class. The students were required to choose the provided options in the questionnaire.

3.5. Instruments of the Research

Actually, there were two instruments used in collecting the data of this research. As stated in the elaboration of data collecting technique, the first instrument was writing test to collect the data of the students’ writing skills. In this case, the researcher scored the students’ writing in accordance with some aspects of writing adapted from Heaton (1988: 146) as follows:

Table 3.2. Rating Scales of Writing Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Excellent to very good (30-27)</th>
<th>Good to average (26-22)</th>
<th>Fair to poor (21-17)</th>
<th>Very poor (16-13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledgeable–substantive – etc.</td>
<td>Some knowledge of subject – adequate range – etc.</td>
<td>Limited knowledge of subject – little substance – etc.</td>
<td>Does not show knowledge of subject – non-substantive – etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Excellent to very good (20-18)</td>
<td>Good to average (17-14)</td>
<td>Fair to poor (13-10)</td>
<td>Very poor (9-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fluent expression – ideas clearly stated – etc.</td>
<td>Somewhat choppy – loosely organized but main ideas stand out – etc.</td>
<td>Non-fluent – ideas confused or disconnected – etc.</td>
<td>Does not communicate – no organization – etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>Excellent to very good (20-18)</td>
<td>Good to average (17-14)</td>
<td>Fair to poor (13-10)</td>
<td>Very poor (9-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-substantive – etc.</td>
<td>Non-fluent – ideas confused or disconnected – etc.</td>
<td>Does not communicate – no organization – etc.</td>
<td>Does not show knowledge of subject – non-substantive – etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since writing test is a subjective test, it is necessary that the students’ writing be scored by two raters; the first was the researcher and the second was one of the lecturers in English Education Study Program of Muhammadiyah Lampung University. She has been taught English Grammar since 2015. It could be inferred that in scoring students’ writing ability, the researcher used Inter-Rater. Furthermore, the scores from the two raters were combined and the average score was taken as the final score. The possible score gained by students based on the criteria above ranks from 0 - 100. In scoring the students’ writing, the researcher used the table of scoring system below:

(Source: Adapted from Heaton, 1988)
Table 3.3. Scoring System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>St' Code</th>
<th>C (13-30)</th>
<th>O (7-20)</th>
<th>V (7-20)</th>
<th>LU (5-25)</th>
<th>M (2-5)</th>
<th>Total Score (0-100)</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R1 R2</td>
<td>R1 R2</td>
<td>R1 R2</td>
<td>R1 R2</td>
<td>R1 R2</td>
<td>R1 R2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

C : Content
O : Organization
V : Vocabulary
LU : Language Use
M : Mechanics

Furthermore, the second research instrument was a questionnaire to collect the data about the students’ learning motivations. The questionnaire used was adapted from Shia (1998) which was modified for Indonesian EFL context by Nasihah and Cahyono (2017:260) (See Appendix 6). It consisted of 20 item statements which were coded into five-point-Likert scales with ranges from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Table 3.4. Table Specification of Learning Motivation Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Intrinsic Motivation (Mastery goals and the need for achievement)</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Extrinsic Motivation
(Authority expectations (family and teacher), peer acceptance, power motivations, and fear of failure)

(Source: adapted from Shia, 1998)

Actually, the items were constructed based on two main factors. Intrinsic motivation factors included: mastery goals and the need for achievement. While extrinsic motivation factors included: authority expectations (family and teacher), peer acceptance, power motivations, and fear of failure.

3.6. Validity of the Instruments

Certainly, a sufficient instrument must be valid. Therefore, the researcher employed several procedures to measure the validity of instruments used in this research which can be organized as follows:

1) Validity of writing test

According to, Heaton (1988:159), a test is said to be valid to the extent that is measures what is supposed to measure. Actually, there are three types validity which are important to be evaluated namely face, content, and construct. To get the face validity in this research, the instrument of writing test was previously examined by the researcher’s advisors to check whether it had been appropriate to be used or not. Then, the content validity was measured based on core competences and basic competences in English syllabus of Curriculum 2013 for the tenth grade of senior high school as follows:
### Table 3.5. The Content Validity of Writing Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Competences</th>
<th>Basic Competences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Menghayati dan mengamalkan ajaran agama yang dianutnya.</td>
<td>1. Menganalisis fungsi sosial, struktur teks, dan unsur kebahasaan pada teks deskriptif sederhana tentang orang, tempat wisata, dan bangunan bersejarah terkenal, sesuai dengan konteks penggunaannya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Menghayati dan mengamalkan perilaku jujur, disiplin, tanggungjawab, peduli (gotong royong, kerjasama, toleran, damai), santun, responsif dan pro-aktif dan menunjukkan sikap sebagai bagian dari solusi atas berbagai permasalahan dalam berinteraksi secara efektif dengan lingkungan sosial dan alam serta dalam menempatkan diri sebagai cerminan bangsa dalam pergaulan dunia.</td>
<td>2. Menangkap makna dalam teks deskriptif lisan dan tulis sederhana.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Memahami, menerapkan, menganalisis pengetahuan faktaual, konseptual, prosedural berdasarkan rasa ingin tahinya tentang ilmu pengetahuan, teknologi, seni, budaya, dan humaniora dengan wawasan kemanusiaan, kebangsaan, kenegaraan, dan peradaban terkait penyebab fenomena dan kejadian, serta menerapkan pengetahuan prosedural pada bidang kajian yang spesifik sesuai dengan bakat dan minatnya untuk memecahkan masalah.</td>
<td>3. Menyunting teks deskriptif lisan dan tulis, sederhana, tentang orang, tempat wisata, dan bangunan bersejarah terkenal, dengan memperhatikan fungsi sosial, struktur teks, dan unsur kebahasaan yang benar dan sesuai konteks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mengolah, menalar, dan menyaji dalam ranah konkret dan ranah abstrak terkait dengan pengembangan dari yang dipelajarnya di sekolah secara mandiri, dan mampu menggunakan metoda sesuai kaidah keilmuan.</td>
<td>4. Menyusun teks deskriptif lisan dan tulis sederhana tentang orang, tempat wisata, dan bangunan bersejarah terkenal, dengan memperhatikan tujuan, struktur teks, dan unsur kebahasaan, secara benar dan sesuai dengan konteks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Adapted from English Syllabus of Curriculum 2013)

Furthermore, the construct validity of writing test in this research was measured based on the theory of academic writing. The students’ writing should be composed based on several writing compositions namely content,
organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. The test also scored based on each writing composition.

2) Validity of questionnaire

As stated before that one of the criteria of a good instrument is that the instrument must be valid. The questionnaire used was adapted from Shia (1998). This questionnaire had been constructed based on the theory of learning motivation. Thus, the construct validity of this questionnaire had been standardized. Construct validity is necessary for measurement instrument which has several indicators in measuring one aspect or construct (Setiyadi, 2006: 25).

3.7. Reliability of the Instruments

Actually, Heaton (1988:162) describes that if the test is administered to the same candidates on different occasions (with no language practice work taking place between these occasions), then, to the extent that it produces differing results, it is not reliable. It means that reliability refers to the consistency of the test in evaluating the same sample in different time. In this research, the researcher also employed several procedures to evaluate the reliability of instruments used. It can be elaborated as follows:

1) Reliability of Writing Test

In testing the reliability of the writing test, inter-rater reliability was used as suggested by Vanderstoep & Johnston (2009: 65). He states that inter-rater reliability is often used for behavioral observations. A measure has high
inter-rater reliability if two people who are observing a behavior agree on the nature of that behavior. Thus, Pearson Product Moment Correlation was applied to measure the correlation between the pretest and posttest score given by Rater 1 and Rater 2. Analyzed by using SPSS statistics 17.0, the results can be seen as follows:

**Table 3.6. The Correlation between Experimental Students’ Pretest Score Given by Rater 1 and Rater 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Rater 1 (Experimental Pretest)</th>
<th>Rater 2 (Experimental Pretest)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rater 1 (Experimental Pretest)</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation .975**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rater 2 (Experimental Pretest)</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation .975**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

**Table 3.7. The Correlation between Experimental Students’ Posttest Score Given by Rater 1 and Rater 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Rater 1 (Experimental Posttest)</th>
<th>Rater 2 (Experimental Posttest)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rater 1 (Experimental Posttest)</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation .996**</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rater 2 (Experimental Posttest)</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation .996**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Table 3.8. The Correlation between Control Students’ Pretest Score Given by Rater 1 and Rater 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rater 1 (Control Pretest)</th>
<th>Rater 2 (Control Pretest)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Correlations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rater 1 (Control Pretest)</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rater 2 (Control Pretest)</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.990**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 3.9. The Correlation between Control Students’ Posttest Score Given by Rater 1 and Rater 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rater 1 (Control Posttest)</th>
<th>Rater 2 (Control Posttest)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Correlations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rater 1 (Control Posttest)</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rater 2 (Control Posttest)</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.961**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Concluded based on the tables above, the reliability of the writing test is considered high since the correlation score is very high.

2) Reliability of questionnaire

In testing reliability of questionnaire, an internal consistency measure was employed in this research. Internal consistency measures are procedures to
determine whether all the items in a test are measuring the same thing (Ary et al, 2010: 643). Cohen et al (2007: 147-148) suggest that there are two main forms which are used to measure internal consistency of instrument, split-half techniques and alpha coefficient (Cronbach’s alpha). According to Creswell, (2012: 152), Cronbach’s alpha can be used for testing reliability when the variables are continuous, e.g. popular Likert scale (strongly agree to strongly disagree). Therefore, Learning Motivation Questionnaire in this research, considered as Likert scale questionnaire, could be tested by using Cronbach’s alpha. The formula for alpha is:

\[ \alpha = \frac{n r_{ii}}{1 + (n - 1) r_{ii}} \]

Note:

n = the number of items in the questionnaire

\( r_{ii} \) = the average of all the inter-item correlations.

\( (Cohen \ et \ al, \ 2007: \ 506) \)

Actually, to find the alpha value can use the formula above or by using SPSS 17.0. Moreover, to determine the reliability of the questionnaire, Cohen et al (2007: 506) provides the following guideline:
Table 3.10. The Guideline for Describing Alpha Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>alpha value</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 0.90</td>
<td>very highly reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80-0.90</td>
<td>highly reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70-0.79</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60-0.69</td>
<td>marginally/minimally reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 0.60</td>
<td>unacceptably low reliability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Cohen et al, 2007: 506)

Having been tested by using SPSS 17.0, the alpha value and reliability of Learning Motivation Questionnaire in this research can be seen as follows:

Table 3.11. The Reliability of Learning Motivation Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach's Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.894</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the alpha value was 0.894. It can be inferred that Learning Motivation Questionnaire in this research is highly reliable and ready to use.

3.8. Normality and Homogeneity Tests

Before using independent group t-test to analyze the data, the researcher tried to find out the normality and homogeneity tests.
1) Normality

Normality distribution test is a test to measure whether our data have a normal distribution. To find out the normality, the researcher used Shapiro-Wilk test with SPSS 17.0. The hypothesis for testing normality was:

- $H_0$: The data are not normally distributed.
- $H_a$: The data are normally distributed.

The criteria were as follows:

- $H_0$ is accepted if alpha level is lower than 0.05 (p<0.05).
- $H_a$ is accepted if alpha level is higher than 0.05 (p>0.05).

2) Homogeneity

Homogeneity testing is used to measure the obtained score whether it is homogeneous or not. To test the assumption of homogeneity of variance, Levene’s test was used with SPSS 17.0. It was used to asses if the groups had equal variances. The hypothesis for testing homogeneity was:

- $H_0$: The variance of the data is not homogenous.
- $H_a$: The variance of the data is homogenous.

The criteria were as follows:

- $H_0$ is accepted if alpha level is lower than 0.05 (p<0.05).
- $H_a$ is accepted if alpha level is higher than 0.05 (p>0.05).
3.9. Research Procedures

In conducting the research, the researcher employed several research procedures as follows:

1) Determining the research problem

Based on the result of pre-survey, there were three presented problems in this research. The students get difficulties in generating and organizing ideas for writing, constructing sentence with the correct grammar, and composing a text with appropriate content and structure. It was relevant with the assumption from Richards and Renandya (2002:303) that the difficulty of writing lies not only in generating and organizing ideas, but also in translating their ideas into readable text. It could be concluded that the students face difficulties in every writing process. Therefore, the development of roundtable technique based on process approach was needed to solve students’ writing problems.

2) Determining population and sample

The population was all the students at tenth grade of SMA N 1 Pekalongan. There were 111 students at the tenth grade of SMA N 1 Pekalongan. The samples of this research were grouped into experimental and control. Purposive sampling based on the class was employed in this research. Two classes were purposively chosen from five classes at the tenth grade of SMA N 1 Pekalongan based on their low and homogeneous writing skill. The researcher took two classes namely X MIA 1 as experimental and X MIA 2 as
the control. There were 21 students for each class. So, there were 42 students as the research samples.

3) Selecting the material

The materials of this research was descriptive text because writing descriptive is the target skill which must be mastered by students at the tenth grade senior high school based on the syllabus of curriculum 2013.

4) Administering writing pretest and learning motivation questionnaire before the treatments

Before conducting the treatments, there was a writing pretest for students in experimental and control class. The students were instructed to write a descriptive text individually based on the several available topics. Furthermore, the results of writing pretest were scored by two raters. The first was the researcher and the second was one of lecturers in English Education Study Program of Muhammadiyah Lampung University. Moreover, the students in experimental class were also required to answers the questionnaire about learning motivation at the same meeting when writing pretest was conducted.

5) Conducting treatments

There were two different treatments in this research. The first treatment was conventional roundtable technique for the control class and the second treatment was developed roundtable technique for experimental class. The treatments were given in two meetings. The application of the treatments can be elaborated as follows:
Table 3.12. The Application of the Treatments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Control Class</th>
<th>Experimental Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Meeting 1 | **Kagan’s Roundtable Technique:**  
1) The students were divided into some groups which consist of five students for one team.  
2) One pen and a piece of paper were distributed for each group.  
3) In applying roundtable, one student wrote a contribution in their group paper and then passed it to the student on his or her left. The paper or pen literally went around the table. | **Developed Roundtable Technique Based on Process Approach:**  
1) The students were divided into some groups which consisted of five students for one team. The teacher also determined the leader and writing topic for each team.  
2) One pencil, eraser and four papers were distributed for each group.  
3) There were two developed roundtable implemented at the first meeting:  
   a. Roundtable pre-writing  
   b. Roundtable drafting |
| Meeting 2 | The students got the similar activities above (conventional roundtable technique) with the different topic of writing. |  
4) For the second meeting, developed roundtable technique based on process approach was still continued. There are two developed roundtable implemented:  
   c. Roundtable revising  
   d. Roundtable editing  
5) Publishing and sharing as the teacher’s feedback. |

6) Administering writing posttest and learning motivation questionnaire after the treatments

After the researcher conducted the treatments, the posttest was given to control and experimental class. The students were instructed to write a descriptive text individually based on the several available topics. Especially for the students in experimental class, they were also required to answer the learning motivation questionnaire for the second time.
7) Analyzing the data

In analyzing the data, the researcher used several data that included the students’ pretest and posttest scores in experimental and control class. Moreover, the data of the students’ learning motivations questionnaire at the pretest and posttest in experimental class was also analyzed. The steps in data analysis were connected with the research questions. Then, the results of data analysis were interpreted to answer all research questions.

3.10. Data Analysis

As stated in the previous discussion, the steps in data analysis were connected with the research questions. To answer the first research question, the researcher organized the data of Normalized Gain (N-Gain) of pretest and posttest result from experimental and control class. Then, mean of N-Gain score of experimental and control class were compared through Independent sample t-test by using SPSS statistics 17.0 to find out whether developed roundtable technique based on process approach improves the students’ writing skill better than conventional roundtable technique.

Related to the second research question, it was answered by organizing the data about the students’ learning motivations collected through questionnaire at the pretest and posttest in experimental class. The data was analyzed by using Paired sample t-test in SPSS statistics 17.0 to find out whether there is any significant
improvement on the students’ learning motivations after being taught by using developed roundtable technique based on process approach.

3.11. Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis testing was used to prove whether the proposed hypothesis is accepted or not. In this research, there were three hypotheses stated based on the research questions. The hypotheses were analyzed at significance level of under 0.05 in which the hypotheses were approved if $p < \alpha$. It means that probability of error in hypothesis is only about 5%. The first hypothesis was drawn as follows:

- $H_{01}$: Developed roundtable technique based on process approach doesn’t improve the students’ writing skill better than conventional roundtable technique.
- $H_{11}$: Developed roundtable technique based on process approach improves the students’ writing skill better than conventional roundtable technique.

The criteria for accepting the hypothesis is as follows:

- $H_{01}$ is accepted if the t-value is lower than T-table.
- $H_{11}$ is accepted if the t-value is higher than T-table.

Concerning with the second research question, the hypothesis was drawn as follows:

- $H_{02}$: There is no significant improvement on the students’ learning motivations after being taught by using developed roundtable technique based on process approach.
H₃: There is any significant improvement on the students’ learning motivations after being taught by using developed roundtable technique based on process approach.

The criteria for accepting the hypothesis is as follows:

- H₀₂ is accepted if the t-value is lower than t-table.
- H₂ is accepted if the t-value is higher than t-table.

This is the end of the discussion in this chapter. The methods of this research have been discussed systematically.
V. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

This chapter describes the conclusion of the discussions and also the suggestions to the other researchers and English teachers who want to use developed roundtable technique based on process approach and for those who want to conduct the similar research.

5.1. Conclusions

As there are two Research Questions addressed in this research, there are two sub-topics of conclusion would be presented.

5.1.1. Improvement of Writing Skills between the Students Who Are Taught by Using Developed Roundtable Technique Based on Process Approach and Conventional Roundtable Technique

The result of Independent sample t-test indicates that developed roundtable technique based on process approach improves the students’ writing skill better than conventional roundtable technique since there is any significant difference of Normalized Gain between experimental and control class. It can be inferred that the choice of teaching technique is one of essential factors which affects the students’ writing skills.
In this research, developed roundtable based on process approach is more effective than conventional one because it can gives the opportunity for students to learn and help each other through working cooperatively in a roundtable group process by process starts from prewriting, drafting, revising, and editing. Thus, all of the students can solve their problems in every writing process maximally in order to improve their skills.

Specifically, the other result of this research also reveals that developed roundtable technique based on process approach improves the students’ writing skill in the aspect of organization and language use better than conventional roundtable technique because there is any significant difference of Normalized Gain organization and language use between experimental and control class. Since roundtable is developed based on process approach, it can maximally provide the students a chance to cooperatively learn and corrected each other in composing a text with an appropriate language use and text structure in revising and editing process.

5.1.2. Improvement of the Students’ Learning Motivations after Being Taught by Using Developed Roundtable Technique Based on Process Approach

On the other investigation, the result reveals that there is any significant improvement on the students’ learning motivations after being taught by using developed roundtable technique based on process approach. It can be noted that, developed roundtable technique based on process approach is also effective to enhance the students’ learning motivations. Actually, the improvement of the
students’ learning motivation in this research is caused by the implementation of developed roundtable technique based on process approach which is effective to create the interactive teaching in the class by giving opportunity for the students to participate fully in group.

Much deeper, the last result of this research also finds that the students’ intrinsic motivation more improves than extrinsic motivation after being taught by using developed roundtable technique based on process approach because Normalized gain of the students’ intrinsic and intrinsic motivation is significantly different. It can be inferred that developed roundtable technique based on process approach is effective to enhance the students’ learning motivations particularly intrinsic motivation.

5.2. Suggestions
Referring to the conclusion above, some suggestions could be listed for the teachers, learners, and further researchers:

5.2.1. For the Teachers
It is suggested to apply the developed roundtable technique based on process approach to enhance the students' writing skills and learning motivations. By implementing developed roundtable technique based on process approach, it can create interactive teaching and provide the opportunity for the students to participate fully, learn and help each other process by process for learning writing in the class. However, the difficulty in applying developed roundtable technique
based on process approach lies in controlling the students when working in groups. Therefore, the teacher should concentrate fully in managing time and guiding students step by step through employing clear instructions so that students can optimally work cooperatively and learn each other in their groups. In addition, when developed roundtable technique based on process approach is applied for teaching writing, it only can be employed maximally for intermediate learners who have mastered simple tenses and adequate vocabularies.

5.2.2. For the Learners

It is suggested to utilize the developed roundtable technique based on process approach to solve the students’ problems in every writing process in order to improve their skills.

5.2.3. For Further Researchers

It is suggested to conduct the developed roundtable technique based on process approach with randomized subject, larger sample size, longer time period, and supporting qualitative data to get more reliable and valid in the result of the research. In addition, the Learning Motivation Questionnaire of research also needs to be tried out and retranslated into language which is easily understood by students for being more accurate in collecting the data.
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