CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHOD

In this chapter, the writer discusses about the research design, population, sampling, and sample, variable of the study, research instrument, methods in collecting data, the procedure of teaching writing by using Roundtable Technique and Numbered Head Together, method of data analysis, validity and reliability, and then hypothesis testing.

A. Research Design

Research design can be defined as the way for the writer to collect the data. The research design that will be applied by the writer should be suitable with the research and condition of researcher or writer. There are two kinds of approach in educational research; they are Quantitative and Qualitative approach. Then, this study focus on Quantitative approach which determine the relationship between independent variable and dependent variable in a population. In getting the aim of this study, this study belongs to comparative study that used experimental design. Based on Gay (1992) comparative study is the attempt of researcher to determine the cause or reason for existing differences in the behavior or status or group or individual. Related with that explanation by using the comparative research design, this study was aimed to know which one is more effective between Roundtable Technique and Numbered Head Together to improve the students' writing ability in hortatory text at 11th graders.

Furthermore, there were three kinds of experimental design, they are pre-experimental, quasi-experimental, and true experimental. Then, in this study,

quasi-experimental was applied by the writer. The reason why the writer used this design was that the writer took the data in a school. Therefore, the writer could not randomly assign subjects to treatments. It happens because the school system has been organized the students into classes and have schedule well so the writer cannot disturb and reorganize it to accommodate a research study. It is related to Creswell (2009, p. 626) states that quasi-experiments are experimental situation in which the researcher assigns, but not randomly, participants to groups because the experimenter cannot artificially create groups for the experiment.

Then, in this design, there were two classes as the sample. One class was taught by using Roundtable Technique and another class was taught by using Numbered Head Together. Before implementing those techniques as the treatment, the writer conducted the pre-test. It was intended to know the writing ability of the students before giving treatment. After giving the treatment, the post-test was administered to the both of classes. The test was conducted to get the scores that would be compared with the pre-test score. It was aimed to investigate whether there was significance the different score between teaching writing by using Roundtable Technique and Numbered Head Together. In the following, the writer showed the design of this study by the table.

Table 3.1 The Illustration Quasi-experimental Research Design

Class	P1	Y	P2
XI IIS 1 (X-1)	Pre-test	Treatment: Roundtable Technique	Post-test
XI MIA 1 (X-2)	Pre-test	Treatment: Numbered Head Together	Post-test

Explanation:

P1   : Pre-test (conducting pre-test in both of the groups)

Y   : Treatment (giving treatment by using Roundtable Technique in X-1 and Numbered Head Together in X-2)

P2   : Post-test (conducting post-test in both of groups)

Based on the table above, the procedures in conducting the quasi-experimental research design are:

1. The first is administering the pre-test in both of the class. It was aimed to measure the writing ability of the students before giving the treatment in each group.

2. The second is applying the treatment in both of the class. Students in XI IIS 1 was treated by using Roundtable Technique in teaching hortatory text. Meanwhile, the students in XI MIA 1 was given Numbered Head Together as their treatment to teach hortatory text.

3. The last is administering the post-test in both of the groups. It was purposed to know which one of the technique between round table and numbered head together that more effective to be applied in teaching writing of hortatory text.

B. Population, Sampling, Sample

1. Population

According to Sugiyono (2013, p. 115) population is the region of generalization that consist of object or subject that has certain quality and characteristic, which is applied by the researcher to be understood. It means

that the population is group of object in which the writer can get the data form them and the result can be generalizable.

Moreover, this study was aimed to find out which technique more effective between Roundtable Technique and Numbered Head Together to improve the students' writing ability especially in hortatory text. So, the population of this study was the students of 11th grade at MAN 3 Blitar. In MAN 3 Blitar, there are 10 classes of 11th grade which every class consist of 33-37 students and the populations are 366 students.

2. Sampling

Sampling is the way of the writer in deciding the object or sample for her study from the population. There are two kinds of samplings; they are probability and non-probability sampling. In this study, the writer used non-probability sampling. It meant that each individual do not have the same chance to be selected as the sample in the research. Then, the type of non-probability sampling that used in this study was purposive sampling. According to Ary et al (2010, p. 156) purposive sampling is refers to as judgment sampling sample elements judge to be typical or representative are chosen from the population. It can be simplified that purposive sampling is the way of get the sample based on the purpose of the study.

Moreover, the writer had the reason why used purposive sampling as her way to select the sample. The reason was by this sampling the writer chose the class that had average ability especially in writing. This class was categorized as normal class. It meant that there was progress of the sample when they were given the treatment. Thus, the writer believed that if the students was

stimulated by Roundtable Technique and Numbered Head Together as the treatment, their writing ability in hortatory text could be improve.

3. Sample

Sample is a part of population that smaller than population. Related with the purposive sampling that was applied, the writer determined two classes as the sample in this study, they were XI IIS 1 and XI MIA 1. Both of those classes became the experimental group. There were 33 students in XI IIS 1 and 36 students in XI MIA 1. So, the total of the sample in this study was 69 students.

C. Variable of Study

Based on Ary (2010, p. 37) variable is a construct characteristic that can take on different values or scores. It means that variable is the characteristic of the object that researched. The variable can affect the result of the study. In this study, the writer used two variables; they were independent variable (X) and dependent variable (Y).

1. Independent Variable

Independent variable is variable that affects the dependent variable. It related with Brown (2004) that said variable selected by the researcher to determine their effect on or relationship with dependent variable. Then, this study had two independent variables (X); they were Roundtable Technique as X-1 and Numbered Head Together as X-2.

2. Dependent variable

Dependent variable is observed to determine what effect, if any, the other types of variables may have on it (Brown, 2004). It meant that

variable is the variable that affected by independent variable (X). The dependent variable (Y) of this study was students' writing ability in hortatory text, which was indicated by students' score of writing hortatory text in the post-test.

D. Research Instrument

Research instrument is a tool to collect the data in a research or study. It is related with Arikunto (2006, p. 150) that said research instrument is also a tool or facilitate that used by the researcher to collect the data. Then, as an experimental study, the writer used test as the instrument to collect the required data. Ary et.al. (2010, p. 201) stated that test was a set of stimuli presented to individual in order to elicit response on the basis of which a numerical score can be assigned.

Moreover, the test was used in the study was essay writing test. The students were asked to make hortatory text related with the topic that they chose. The test was intended to measure the students' writing ability before and after giving the treatments Roundtable Technique and Numbered Head Together (RNHT). The test was given before treatment called as pre-test. This test was intended to measure the students' score in writing of hortatory text before the treatment be given. Meanwhile, the test was administered after treatment called as post-test and it was aimed to measure the students' score in writing hortatory text after given the treatment.

E. Method in Collecting Data

Method can be defined as the way or step. Related with that, method collecting data is the systematically of way which applied by the researchers

to get or collect the data. Then, the method in collecting data in this study was by administering test. The test was conducted twice, the first was pre-test and the second was post-test. The details explanation was in the following:

1. **Pre-test**

Pre-test is the test, which conducted before the students get the treatment. In this study, the pre-test was given for two classed, they were XI IIS 1 and XI MIA 1. The pre-test was conducted on March 5th, 2020 either XI IIS 1 or XI MIA 1. In that time there were no students who absent in both of the classes. In this test, the students were invited to write hortatory text by the topic, which had been provided by the writer. The writer provided three topics and the students could choose one of them. The time allotment for this test was 60 minutes. It was considered in try out that had been conducted before in XI IIS 2. In that time, the writer settled 45 minutes for the students to write hortatory text, but that time was not enough. Therefore, the writer added the time allotment to be 60 minutes and the students could finish their work in that time properly.

2. **Post-test**

The post-test was administered after the treatment. The post-test in XI IIS 1 was administered on 11th April, 2020 while XI MIA 1 was conducted on 14th April, 2020. The level of difficulty of the test was still same with the pre-test, but the topic was different. In this test, the writer provided three topics. The students were asked to choose of

those topics. Then, they wrote hortatory text based on their own topic choice. The time allotment of this test was 60 minutes. This test was applied to know the effect of the students' writing ability in hortatory after given the treatment. Besides the score of this test was used to compare the differentiation of students' writing ability between the students who were taught by using Roundtable Technique with the students who were taught by using Numbered Head Together.

F. Treatment

Treatment is the sequence of step to conduct experimental research design. The treatment was given after conducting pre-test. The aim of treatment in this study was to compare which technique was more effective between Roundtable Technique and Numbered Head Together in teaching writing especially hortatory text. In this study, the treatment was applied for two classes either XI IIS 1 or XI MIA 1. The students in XI IIS 1 were treated by using Roundtable Teaching to teach writing of hortatory text. Meanwhile, the students in XI MIA 1 were taught by using Numbered Head Together. In each class the treatment was given twice or two meetings.

The treatment in XI IIS 1 was conducted on 7th March, 2020 and 12th March, 2020. The treatment that conducted was classroom meeting. The first treatment was be held on 7th March, 2020. The activity in giving treatment was divided three parts (pre activity, main activity and post activity). In pre activity, the writer opened the class by asking the condition of students. Then, the writer gave them ice breaking (brain hand game). It was aimed to refresh their mind from the lesson before. After that in main activity, the writer

applied Roundtable Technique to teach writing of hortatory text. Before applying the technique, the writer explained what the meaning of hortatory text, generic structure, and language feature of hortatory text. After the students understood about hortatory text, the writer invited the students to make a group which consist of 6-7 students. They sat down in O shape with the table in front of them. The writer gave them a piece of paper in every group. Then, they were asked to prepare a pen on the table and they must keep all things except a paper and a pen. After that, the writer gave the students three topics and let them to choose one of topic and then all of the group must be in the same topic. Then, the writer explained the rules for this technique, they were:

a. The time in this technique was 15 minutes

b. The paper was given from one student to the other and when the get the paper they had to write the sentence that related with the topic and sentence before. They could not let the paper without write a sentence on it. The students do that until the time is up.

c. Among of the members in group were allowed to give supporting for their friends who got the turn to write the sentence, but they could not take place where they should be.

Moreover, when the time is up the writer asked the groups to exchange their writing project. They counted how many sentences that had been produced. The last, the writer asked two groups to send a volunteer as representative of their groups to read a lot their writing in front of their friends. Then, in the post-activity, the writer gave appreciation for the entire

group and the winner, which had, wrote more sentences than the other group. The writer evaluated the activity that had been done. In the last minutes, the writer remembered the students to study hard and prepared the lesson for next meeting.

The second treatment of Roundtable Technique in XI IIS 1 was conducted on 12th March, 2020. It was to be the last treatment in this class. When, the writer entered the class, the students looked tired. They said that they got daily test in the previous subject. So, the writer invited the students to play brain hand game as like in the previous meeting, but the tempo was faster than before. A few minutes later, the game was ended. Then, the writer continued the activity in the main activity. The writer recalled the students' understanding about hortatory text. The writer asked the students to open their worksheet and look in one of a hortatory text there. The writer called three students randomly to read a lot of the text, one paragraph for on student. The students were asked to analyze about the structure of the text, language feature, and the aims of the text. Most of the students could show those elements.

Then, the writer asked the students to make the group, but the members had to be different with the previous meeting. Every group consisted of 6-7 students. The writer explained that the activity was making hortatory text with Roundtable technique. The rules were the same with the first treatment before. Then, writer gave them a piece of paper in each group and asked them to keep their things in their bag except one pen to write the hortatory text. The writer gave the rest topics from previous meeting through LCD projector. After that

when the time was settled up, they started to write. The situation was very busy than previous meeting because they competed among the groups to be the winner. When the time was up, they exchanged their writing and counted the sentences that they had written. The group that had fewest sentences, it got reward in the form of powder sprinkle that had to spread on their face. Then in the post-activity, the writer evaluated the activities that had been done. The writer gave applause the winner and all the students which had participated well. Finally, the writer closed the meeting and announced that would be held post-test next meeting.

Besides, the treatment in XI MIA 1 was conducted on 11th March, 2020 and finished on 12th March, 2020 and the treatment was Numbered Head Together (NHT). The treatment was applied twice. The treatment was classroom meeting. The teaching and learning process were divided three parts, they were pre-activity, main activity, and post-activity, and then the treatment was taken in the main activity. The first treatment of NHT in XI MIA 1 was be held on 11th March, 2020. In the pre-activity, the writer started the class by asking their condition. Then, the writer asked what the issue about the environment was. They said that littering was to one of the issue in their environment. Then in the main activity before giving NHT as the treatment, the writer played a short video related with their answer, it was the effect of littering. It was aimed to stimulate the students in getting the meaning of hortatory text.

After the end of video, the writer reviewed the content of video with the students. Through that video the writer, introduced what the hortatory text

was, the generic structure of the hortatory text, and the language features of the hortatory text. The writer let the students to ask if they did not understand with the explanation. Then, after all students get the meaning about hortatory, the writer divided them into several groups. One group consisted of 4 students. Each member got the number from the writer that used in his or her head. It was to be the characteristic of NHT.

Moreover, the writer distributed a card for every group that consisted of a case, instruction, and 4 questions. Those questions were to be a part of applying NHT. The students who got number one before, they had to do the question for number one and so on. So, every member got the job and they had to finish their work. They must be responsible with their part. There were no students who not doing the task. They were let to help each other, but they could not replace their friends. If they had finished, they arranged their answer to be a hortatory text. The time allocation for producing the writing was 15 minutes. When the time was up the writer called the number and name of the group randomly. The student who was called, she/he had to represent his group to deliver the product of his writing in the group. The writer gave applause to the representatives of the groups. Then, in the post-activity, the writer evaluated all of the activities that had been done. The writer also reminded them to study in the house and prepared for the next meeting.

Furthermore, the second treatment of NHT in XI MIA 1 was conducted on 12th March, 2020. The writer opened the class by asking the students to say *basmallah* together. The writer also invited them to say their jargon to make their spirit warm up again. Then, the writer reviewed the material of the

previous meeting that was hortatory text. The writer gave some questions to the students about breakfast. Then, the writer correlated their answer with the hortatory text that stated in their worksheet. The students looked the text in their worksheet. Next, the writer propose question about the text that related with the structure of hortatory text, language features of hortatory text, and the purpose of the topic on the hortatory text to the reader. There were some students who raised their hand and they wanted to answer those questions. They could answer the questions correctly.

In main activity, the students were invited to make new group. The member must be different with the previous group. Then, they were given number and they had to used it in their head. This was to be the feature from NHT. This number indicated what number of question that they would do. Next, the writer gave a card for each group, which consisted of a case, instruction, and 4 question. The case was still related with the review before in pre-activity. Then, the steps applying NHT to teach writing hortatory in this second treatment was still same with the first treatment on 11th March, 2020. After the students finished in their writing, they called some groups randomly to deliver their writing in front of their friends. Then, the other group let to give comment or suggestion towards their friends' writing. The writer gave applause for the representative groups because they were ready to represent their group and deliver their writing. In post-activity, the writer evaluated all activities during the teaching and learning process. She also, said thanks for their nice attention along the activities that done start from the first meeting.

Then. The writer announced that they would get post-test in the next meeting. In the last, the writer closed the class by reciting *hamdallah* together.

G. The Procedures of Teaching Writing by Using Round Table Technique

The focus on this study was to which one more the effective between Roundtable Technique and Numbered Head Together towards the students' writing ability in hortatory text. In the following was described the procedures of applying Roundtable Technique to teach writing of hortatory text. It was applied in XI IIS 1. This procedure was modified from the previous studies, which was adjusted with the condition and situation of students. Then, the ways were:

1. The writer divided the students to be several groups. Each group consisted of 6-7 members.
2. The students sat with their members with the O shape and the table in front of them.
3. The writer gave a piece of paper for each group.
4. Each group was asked to prepare one pen and keep the things in the bag except pen and paper that was going to use to write hortatory text.
5. The writer gave three topics with the pictures in LCD projector.
6. All the groups were asked to choose one of those topic and they had to take the same topic. So, selection of the topics was considered by their agreement.

7. The writer explained the rules of writing hortatory text by using Roundtable Technique, they were:

   d. Each group decided one member to be the first students who write the first sentence or to be the beginning.

   e. The students wrote hortatory text by using a pen and on a piece of paper that have been prepared. They did not let to use another pen.

   f. The paper had to be turned from the first member to another in a group and each of the members had to contribute in making a text of hortatory text.

   g. They did not let the paper pass without an ideas or a sentence that written.

   h. They were given 15 minutes to write hortatory text.

   i. The group that could finish their work before 15 minutes, they got plus point.

8. When the time was up, the writer asked the students to exchange their work to another group.

9. They counted how many sentences that they had written.

10. The winner was the group that wrote more sentences than the other groups.

11. The writer asked three representatives group to read a lot their writing alternately.

12. The other group gave response to the writing of their friends.

13. The teacher gave feedback in generally about the students' writing and appreciation for their participation in that activity.

H. The procedure of Teaching Writing by Using Numbered Head Together

This study had two independent variables, they were Roundtable technique and Numbered Head together. The procedure of Roundtable Technique had been explained before and in this session were going to discussed about the procedure in Numbered Head Together (NHT) to teach writing especially hortatory text. This technique was applied in XI MIA 1. The procedures in this technique were modified from previous studies which adjusted with the situation and condition of the students, but this was not far away different. The procedures were:

1. The students were divided into several groups. One group consist of 4 students

2. Every member got the number (1,2,3,4).

3. The students used the number in their head

4. The teacher gave a card in each group. In the card, there was a case, instruction and four questions.

5. The writer explained the rules in this technique, they were:

   a. Each member must answer a question based on his or her head number.

   b. Each member was responsible with his or her task

   c. The students could help each other in a group, but they could not replace their friends' task.

   d. The students arranged their answer to be a text of hortatory. One group one product of writing that must be submitted later.

e. The students had to make sure that their friends in a group understand what their answer. So, when they got calling randomly from the writer to read a lot their answer or writing, they could represent their group well.

f. The time allocation for doing the task was 15 minutes.

6. When the time was up, the writer called the group and numbers 2-3 students as representative their group randomly. She or he that got the calling must represent their group and read a lot his or her writing in a group.

7. The others group gave response to the writing that was read.

8. The writer gave feedback for the entire group and did not forget to evaluate about the activity that was done.

9. The writer gave appreciation to all the students

I. Data Analysis

Data analysis is the way that is used by the researcher or writer to analyze the data, which have been gotten. Then, the purpose of this study was to compare different score of the writing in hortatory text between the students who were taught by using Roundtable Technique and those who were taught by using Numbered Head Together (NHT) of 11th graders at MAN 3 Blitar. The data of this study was students' writing of hortatory text. In analyzing the data in this study was applied statistical method. The data that was analyzed in this study collected from the pre-test and post-test which had been conducted before. The data was analyzed by using SPSS 16.0 version. It was counted to find out the mean, median, and standard deviation of variable X-1 and X-2.

The procedure in analyzing the data used descriptive and inferential statistic. The function of descriptive statistic is to describe the condition of the study such as mean, median, mode, and standard deviation. After getting the description of the scores, the writer used T-test to know the significant different effect of teaching writing of hortatory text between using Roundtable Technique and NHT. The analyzing was used by using independent sample T-test.

J. Validity and Reliability

In this study, the instrument to get data was test. The test can be categorized in good test if the test fulfills two requirements, they are validity and reliability. The detail information of validity in this study was explained below.

1. Validity

In quantitative study the validity and reliability is the important aspect, which can be forgotten. According to Fraenkel and Wallen (2009, p. 150) validity is the most important idea to consider when preparing or selecting an instrumental for use. This validity was used to measure what should be measured. It was supported by Hughes (2000, p. 26) a test is said to be valid if it is measures accurately what is intended to measures. Then, in measuring the test of this study, there were three validities that used, they were face validity, content validity, and construct validity.

a. Face Validity

Face validity is one of the validity, which measure the content of the test is suitable with the subject that is tested or not. Ary et.all (2010, p. 228)

stated that face validity is the extent to which examinee believe the instrument is measuring what is supposed to measure. Moreover, the test of this study was designed to measure the writing ability of the students in hortatory text. There are many aspects, which should be considered in making a good test based on the face validity, they are:

1) The instruction of the test must be clear so that the students got the meaning what should they do.

2) In the test, the students XI IIS 1 and XI MIA 1 were asked to write hortatory text based on the topic that was provided by the writer. The topic was selected based on recently issues and their level.

3) The time allocation used in finishing the test must be clear so that the students can produce the writing well. Then, the time allocation for this test was 60 minutes. It was based on the try out that was conducted before the test. The try out was conducted in XI IIS 2 and it was be held on 4th March, 2020. The try out was applied to try out the instruction and topics that would be used in the test. In try out the students were given 45 minutes or one hour of learning, but they could not finish their work. Then, the writer gave additional time 15 minutes for them and they could finish it in a right time. Hence, the time allocation in the test was 60 minutes.

b. Content Validity

According to Best and Kahn (1995) explain that content validity refers to the degree to which the test actually measures or is specially related to the traits for which it was design, content, validity, is based upon

the careful examination of course textbooks, syllabus, objectives, and the judgments of subject matter specialists. It means the content validity of the instrument can be known from the compatibility between the instrument and the sources (curriculum or syllabus). In the context of this study, the content validity refers to 2013 National Curriculum or known as K13.

The writer conducted consultation with the expert such as advisor lecturer and also validator as the way to validate the instruments that had been set up. In this study, the content of the item in testing used hortatory text. It was suitable for the 11th graders at MAN 3 Blitar because the test based on the material and basic competence in K13. So, the instrument of this study fulfilled the requirement of having content validity.

Table 3.2 English Syllabus about Hortatory Text

Basic Competence	Indicator
3.9. Membedakan fungsi sosial, struktur teks, dan unsur kebahasaan beberapa teks hortatory exposition tulis dengan memberi dan meminta informasi terkait pendapat mengenai topik yang hangat dibicarakan umum, argumentasi pendukung, serta saran sesuai dengan konteks penggunaannya.	3.9.1. Menjelaskan fungsi sosial, struktur teks, dan unsur kebahasaan beberapa teks hortatory exposition tulis dengan memberi dan meminta informasi terkait pendapat mengenai topik yang hangat dibicarakan umum, argumentasi pendukung, serta saran sesuai dengan konteks penggunaannya. 3.9.2. Menganalisis perbedaan fungsi sosial, struktur teks, dan unsur kebahasaan beberapa teks hortatory exposition tulis dengan memberi dan meminta informasi terkait pendapat mengenai topik yang hangat dibicarakan umum, argumentasi pendukung, serta saran sesuai dengan

	konteks
4.9. Teks hortatory exposition	
4.9.1.Menangkap makna secara kontekstual terkait fungsi sosial, struktur teks, dan unsur kebahasaan teks hortatory exposition tulis terkait isu aktual.	4.9.1.1. Mengidentifikasi makna secara kontekstual terkait fungsi sosial, struktur teks, dan unsur kebahasaan teks hortatory exposition tulis terkait isu aktual. 4.9.1.2. Menyampaikan makna secara kontekstual terkait fungsi sosial, struktur teks, dan unsur kebahasaan teks hortatory exposition tulis terkait isu
4.9.2.Menyusun teks hortatory exposition tulis terkait isu aktual dengan memperhatikan fungsi sosial, struktur teks, dan unsur kebahasaan secara benar dan sesuai konteks.	4.9.2.1. Mengembangkan topik ke dalam judul yang menarik untuk menyusun teks hortatory exposition tulis terkait isu aktual dengan memperhatikan fungsi sosial, struktur teks, dan unsur kebahasaan secara benar dan sesuai konteks. 4.9.2.2. Membuat gagasan utama sesuai dengan topik untuk menyusun teks hortatory exposition tulis terkait isu aktual dengan memperhatikan fungsi sosial, struktur teks, dan unsur kebahasaan secara benar dan sesuai konteks. 4.9.2.3. Mengembangkan gagasan utama ke dalam paragraf untuk menyusun teks hortatory exposition tulis terkait isu aktual dengan memperhatikan fungsi sosial, struktur teks, dan unsur kebahasaan secara benar dan sesuai konteks. 4.9.2.4. Memproduksi teks hortatory sederhana terkait isu aktual dengan memperhatikan fungsi sosial, struktur teks, dan unsur kebahasaan secara

		benar dan sesuai konteks.

c. Construct Validity

According to Johnson (2001, p. 303) that construct validity deals with relationship between a test and a particular view of language and language learning. It means that the test should be appropriate with the theory of the skill and the component of language. Then, the test of this study measured the students' writing ability in hortatory text. In scoring, the students' writing ability was used scoring rubric to avoid the subjectivities. In this study, the scoring rubric in measuring the student's writing ability in hortatory text was adapted from Brown (2007, p. 214). The technique of scoring was based on five aspect, they were content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics. In the following was showed the scoring rubric which covers of those aspects.

Table 3.3 Scoring Rubric for The Aspect of Writing

No	Aspects of Writing	Criteria	Score	Weighting
1.	Content (C) 30% -Topic -Detail	The topic is complete and clear and the details are relating to the topic	4	3x
		The topic is complete and clear but the details are almost relating to the topic	3	
		The topic is complete and clear but the details are not relating to the topic	2	
		The topic is not clear and the details are not relating to the topic	1	
2.	Organization (O) 20% -Identification -Description	Identification is complete and descriptions are arranged with proper connectives	4	2x
		Identification is almost complete and descriptions are	3	

		arranged with almost proper connectives		
		Identification is not complete and descriptions are arranged with few misuse connectives	2	
		Identification is not complete and descriptions are arranged with misuse connectives	1	
3.	Grammar (G) 20% -Use simple present -Agreement	Very few grammatical and agreement inaccuracies	4	2x
		New grammatical and agreement but do not affect the meaning inaccuracies	3	
		Numerous grammatical and agreement inaccuracies	2	
		Frequent grammatical and agreement inaccuracies	1	
4.	Vocabulary (V) 15% -Word choice	Effective word choice, word forms and appropriate word number ad sufficient word number	4	1.5x
		Few misuses of word, word forms, but not change the meaning	3	
		Limited range confusing word choice, no word forms, and less word number	2	
		Very poor knowledge of words and word forms, limited word number	1	
5.	Mechanics (M) 15% -Spelling	It use correct spelling, punctuations, and capitalization	4	1.5x
		It has occasional errors of spelling, punctuation, and capitalization	3	
		It has frequent errors of spelling, punctuation, and capitalization	2	
		It is dominated by errors of spelling, punctuation, and capitalization.	1	

$$Score = \frac{3C + 2O + 2G + 1.5V + 1.5M}{40} \times 100$$

Then, the score could be categorized as the table below:

Table 3.4. Table of Criteria Students' Score

Criteria	Range Score
Excellent	86-100
Good	71-85
Fair	56-70
Poor	41-55
Very Poor	25-40

Qualification of scores:

86-100   = Exceeds the standard

71-85   = Meets the standard

56-70   = Approaches the standard

41-55   = Avoids the standard

25-40   = Does not meet the standard

2. Reliability

Reliability is a way to measure the consistency of a question of the test or instrument. It can be conducted by doing inter-rater reliability. Inter-rater reliability refers to consistency of scores given by two or more scorer to the same set of oral or written texts (Sarosdy et.al. 2006, p. 135). In this study, two scorers were the writer and her friend from English Department that also doing research in that time.

Furthermore, in making the test, the writer had discussed it with her advisor and the English teacher in MAN 3 Blitar. Through for several consultation, finally the test was accepted and the writer could take the data. Before the test was given to XI IIS 1 and XI MIA 1, the test were tried out in another class with the same level that was XI IIS 2. Try out was done on It was done on March 4th 2020. It was conducted to know how far the reliable of the test. After the writer got score from the try out, it was analyzed by using

SPSS 16.0 version. Hence, the writer knew whether the test of this study reliable or not. The result of computing reliability could be seen in the table 3.5 as the following:

Table 3.5 The Result of Reliability

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	17	100.0
	Excluded^a	0	.0
	Total	17	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.893	2

In measuring the reliability, the writer used Cronbach's Alpha to check whether the test was reliable or not. Then, the picture above showed that the score of Cronbach's Alpha was 0.893. It was interpreted by using Sujianto's statement (2009, p. 97) as the following table:

Table 3.6 Cronbach's Alpha Interpretation Based on Sujianto

Cronbach's Alpha	Interpretation
0.00 – 0.20	Less reliable
0.21 – 0.40	Rather reliable
0.41 – 0.60	Quite reliable
0.61 – 0.80	Reliable
0.81 – 1.00	Very reliable

Moreover, from the table above the value Cronbach' Alpha of this study was in category very reliable. It could be seen that the value of Cronbach's Alpha this study was 0.893 and it was in the middle of value $0.81 < 0.893 < 1.00$.

K. Normality and Homogeneity Testing

1. Normality Testing

Normality testing is a way to test whether the variable normal or not. Normal means that the data have normal distribute. Then, the normality testing was applied in this study. It is necessary for the writer to know that the data involved in the study in normal distribution.

Moreover, in measuring the normality testing, the writer used One Sample Kolmogrov-Sminorv in SPSS 16.0 version. The value of significance (α) is 0.05. The decision of normality testing was the following:

a. If the significance value > 0.05, the data have normal distribution

b. If the significance value < 0.05 the data did not have normal distribution

Furthermore, the result of normality testing in this study can be seen in in the table 3.7 that is presented in the following.

Table 3.7 The Result of Normality Testing

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		ROUNDTABLE_IIS1	NHT_MIA1
N		33	36
Normal Parameters[a]	Mean	69.27	76.78
	Std. Deviation	6.811	8.715
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.148	.212
	Positive	.139	.182
	Negative	-.148	-.212
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.852	1.270
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.463	.079

Based on the result of normality testing in the table 3.7, it showed that the value of Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) in Roundtable was 0.463 and the value of Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed in NHT (Numbered Head Together) was 0.079. It means that the value of normality in both of group is higher than 0.05 (0.463 > 0.05 and 0.079 > 0.05). Therefore, it can be interpreted that both of them had normal distribution.

2. Homogeneity Testing

Homogeneity testing is the test that used to know the similarity of the two condition or population. This test is intended to see that the data come from the population having same variance. In this study, the testing of the homogeneity was used ANNOVA in SPSS 16.0 version with the significance (α) = 0.05. The detail in making the homogeneity testing was the following:

1. If the significance value > 0.05, the data distribution was homogeneous.

2. If the significance value < 0.05, the data distribution was not homogeneous

Then, the result of homogeneity testing in this study can be seen in the table 3.8 as the following:

Table 3.8 The Result of Homogeneity Testing

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Score

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
2.165	7	23	.077

Based on the result of the table above, the value of Sig (Significance) was 0.77. It means that the Sig was higher than 0.05 (0.77 > 0.05). Thus, it can be conclude that the samples or groups had the same variances.

L. Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis testing is a part to know whether the null hypothesis (H_0) rejected or not. In other word, hypothesis testing is intended to answer the research question of the study. Then, the step in hypothesis testing was described below, they are:

1. **Stating the hypothesis**

   The hypothesis of this study are:

   c. Null Hypothesis (H_o): There is no significant different score in students' writing ability in hortatory text that taught by using Roundtable technique and Numbered Head Together.

   d. Alternative Hypothesis (H_a): There is significant different score in students' writing ability in hortatory text that taught by using Roundtable technique and Numbered Head Together

2. **Finding the critical value**

   After stating the hypothesis, the writer decided the significance level or the tolerance of error at α = (5% or 0.05) because this study is about language and education.

3. **Computing the test value**

   In order to compute the test value, this study used SPPS 16.0 version.

4. **Drawing the conclusion**

   After calculating the data in SPSS, the writer will make the conclusion in analysis. The Null hypothesis is rejected it can be explained that if the P-value is less than 0.05 and the opposite if the P-value is bigger or equal than 0.05 the Null Hypothesis is not rejected. The P-value in SPSS shows

Significance (Sig). So, if the result of this study shows that the data of P-value less than 0.05, the null hypothesis that tell the students who are taught by Round Table Technique have different score with those are taught by Numbered Head Together will be rejected. Then the opposite, if the P-value of this study show bigger or equal than 0.05 the null hypothesis is will be not rejected.