The Effectiveness of Roundtable Technique to Teach Writing Descriptive Text for Students with Low Self-Efficacy

Desna Fauziah[1], Mukhaiyar[2], and Ratmanida[3]
[1] Universitas Negeri Padang, Padang, Indonesia, ✉ (e-mail), [1]fauziahdesna@gmail.com
[2]Universitas Negeri Padang, Padang, Indonesia, ✉ (e-mail), [2]mukhaiyar@fbs.unp.ac.id,
[3] Universitas Negeri Padang, Padang, Indonesia, ✉ (e-mail) [3]ratmanida@fbs.unp.ac.id,

Abstract

Self efficacy is someone's belief of his capability to complete a task or to perform something. Zimmerman and Martinez-Pons, as cited in Kitikanan and Sasimonton (2017: 4) say, "Students with high self-efficacy tend to learn and achieve more than those with low ones". In other words, when someone has high self-efficacy, his/her effort to do writing will be better and it is assumed that their writing achievement will be better as well. On the contrary, students with low self-efficacy often have lower score of writing than the students with high self-efficacy. Then, many techniques work well for only students with high self-efficacy. This study was designed to see whether or not Roundtable technique is effective to be used to teach writing descriptive text for the students with low self-efficacy. The research was done at Al-Azhar Islamic Junior High School 32 Padang. This was an experimental research design with 51 students in the population. The students were spread in three classes which consisted of 17 students in each class. Two classes were chosen as the sample by using cluster random sampling technique. One class was the experiment class, and the other was as control class. Students' self-efficacy was tested by using questionnaires. Then, they were grouped into students with high and low self-efficacy. After that they were given treatment. The data were then collected after the treatment was given by administering writing test. The students' writing achievement scores were analyzed by using t-test formula and the level of significance used was 0.05 (5 %). After being calculated, the value of t-observed was 2.975, whereas the t-table was 2.306. Consequently, Roundtable technique was effective to be used to teach the students with low self-efficacy to write descriptive text at Al-Azhar Islamic Junior High School 32 Padang.

Keywords*: teaching descriptive text, roundtable technique, students' self-efficacy*

Introduction

It has been known that writing is very important. It is very needed in many aspects of life. Therefore, writing is learned early, started at Junior High school. One kind of text that has to be learned in this level is descriptive text. This is the first kind of text that the students learn before recount, narrative, procedure, and report text. It is agreed as the simple text to be learned. As stated in Descriptive Text in Teaching English (2010: 1) "A descriptive text is considered as the simplest and easiest writing form compared to narrative, recount, or procedure, particularly for the beginning writers".

However, students at Junior high school have problems in writing descriptive text. Rini (2013) conducted a qualitative study on students' ability to write descriptive text at SMP N 2 Kartasura. She found that writing descriptive text was difficult for the students at junior high school. The students' problems in writing descriptive text were in arranging elements of descriptive text, composing sentences, memorizing the vocabulary, and spelling words. Then, Winda (2016) conducted a qualitative research studied the students' ability in writing descriptive text

at grade VIII at MTSN Lubuk Buaya Padang. She found that writing descriptive text was difficult for the students. The result of her research revealed that the problems faced by the students were mostly based on two indicators. They were in generic structures and language features. Students found difficulties both in writing identification and description paragraph. However, based on the two indicators, identification paragraph was more difficult for the students than description paragraph. Moreover, students also found difficulties in writing sentences with the correct grammar. Based on these two researches, it can be said that writing is difficult for the students.

In fact, writing is a skill which is rarely taught to learners at high school level level. Ramadani (2014) mentions that students at high school level in Indonesia do not have enough exposure to writing. Writing is limited to producing loose sentences while the skill to develop ideas is not developed. This may hamper students' writing achievement. There are several reasons why writing skill is rarely taught to learners. First, it is difficult to plan and teach this skill. Second, writing skill is not tested in semester or final examination. Third, the teacher is more often preoccupied with explaining the parts (generic structure) of a text than by applying it in a student's writing. Finally, teaching writing skills is very time consuming in the process and also in providing feedback.

Those problems might be not a big problem for the students with high self-efficacy. No matter the teaching techniques used by the teacher, the students would put much effort to finish their writing task. Yet, what happens to the students with low self-efficacy? They would have low motivation to write since they believe that they cannot do the writing activities and believe that they cannot get a good score in writing. As mentioned by Wening (2016) that when the students believe that they have high capability in doing activities in writing, their writing performance would be better than those who have low belief that they have low capability in doing activities in writing. Then, Zimmerman and Martinez-Pons, as cited in Kitikanan and Sasimonton (2017: 4) say, "Students with high self-efficacy tend to learn and achieve more than those with low ones". In other words, when someone has high self-efficacy, his/her effort to do writing will be better and it is assumed that their writing achievement will be better as well.

Some studies related to the use of Roundtable technique as one of cooperative learning model have been conducted. Hapsari (2011) conducted a study on the use of roundtable technique to improve students' achievement in writing hortatory exposition text in SMA Negeri I Batang" (Hapsari: 2011). The objectives of this study are to investigate whether Roundtable technique gives contribution to improve students' achievement in writing hortatory exposition text and to discover difficulties faced by students of SMA Negeri I Batang in using Roundtable technique in writing hortatory exposition text. To achieve the objectives of the study, she conducted an action research. She used four steps: planning, acting, observing, and reflecting. The students could not write the correct form of hortatory exposition text before the treatment. After they got the treatment, they could write hortatory exposition text in correct organization and grammar. Students' achievement in writing hortatory exposition text improved. In addition, most students were interested in the teaching activities by using Roundtable Technique in writing hortatory exposition text. Then, they were able to apply Roundtable technique well. From the findings, she concluded than the use of Roundtable technique in teaching writing hortatory exposition text is very beneficial for students. Then, Khaghaninezhad and Kaashef (2014) did a research on applying cooperative language learning techniques in Iranian English Language Teaching (ELT) context. The cooperative learning techniques used were the three-step interview, round-table, think-pair-share, solve-pair-share and numbered heads. The study attempted to investigate the possible effects of applying cooperative learning techniques in Iranian context. The participants of the study were intermediate EFL learners of three private English institutes in Iran. The results showed that cooperative teaching of English as a foreign language had a significant effect on the overall achievement and their pronunciation proficiency of experimental Iranian English learners. Moreover, Tavil and Bilen (2015) investigated the effects of cooperative learning strategies on vocabulary skills of 4th grade students in Turkey. They used several techniques using cooperative learning model. One of the techniques that they used was round table. The study was also designed to ascertain the attitudes of the students in the experimental group towards cooperative learning. The

findings reveal that students who are taught by using cooperative learning strategies had better result of vocabulary test. It was also found that the students' positive attitude toward cooperative learning strategies increased progressively during the study.

In addition, Chea and Shumow (2014) studied the correlation between self-efficacy and students' writing achievement at students in Cambodia who learn foreign language. The study reveals that there is a positive correlation between self-efficacy and students' writing achievement. In other words, self-efficacy influences students' writing achievement. Then, Wening (2016) also studied the correlation between self-efficacy and students' writing performance at SMAN I Kalirejo. Based on the study, it was found that there is a significant correlation between students' self—efficacy and their writing performance at SMAN I Kalirejo. It means, when the students believe that they have high capability in doing activities in writing, their writing performance would be better than those who have low belief that they have low capability in doing activities in writing.

Literature Review

Self-Efficacy

Self efficacy is someone's belief of his capability to complete a task or to perform something. Bandura (1997: 3) mentions that self efficacy is students' judgment toward his capability to organize and to do courses that are needed to attain designated types of performances. His judgment will influence how they feel, think, motivate themselves and behave in the classroom. Bandura (1997: 3) furthermore says that people who have strong sense of self-efficacy will approach difficulties as challenge rather than a threat to be avoided. In contrast, he says that people who are doubt about his capabilities will avoid difficult task and assume it as threat to be avoided.

Moreover, self-efficacy can affect motivation. As stated by Zulkosky (2009: 94) "self-efficacy levels can increase or hamper motivation". When facing difficulties, students who have a high sense of efficacy for learning should expend greater effort and persist longer than those who doubt their capabilities. It means that students with a high efficacy will work harder when they encounter difficulties.

In addition, working in group can build greater confidence for the students. It is supported by Crandall (1999: 234-235):

"Peer support can be powerful motivator for shy, insecure, or even uninterested students. In cooperative groups, individuals know that they can get feedback and assistance in making their contributions as clear, relevant, and appropriate as possible. This, in turn, can motivate them to continue to try, especially where peers encourage and support their contributions".

Thus, Students can create and develop self-efficacy as a result of the social persuasions they receive from others in group work structure. These persuasions can involve exposure to the verbal judgments that peers provide. In classroom, students acquire much information about their own capabilities through knowledge of how others perform. It supports the idea that observing similar peers succeed at a task can convey a sense of efficacy to accomplish a task. Students often receive feedback from teachers that they possess capability to perform well.

Concept of Writing

Writing is an activity of expressing someone's ideas which are arranged properly into words and sentences. Nunan (2003: 88) suggests that writing is the process of thinking to invent ideas and express them into statement and paragraph clearly. In writing process, a writer should be able to think and find ideas related to the topic she is going to write. She also has to be able to organize the ideas to create a good product of writing. In addition, according to Brown (2001: 348), "writing is a thinking process". He then explains that writing is a process of putting ideas down on paper to transform thought into words and give them structure and coherent organization. It can be inferred that writing cannot be done instantaneously. A writer should think about what she is going to write, have some ideas in their mind, think about how to put the ideas in correct orders, in order to produce a text which can attract people who read it.

Lyons and Heasly (2006: 13) mention, "Writing is a clearly complex process". Thus, it needs a careful attention. There are some complicated steps need to be done when someone does writing. Brown (2001: 335) then says that written products are the result of thinking, drafting, and revising procedures that require specialized skill. It can be said that people who write needs to be able to think, express ideas, and evaluate the result of their writing. Related to the explanation above, it is understood that writing is a way to express and explain ideas from the writer to the reader. In the process of writing, the writer should be able to organize their ideas or thinking into good paragraph organization to be able to create a good product of writing so that the reader is able to understand it easily.

Descriptive Text

According to Gerot and Wignell, as cited in Elvira and Ardi (2014: 2), "descriptive text is a text type used to tell how something looks, smells, feels, acts, tastes, sound, etc". Basically, it provides detail information about characteristics of people, places, and things. The detail information is used to help the reader in creating mental picture. In short, descriptive text is emphasized in telling something in details.

In addition, descriptive text has two generic structures; identification and description. In identification, learners identify phenomenon or subject that is going to be described. Meanwhile, in description, the learners describe specifically parts, qualities, and characteristics of an object that is being described. Based on the explanation above, we can say that identification introduces or identifies character. Identification, then, is developed in description part. The ideas should be organized to make the reader comprehend the meaning delivered in the descriptive text.

Assessing Writing

According to O'Malley and Pierce (1996: 139), in examining writing, teacher should look at students and their knowledge which is brought to the text. She has to indicate the purpose and genre of writing to determine how students are going to write. Task may consist of questions or statements that will be used by the students in their writing or conditions under which they will write. They should be given time allocation and resources. In simple words, students should be ready to write.

O'Malley and Pierce (1996: 140) then add, testing writing is to know the students' ability in using language and students' ideas through written medium. The purpose of teaching and learning writing is to enable the students to use language skills in social life. In teaching and learning writing, the students are hoped to be able to express ideas into written language.

Heaton (1998: 7) says that by testing writing, students are given opportunity to show ability to perform certain tasks in the language. Teacher can know whether or not the students understand about the text explained by the teacher and teacher can also find out whether or not the students have ability to write the text properly as explained by the teacher.

Furthermore, Heaton (1998: 146) says that there are some components to be tested in writing; they are (1) content/subject, (2), organization / ideas, (3) language uses / grammar, (4) vocabulary / choice of words, (5) mechanics (spelling and punctuations.

Acording to Peha (2002: 3), writing has all the things below: (a) Ideas which are interesting and important. Ideas are the heart of what the writers are writing about and why the writers choose to write about it, (b) organization that is logical and effective. Organization refers to the order of the writers' ideas and the way the writers move from one idea to the next, (c) voice that is individual and appropriate. Voice is how the writers' writing feels to someone when they read it. Voice is the expression of the writers' individual personalities through words, (d) word choice that is specific and memorable. Good writing uses the right words to say the right thing, (e) sentence fluency that is smooth sond expressive. Fluent sentences are easy to understand and fun to read with expression, (f) conventions that are correct and communicative. Conventions are the ways to use punctuations, spelling, grammar, and other things that make writing consistent and easy to read.

Brown says that assessing the students' writing in the class is best served through analytic scoring, which score the organization, logical development of ideas, grammar, punctuation, spelling and mechanics, and style and quality of expression. Meanwhile, according to Jacobs et.al (1981), there are five different categories that needs to be scored in writing, they are content, organization, vocabulary, syntax, mechanics. As the curricular goals vary, the scoring may be tailored. Different emphasis is given based on level. For instance, for intermediate level, an emphasis may be given to syntax and mechanics, while for advance level; an emphasis may be given to organization and development.

Review of Related Findings

In order to support this research, several previous studies done by some researchers were presented below. First, Kousar (2009) studied the effect of direct instruction model on intermediate class achievement and attitude towards English grammar. She found that Direct Instruction is especially useful for teaching well structures subjects like Mathematics, English grammar, etc. It is an approach for teaching that emphasizes well-developed and carefully planned lessons designed around small learning increments and clearly defined and prescribed teaching tasks. It is based on the theory that clear instruction and elimination of misinterpretations can greatly improve and accelerate student learning. In the Direct Instruction approach, teacher's role is to pass facts, rules, or action sequences to students in as direct way as possible. The sample of the study comprised 52 students at the first year who were matched on their ability in English grammar and placed into experimental group and control group on the basis of specially designed pretest. The result of the research is that Direct Instruction Model is consistently better than those of traditional instruction both in terms of achievement and attitude.

On the other hand, another study proved that direct instruction technique is not better than Clustering technique. Styati (2010) studied the effectiveness of clustering technique to teach writing skill viewed from students' linguistic intelligence. It is an experimental research thesis on Descriptive writing for the second semester of English Department of IKIP PGRI Madiun in the academic year 2009/2010. She compared clustering technique and Direct Instruction to teach writing. Her research concludes that students who are taught using clustering technique have better writing ability than those who are taught using Direct Instruction. She conducted a test of linguistic intelligence before doing her research. Related to linguistic intelligence, her research concludes that students who have high linguistic intelligence have better writing ability than those who have low linguistic intelligence.

Then, there is a journal of research in education written by Arra et al. (2011). The title is "Students' Preferences for Cooperative Learning Instructional Approaches: Considerations for College Teachers". He compared the acceptability of three cooperative learning techniques: Think-Pair-Share, Three-Step Interview, and Roundtable. Eighty six college students were first exposed to all three distinct cooperative learning techniques and then asked to rate the acceptability of each. Students completed both quantitative and qualitative assessment measures. The results of the study showed that students significantly preferred the Roundtable technique over the Think-Pair-Share and Three-Step Interview techniques.

The other research related to this study is "the use of roundtable technique to improve students' achievement in writing hortatory exposition text in SMA Negeri I Batang" (Hapsari: 2011). The objectives of this study are to investigate whether Roundtable technique gives contribution to improve students' achievement in writing hortatory exposition text and to discover difficulties faced by students of SMA Negeri I Batang in using Roundtable technique in writing hortatory exposition text. To achieve the objectives of the study, she conducted an action research. She used four steps: planning, acting, observing, and reflecting. The students could not write the correct form of hortatory exposition text before the treatment. After they got the treatment, they could write hortatory exposition text in correct organization and grammar. Students' achievement in writing hortatory exposition text improved. In addition, most students were interested in the teaching activities by using Roundtable Technique in

writing hortatory exposition text. Then, they were able to apply Roundtable technique well. From the findings, she concluded than the use of Roundtable technique in teaching writing hortatory exposition text is very beneficial for students.

The researcher herself conducted a study about "The Effectiveness of Roundtable Technique to Teach Writing Descriptive Text for Students with Low Self-Efficacy". According to the researchers' knowledge, no comprehensive work was dedicated to the use of roundtable technique in teaching writing descriptive text at junior high school for the students with low self-efficacy. This research was hoped to be useful in testing whether Roundtable technique brought a positive outcome toward writing achievement of the students with ow self-efficacy in writing descriptive text.

Operational Definition

In order to avoid misunderstanding in this research, there are several definitions that the researcher is going to explain:

The effect is the outcome or result produced by the techniques used (Roundtable technique and Direct Instruction technique) and writing self-efficacy toward students' writing ability of essay writing.

Roundtable technique is one of cooperative learning model where the students sit in teams. They are given a paper and they have to write their response on the paper by taking turns in the team to help them generate ideas. Teacher gives them time and each of the members has to write his response before passing the paper to the other member of the group.

Students' achievement to write descriptive text is an ability to express ideas which describes someone or something in details into paragraphs that are organized correctly that consist of good introduction, body, conclusion, organization / structure, style, and mechanic.

Self-efficacy is the belief or judgment toward their capability related to component of writing and process of writing, students' belief or judgment toward their capability in grading their writing performance.

Direct Instruction Technique is a technique in which the teacher arranges steps of teaching carefully in details. It emphasizes well developed and carefully planned lessons and is designed around small learning increments and cleanly defined and prescribed teaching tasks.

Method

In this study, the researcher did experimental research. According to Gay and Airisian (2000: 367), "experimental research is the only type of the research that can test hypotheses to establish cause and effects relationship". The design of this research involved two classes, one is as experimental class that was taught using Roundtable technique and the other is as control class which was taught by using Direct Instruction technique. The use of Direct Instruction technique in control class was based on the consideration that both Roundtable technique and Direct Instruction technique divide the students in groups in doing writing. Therefore, it can be said that both of the techniques use cooperative learning method. However, there are some differences between the techniques which can be seen in the table below.

Table 1. Differences between teaching using Roundtable technique and Direct Instruction Technique

Roundtable Technique	Direct Instruction
Teacher initiate the students to understand the generic structure and pattern of a text and then the students are facilitated to generate ideas to produce a text	Teacher initiate the students to understand the generic structure and pattern of a text
The teacher can use many sources to get the topic	The teacher focuses on the available instructional materials

and variations in exposing the topic to the students	such as the worksheets and textbooks
Teacher encourages the students to have many ideas before writing.	Teacher explains the concept clearly and explicitly before students practice writing
Through Roundtable technique, students are motivated to find out the ideas because each of the member has the opportunity	Through Direct Instruction technique, the low ability students will be the spectator because the goal is just to finish the work which will be done by the high ability students
The students have chance to check other groups' work and give comment	The students submit their work to the teacher, no chance to discuss other groups' work
The teacher gives feedback and discuss together with the students about writing	The teacher checks the students work individually when the class finish.

Population

According to Gay and Airisian (2000: 122), population is the group of interest to the researcher, the group to which she/he would like the result of the study to be generalized. The population of this research was the students at grade VIII of Al-Azhar Islamic Junior High School 32 Padang in the academic year 2018/ 2019. The total number of the population was 51 students who are divided into 3 classes, VIII A, VIII B, and VIII C. Each classess consist of 17 students.

Sampling Procedures

The researcher used cluster random sampling in choosing the sample. Gay (2009: 129) says "cluster random sampling is the process of randomly selecting intact groups, not individuals within the defined population sharing similar characteristics". Another consideration of the use of cluster random sampling was because of its practicality and time efficiency. Gay, Mills, and Airasian (2011: 136) explain that cluster sampling involves less time and expense and generally more convenient.

In this research, there were two classes as the sample. The samples were taken randomly from three classes. Before deciding the experimental and control class, the researcher has done the normality and homogeneity testing of the population from the students' score. The score was taken from their midterm test score. This is based on the consideration that there was only one teacher who taught the eighth grade and she used the same tests for the students. After finding out that the population was distributed normally and homogeny, the researcher used lottery to decide the classes to be classified as experimental and control class.

Instrumentation

The instruments used in this research were questionnaire and writing test. The data of students' self-efficacy were taken from the result of self-efficacy questionnaire which consists of 24 items. The questionnaires were developed based on the indicators made by Brunning, the expert of self-efficacy from University of Nebraska which was combined with the indicators from Kauffman who is also from University of Nebraska. Before the questionnaire was given, the items of the questionnaire were consulted with Prof. Dr. Mudjiran,Ms.Kons, as an expert in self-efficacy. He suggested some minor revision in the items since there were some words which were not suitable. After they were revised, the questionnaire was tried out to find out the validity and reliability. From 24 items of questionnaire, 2 items were not valid due to the coefficient relations that were less than 3 (see appendix 6). Therefore, they were deleted. Since the 22 items already represents the indicators, the researcher took the 22 items as the questionnaire. The ideal score of self-efficacy was 110. The questionnaire was distributed before the teaching and learning process began.

Writing test was designed to know the students' ability and competency in writing skill. As stated by Gay and Airisian (2003: 154), "test is designed to provide information about how well the test takers have learned what have been taught". The writing test was given by attaching four pictures on the worksheet. The students chose one of the

pictures that they like to be described. The writer gave space for the students to write. The topic was about describing person, things, and place. Before giving the test to the sample group, the researcher discussed it with the expert in writing, Desvalini Anwar, S.S., M.Hum., Ph.D. to see the validity of the test. Then, after the test was given to the students, the result of the test was checked by two scorers in order to get the reliable scoring. Both scorers were trained to use the scoring rubric. The scoring used Browns' scoring rubrics (Brown: 2003) which use 5 indicators, i.e: organization, content, grammar, mechanic, vocabulary.

Research Design

Both experiment and control class was given the treatment. Experimental class was taught writing descriptive text by using Roundtable technique and the control class was taught by using Direct Instruction technique. Each class got 8 meetings. The time allocation for 1 meeting was 4 x 40 minutes. To make sure that the techniques were done based on the procedures that had been set, the researcher taught both classes. After 8 meetings, the students were given the writing test to know which one of the teaching technique that was more effective to teach the students' writing descriptive

Results and Discussion

The data in table 4.1 shows the result of writing test for the students who have low self-efficacy in experimental and control class.

Table 2. Writing Test Summary of Students with Low Self-Efficacy in Experimental and Control Class

Experimental Class

No	Code	Writing Score
1	FMM	73.5
2	RA	72
3	IMA	84
4	DDP	88
5	VLA	80
Total		397.5
Mean		79.5
Max		88
Min		72
SD		6.80
Variance		46.25

Control Class

No	Code	Writing Score
1	SPF	74.5
2	AA	65.5
3	MIGA	54.5
4	ANY	85
5	GPP	67.5
Total		347
Mean		69.4
Max		85
Min		54.5
SD		11.29
Variance		127.55

The table shows that the total score of writing test in the experimental class is 397.5 while in the control class is 347. The mean score in the experimental class is 79.5 and 69.4 for the control class, which is lower than the experimental class. The maximum score in the experimental class is 88 and minimum score is 72. The range between them is 16. While in the control class, the maximum score is 85 and minimum score is 45. The range between maximum and minimum score is 40.

Research schedule

The classes were given the treatment from 20 August to September 12 2018. Meanwhile the test was given on September 17 2018.

Statistics and Data Analysis

After the researcher got the data, the normality testing was used to find out whether the data were normally distributed or not. The result of the data can be seen in the following table:

Table 3. Summary of Students' Writing Ability Normality Testing in Experimental and Control Class

Class	N	Asymp.Sig. (2-tailed)	Significance level	Conclusion
Experimental	17	0.558	0.05	Normal
Control	17	0.328	0.05	Normal

Table   3 shows that the result of normality testing of writing test for both experimental and control class were in normal distribution. It can be seen that the value of asymp. Sig (2-tailed) in experimental class and control class are 0.558 and 0.328 which are higher than significance level of alpha 0.05.

Furthermore, normality testing of students' writing test in experimental and control class was grouped into high self-efficacy and low self-efficacy. The data of normality testing from each group are listed below:

Table 4. Summary of Students' Writing Ability Normality Testing in experimentand Control Class Based on
        Students' Self-efficacy

Class	Students' Writing Test	N	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	Significance Level	Conclusion
Experimental	High	5	0.642	0.05	Normal
	Low	5	0.404	0.05	Normal
Control	High	5	0.141	0.05	Normal
	Low	5	0.498	0.05	Normal

Clearly, the data from students' writing test with high and low self-efficacy were normally distributed for both experimental and control class. It was proven by the value of asymp. Sig (2-tailed) of each group which are higher than the value of significance level 0.05. The value of asymp. Sig (2-tailed) of students' writing of high student's self-efficacy in experimental class is 0.642 while the value of student's writing with low self-efficacy is 0.404. Then, the value of asymp. Sig (2-tailed) of students' writing with high self-efficacy in control class is 0.14, while the value of students' writing with low self-efficacy is 0.498. Thus, the data of students writing score with high and low self-efficacy from both experimental and control class are normally distributed.

Then, the homogeneity testing was used to find out whether the data in both experimental and control classes were homogeny or not. The homogeneity testing was analyzed by using SPSS 15 with Levene Statistic Test with 0.05 for the significance level. The result of homogeneity testing can be seen below.

Table 5. Summary of Homogeneity Testing in Experimental and Control Class

Data	Asymp. Sig.	Significance	Conclusion
Writing Test	0.889	0.05	Homogeneous
Self-efficacy	0.210	0.05	Homogeneous

The data from table 5 shows that the significant value of the writing test is 0.889 which is higher than α (sig >0.05). While the significant value of students' self-efficacy is 0.210 which is also higher than α (sig > 0.05). It means that the variance of both writing test and the students' self-efficacy are homogeny.

Hypothesis Testing

H1   : Roundtable technique gives significant effect on the achievement of low self-efficacy students in writing descriptive text compared to Direct Instruction technique

H0   : Roundtable technique does not give significant effect on the achievement of low self-efficacy students in writing descriptive text compared to Direct Instruction technique

The hypothesis was tested to know whether Roundtable technique gives more significant effect on achievement of students with low self-efficacy in writing descriptive text than those who were taught by using Direct Instruction technique. The results can be seen in table 4.4

Table 6. Summary of Students' Writing Achievement T-test in Experimental and Control Class

Strategy	$t_{observed}$	t_{table}	Conclusion
Roundtable technique Direct Instruction technique	2.795	2.306	$t_{observed}>t_{table}$ H_1 is accepted

Table 6 shows the data from both experimental class which is taught by using Roundtable technique and control class which is taught by using Direct Instruction technique. The result of the t-test is 2.795, while the t_{table} is 2.306. $t_{observed}$ is higher than t_{table}($t_{observed}>t_{table}$). It means that the H_1 is accepted and H_0 is rejected, or Roundtable technique gives significant effect on achievement of students with low self-efficacy in writing descriptive text than Direct Instruction technique.

Discussion

The average score of students with low self-efficacy in experimental group was higher than those in control group. It shows that the students with low self-efficacy who were taught by using Roundtable technique were better than students who were taught by using Direct Instruction technique. In other words, the use of Roundtable technique in teaching writing descriptive text is also appropriate to be used for teaching the students with low self-efficacy.

Based on the result of the hypothesis, it can be seen that the mean score of the students' writing ability in experimental class which was taught by using Roundtable technique is higher than the mean score in the control class which was taught by using Direct Instruction technique. It means that the Roundtable technique gives a significant effect on the students writing skill than Direct Instruction technique. The use of Roundtable technique gives students a good way to explore their writing skill. It engages the students actively in some activities during teaching writing. It started from the involvement of students in generating ideas about what to write, then sharing ideas with his friend before writing by their own language about the topic given by the teacher. By doing these activities, the students will be attracted that may encourage further writing. This is supported by Iru's statement (2012: 67) who mentioned that writing activities in the cooperative learning model is started through the activities of thought(think), talk/discussion, exchanging ideas(talk) and write the results of the discussion(write).

The finding of this research is also supported by Stenlev & Siemund (2011: 4) who says that Roundtable is an appropriate technique to improve students' English skills; one of them is writing skill. He also said that this technique is useful for brainstorming, reviewing, or practicing skill. Then, this finding is also in line with Hapsari (2011) who investigated the use of roundtable technique to improve students' achievement in writing hortatory exposition text in SMA Negeri I Batang. The result of this study also convinced that Roundtable technique gives an effective contribution to improve students' achievement in writing text.

On the other hand, in teaching writing using Direct Instruction technique, the students have to follow the detail steps given by the teacher. They listen to the theories, see the example, and then they directly do writing without doing such activities like in the Roundtable technique. The students do not have a chance to generate ideas, share with his friends, and discuss about what they are going to write. This condition can cause the students become confuse about what they are going to write. It also makes the students bored and difficult to think. While, by applying Roundtable technique, the students found a new way that makes the students more motivated to write since it requires students to take an active role in the learning process.

The students can be helped to overcome their writing difficulties by cooperating through some procedures such as writing, editing, and rewriting. Although the students who have low self efficacy believe that they do not have enough capability to write, can achieve a better writing score when they are taught by using Roundtable technique than the low self-efficacy students who were taught by using Direct Instruction technique. It is supported by Stenlev and Siemund (2011: 2), students can simply solve their difficulties quickly by working in group. They also said that when people work in group, it allows them to focus and avoid to be stuck. Then, students can be motivated by other students since each member of the group has something unique to contribute. Other students' idea would broaden their horizons.

Conclusion

The result of this research indicates that Roundtable technique gives significant effect on the achievement of students who have low elf-efficacy to write descriptive text. This technique encourages the students to gain many ideas before writing, share and discuss with their friends, and then practice writing the text in a comfortable atmosphere in the classroom.

This research implied that Roundtable technique can be used as an alternative technique in teaching writing descriptive text for the students who have low self-efficacy. This technique provides the opportunity for the students to gather many ideas in writing, learn from their friends, and get rid of the obstacles they face during writing process.

It is suggested for further researcher to develop this research on larger population and sample in order to get the knowledge and the empiric data. Besides that, they are also suggested to conduct the same research for other level of population. It is expected that other researcher can conduct a further research by involving another type of text as dependent variable and other aspect as moderator variable.

Acknowledgments

References

Alwasilah, A. C. (2004). The *Tapestry of English Language Teaching and Learning in Indonesia.* Malang: State University of Malang Press.

Bandura, A. 1997. Self Efficacy: The Exercise of Control. New York : W. H. Freeman and Company.

Brown, D. (2001). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy (2nd).* New York: Pearson Education, Inc.

Brown, D. (2003). *Language Assessment: Principals and Classroom Practices*. New York: Longman

Crandall, J. 1999. Cooperative language learning and affective factors. In J. Arnold (Ed.) Affect in language learning (pp. 226– 245). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Descriptive Text in Teaching English. (2010). *Teaching English for All*. Retrieved from https://teachingenglish4all.wordpress.com/2010/06/28/descriptive-text/

Elvira, I. & Ardi, H. (2014). *Teaching Descriptive Texts by Using Rainbow Cards in Teaching Speaking for Junior High School Student*. Journal of English Language Teaching UNP, vol.3 no.1

Gay, L.R. & Peter Airisian. (2000). *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application (6th ed).* New Jersey: Prentice Hall

Gay, L.R. & Peter Airisian. (2003). *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application (7th ed).* New Jersey: Prentice Hall

Gay, L.R. & Peter Airisian. (2011). *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application (9th ed)*. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.

Gerot, L. and Wignell, P. (1994). *Making Sense of Functional Grammar*. Sydney: Antipodeon Educational Enterprises (AEE) Publishing

Hapsari, A. (2011). *The Use of Roundtable Technique to Improve Students' Achievement in Writing Hortatory Exposition Text:A Case of Grade XI Students of SMA Negeri I Batang in the Academic Year 2010/2011*. Thesis. Universitas Negeri Semarang

Heaton, J.B. (1988). Writing English Language Tests.London: Longman Group

Iru, La and La O. S. (2012). *Analisis Penerapan Pendekatan, Metode, Strategi dan Model-model Pembelajaran*. Bantul, DIY: Multi Presindo

Jacobs., Holly. L., Stephen, A., Zingkgraf., Deanne. R., Wormuth, V., Faye, H., Jane, B., Hughey. (1981). *Testing ESL Composition: A Practical Approach*. Rowley: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

Khaghaninezad, M & Kaashef, F. (2014). *Applying Cooperative Language Learning Techniques In Iranian Elt Context*. International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World,vol.5 (3)

Kitikanan, p. & Sasimonton, p. 2017. The Relationship between English Self-efficacy and English Learning Achievement of L2 Thai Learners. Language Education and Acquisition Research Network (LEARN) Journal, Vol. 10, Issue 1, 2017

Lyons and Heasly. (2006). *Study Writing: A Course in Writing Skills for Academic Purposes*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press

Nunan. (2003). *Practical English Language Teaching*. New York: McGraw-Hill

Olson, J. (2008). *A Literary Review of Engaged Learning and Strategies that can be Used in Planning and Implementing Instruction.* Wisconsin: American Psychological Association.

O'Malley, J.M., and Pierce, L.V. (1996). *Authentic Assessment for English Language Learners.* Practical Approaches for Teachers. Virginia: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.

Peha, S. (2002). *The Writing Teachers's Strategy Guide*. http: //www.ttms.org

Rini. (2013). *A Genre Analysis of the Difficulties in Wriitng Descriptive Text by the Students of Class VIII SMPN 2 Kartasura In 2012/ 2013 Academic Year.* Thesis: Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta.

Stenlev, J & Siemund. (2011). *Roundtable As Cooperative Learning Technique*. English Language and Linguistics, Vol.18, pp 40 – 45

Tavil, Z and Bilen. (2015). *The Effects of Cooperative Learning Strategies on Vocabulary Skills of 4th Grade Students*. Journal of Education and Training Studies Vol. 3, No. 6; ISSN 2324-805X E-ISSN 2324-8068

Winda. (2016). *Students' Difficulties in Descriptive Texts at the Eight Grade of MTsN Lubuk Buaya Padang*. Thesis: STKIP PGRI West Sumatera

Zulkosky. 2009. Self-Efficacy: A Concept Analysis. Journal Compilation. Wiley Periodical, Inc. Retrieved from http://studylib.net/doc/8233632/self-efficacy--a-concept-analysis