TEACHING PROCEDURAL TEXT WRITING THROUGH GROUP DISCUSSION AT GRADE XI SMAN 5 KOTA SERANG

Research Paper

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirement for S1 Degree in English
Department of Teacher Training and Education Faculty

By

NURHIDAYATI

2223082407

ENGLISH STUDY PROGRAM
ART AND LANGUAGE DEPARTMENT
TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION FACULTY
UNIVERSITY OF SULTAN AGENG TIRTAYASA
SERANG
2015

TEACHING PROCEDURAL TEXT WRITING THROUGH GROUP DISCUSSION AT GRADE XI SMAN 5 KOTA SERANG

Research Paper

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirement for S1 Degree in English
Department of Teacher Training and Education Faculty

By

NURHIDAYATI

2223082407

ENGLISH STUDY PROGRAM
ART AND LANGUAGE DEPARTMENT
TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION FACULTY
UNIVERSITY OF SULTAN AGENG TIRTAYASA
SERANG
2015

ABSTRACT

TEACHING PROCEDURAL TEXT WRITING THROUGH GROUP DISCUSSION AT GRADE XI SMAN 5 KOTA SERANG

Nurhidayati
2223082407

The aim of this research is to find out the effect of Group Discussion toward sutudents' Procedural Text Writing improvement at the eleventh grade students of SMAN 5 Kota Serang. The population of this research was all of students of the eleventh grade of SMAN 5 Kota Serang, and the sample used in this research was the students of XI MIA 2 consisted of 31 students, and XI MIA 3 consisted of 30 students. The researcher took all of them as subject of the research. The main of experimental research is to search the information about teaching procedural text writing through group discussion. The result of this research based on the data collected from the students showed that, the t_{value} is 0.24 with the level of significance 5% are 2, 00 and 2, 65 from the *d.f* .59 t_{Value} is higher then t_{table} 2.00<2.91 >2, 65 So the null hypothesis of the research is rejected, meaning that there is an influence of discussion technique on student reading ability. It showed that discussion technique can be used as one of the alternative way to teach writing. As the result, the pre-test in the control class got the average score is 64.3 while the post-test in the control class with the average score 74.8. Then the pre-test in the experiment class got the average score 64.70 while the post-test in the experiment class with the average score 82. Having analyzed the data of pre-test and post-test by using t-test formula, the result shows that the coefficient is 2.91. It means that there is a significance difference in teaching writing comprehension by using Group Discussion. From the result of calculation, it is obtained the value of the t observation (to) is 2.35 the degree of freedom (df) is 38. The researcher used the degree of significance of 5% and 1%. In the table significance, it can be seen that on the df 38 and on degree of significance are 2.00 and 2.65. if the *to* compared with each value of degrees of significance, the result is 2.00 < 2.91>2.65. where *to* score obtained from the result of calculating, the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted and the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected. All of those findings suggest that group discussion effective in improving students' procedural text writing ability.

Keyword : Procedural text, group discussion, experimental reasearch, sample, population, pre- test, post-test.

CURRICULUM VITAE

The researcher's full name is Nurhidayati, was born in Rangkasbitung, December 24th 1990. Like most people raised in Rangkasbitung use to speak traditional language of Sundanese. The researcher's formal education was graduated from Elementary School at SDN Pabuaran I Pabuaran Rangkasbitung in 2002. Then, graduated Junior High School at MTSN Pasir Sukaraya Rangkasbitung in 2005. After that, graduating the study of Senior High School at SMAN 1 Rangkasbitung. Then, continued to graduate study in Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa State University (UNTIRTA) in Serang, majoring English Program at Department of Teacher Training and Education Faculty in 2015. Registering as English Program of Teachers' Training and Education Faculty in 2008 then finishing the final fulfillment for undergraduate degree in 2015. Having current address in Serang, watching movie and listening to music are the most favorite hobbies. Dreaming to be successful designer with motto : never give up and try your best.

TABLE OF CONTENT

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Background of Study

The purpose of teaching writing is to improve students' ability to function effectively in such as written context. Takala (1988:4) said that writing plays an important role in which speaking can not to fulfill the communicative needs. Therefore students need a lot of communicative practices to apply their writing abilities. Writing is an effective way to communicate and express our thoughts, feelings, and opinions to others. Writing has function to entertaining and making fun.

There are a variety of ways to teach procedural text writing in our everyday live. One of the methods in teaching writing is using communicative approach to write a procedural text. Writing procedural skill helps the learners gain independent, comprehensibility, fluency and creativity in writing. If learners have mastered these skills, they will be able to write other kind of text so that not only they can read what they have written, but others speakers of that language can read and understand it.

An initial revealed some students are still lazy to write because they do not have enough vocabulary and they are afraid if making mistake with the grammar, too. Even the average score of the students are good, there are still some students who have bad score, therefore those students think that writing is boring activity and it is uninteresting for them.

Procedure is one of text that is to help the readers how to do, use, or make something completely. Sometimes, the students create the procedure text without care about the generic structure specifically. This issue is important because most of students in the site need to optimize their in procedural text writing. According to the teacher of the students in the site, students still find it is difficult to write a procedure text. For example, the students need to see the dictionary when they write a text, the students didn't understand of using V1 in writing procedure text. To solve the problems, the researcher chooses the title to do an experiment by implementing group discussion in teaching learning activity.

Based on the above statements, the researcher held research to investigate how far is the procedural text writing ability of the eleventh year students of SMAN 5 Kota Serang after being taught with group discussion. The researcher concluded that the important roles of communicative approach is on the process of communication rather than mastery of language could lead to one of the technique called group discussion. In this research, the researcher focus on group discussion, it used in teaching procedural text writing. Many proponents of group discussion have

advocated the use of “authentic” “real-life” materials in the classroom. Instead of being the dominating authority in the classroom, the teacher in the group discussion able to facilitates the communicative process.

B. Identification of the Problem

According to the background above, the researcher identifies the problems of the research as follow:

(1) How is the student’s writing procedural learning achievement by using group discussion?
(2) How is the difference between the student’s learning achievement in studying procedural text writing with conventional method and with group discussion?

C. Limitation of the Problem

This research is limited to the following problems:

The lesson that was studied in this research is writing subject for the experimental class in teaching procedural text by using group discussion. The typology is concerned overall with discussion. Teaching writing by discussion is a form of group of many form, a listening, reading and talking form. It requires a group of people, an aim, a text and a focusing question that is tied to one of the three aims.

D. Formulation of the Problem

The limitation of problem above is formulated as follows;

"Is there any influence of group discussion on students' procedural text writing ability in the eleventh grade students of SMA N 5 Kota Serang?

E. Objectives of the Research

Based on the research questions above, the main purpose of this research was to find out the influence of group discussion in teaching procedural text writing.

F. Uses of the Research

The uses of this research, as follows:

1. Practical Uses

a. For Teacher of English

1) For English teacher, it is supposed that writing procedural text will be more considered in the teaching learning process. From this research, it will make the teacher know and understand the characteristics of their students, so they can handle the teaching learning process well**.**

2) The teacher's role in a school especially in Senior High School also confirms very much increasing English subject with communicative approach. In supporting the Teaching Learning process at school,

teacher should try hard to be more active in giving a chance to the students to practice writing English.

b. For the school

By this study, first the researcher really hopes that after reading the paper specifically, the reader can add their knowledge about how to behave and how to overcome all problems in surviving in the school life.

c. For the Students

By doing this research, students can enrich and encounter the skill of writing especially in procedure text writing.

2. Theoretical Uses

1) To give information about the implementation of communicative approach.
2) To better understand fundamentals analyzes which will be useful in teaching learning method.

G. Subject of the Research

This research took in the eleventh year students of SMAN 5 Kota Serang, the writer analyzed mainly based on her personal view in research field.

This research was focused on teaching procedural text writing using communicative approach in eleventh class of SMAN 5 Kota Serang students that will be chosen for an experimental class.

H. Operational Definition

1) Definition of Communicative Approach

Communicative approach is an approach which views language as a form of social behavior and the aim of language teaching is teach the learners to communicate fluently, appropriately and spontaneously in culture context of language teaching (C.J Brumifit and J.T Robert, 1983:135)

2) Definition of Group Discussion

Brilhart (1986) expounds upon the theory of what are the standards for an ideal discussion group that the fact that the quality of any discussion group can only be determined from its outputs, its effectiveness. Members, obviously, are a necessary component. Members share basic values and beliefs relevant to the purpose of their being a group and toward each other.

3) Definition of Teaching

According to Sudjana (in Djamarah, 1995: 45), the same as learning, teaching is a process. There are processes of controlling, organizing, motivating, guiding, facilitating, and giving feedback to the students in process teaching and learning. Teaching process is not only putting premium

on product, but also on learning process. So, teacher needs evaluation's instrument that can be used to assess all of students' learning process step by step.

4) Definition of writing

Writing is an activity to express ideas, issues, events, filling, or thinking through written form. A definition of writing suggest by John (1967:221) as a visual ability that important to the individual only when wish to communicate on paper.

5) Definition of Procedural Text

Procedure is a text that shows a process in order. Its social function is to describe how something is completely done through a sequence of series.

I. Organization of the Paper

In this research, the chapter will be divided into three chapters, as follows:

First chapter is introduction in which includes background of the study, identification of problem, limitation of the problem, formulation of the problem, objectives of the research, uses of the research, subject of the research, operational definition and organization of the paper.

Second chapter talks about theoretical framework that consist of definition of group discussion, definition of writing, definition of teaching and definition of procedural text.

Third chapter includes the research method such as research design, the subject and setting of the research, data collection technique, research instrument, research procedure, and data analyzing.

Fourth chapter discusses result and discussion subject. Consists of data description and the analysis of the data.

Fifth chapter deals with the researcher's conclusion from what has been done and observed, analyzed and discussed on the previous chapter.

CHAPTER II
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

A The Communicative Approach

1. Definition of Communicative Approach

Communicative approach is an approach which views language as a form of social behavior and the aim of language teaching is teach the learners to communicate fluently, appropriately and spontaneously in the culture context of language teaching (C.J Brummifit and J.T Robert, 1983:135).It can be concluded that communicative approach is an approach to the teaching of second and foreign languages that emphasizes interaction as both the means and the ultimate goal of learning a language. It is also referred to as “communicative approach to the teaching of foreign languages” or simply the “communicative approach”. The field of language teaching has undergone many shifts and trends over the last few decades. Numerous methods have come and gone.

Communicative Approach is generally regarded as an approach to language teaching (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). As such, Communicative Approach reflects a certain model or research paradigm, or a theory (Celce-Murcia, 2001). It is based on the theory that the primary function of language use is communication. Its primary goal is for learners to develop communicative competence (Hymes, 1971), or simply put, communicative ability. In other words, its goal is to make use

of real-life situations that necessitate communication. Communicative competence is defined as the ability to interpret and act appropriate social behaviors, and it requires the active involvement of the learner in the production of the target language.

Brummfit and K. Johnson (1979:141) stated that the communicative approach, that is an approach to teaching of English which recognize the acquisition of receptive and productive knowledge it involves the teaching learning of rules used as well as rules of grammar.

Furthermore discussing the understanding of communicative approach, it is very important for this paper to look at the background of communicative approach, because it is very difficult to understand without knowing the history of development of communicative approach this consist of several steps:

a. In the last few years, English language teaching had a foreign language or second language. Therefore English has new character, previously in teaching and learning purpose.
b. The problems of the student especially who live in developing countries and who received several years of formal English teaching, frequently remain deficient in the ability to actually use the language and to understand its use.
c. The assumption said that language is means of communication. This means that by learning language, the students are supposed not only to understand the English language but also to use it in daily needs.

In writer thought, communicative approach is an approach that view language as its nature, namely as a tool for communication, it is of use the language as a mean of communication. To communicate means to pass on information, feelings, news, etc.

2. The Principles of Communicative Approach

As we know that communicative approach is one of way in teaching a foreign language or the communicative approach is as system of teaching a foreign language. In this case, it holds as important role for teacher in presenting the materials.

Larsen and Freeman (1986) formulated the important roles of communicative approach, such as:

a. the target language is not only the object of study but also it is a vehicle for classroom communication.
b. It focuses on the course in real language use, so a variety of linguistic form should be presented together.
c. Students should be given opportunity to express their ideas and opinion.
d. Learning to use form appropriately is an important part of communicative competence.

The researcher concluded that the important roles of communicative approach is on the process of communication rather than mastery of language forms leads to different roles from those found in more traditional second language classrooms. Many proponents of Communicative Language Teaching have advocated the use of “authentic”

"real-life" materials in the classroom. These might include language based realia, such as signs, magazines, advertisements, and newspapers, or graphic and visual sources around which communicative activities can be built. Instead of being the dominating authority in the classroom, the teacher in the Communicative Approach facilitates the communicative process among and between the students and the various tasks, giving guidance and advice when necessary. One of the important components of communicative competence is the ability to select a linguistic form that is appropriate for a specific situation. Language has been redefined as an integral part of the culture with which it is connected today. There is plenty of evidence that a good command of English grammar, vocabulary, and syntax does not necessarily add up to a good mastery of English.

3. The Steps of Communicative Approach

Larsen (1986) stated that there are many ways of presenting English through communicative approach as follow:

a. The teacher gives the communicative activities through the passage or discourse
b. The teacher introduces the form of the language by giving drills to get the competences.
c. The teacher gives the students a task
d. Text must be given to get the competence in spoken or utterance and mistakes will be corrected

From the steps above , the first is a presentation of a situation r context through a brief reading sources or several mini reading texts by a motivational activity relating the text to students' experiences and interest. This includes a discussion of the passage or discourse such as people, roles, setting and topic. Then followed by brainstorming to establish the vocabulary and expressions to be used to accomplish the communicative competences. Question and answer, studying basic communicative expression and reading recognition and interpret activities including reading or copying the reading text with variations for reading practice. Finally , the evaluation of learning with guided of language and question, homework and extension activities such as finding students' creation of new reading text around the same topic.

B. The Definition of Discussion

Larson (1997), Wileen & White (1991) stated that it (discussion) is characterized as a structured conversation among participants who present, examine, compare and understand similar and diverse ideas about an issue.

Larson (1997) and Gall (1985) reported that discussion is an effective way to promote higher-level thinking, develop student attitudes, and advance student capability for moral questioning. Newman(1988) stated that, discussion provides opportunities for student thoughtfulness about information received in class.

The researcher concluded statements above as the main point of what effective teaching is, no matter what strategy is utilized by a teacher; ensuring that students are properly and effectively absorbing and assimilating all information given to them. Ultimately, the goal of every teacher for their students should be to ensure that the students take what they learned, and apply it to not one, but multiple aspects of their education and even their lives. For discussion to be effective, another necessary component is knowledge of how to discuss

Parker (1996) stated that possible discussion skills include listening, clearly making claims, supporting claims with facts, helping a group move through obstacles, critiquing ideas and not individuals (keeping a high respect for human dignity), and developing together a shared understanding of the problem or issue. Maloch (1999) seems to be in agreement with this thinking, stating that the teacher should focus on helping students build some sort of conversation – the students' immediate need – before s/he focuses on deepening that conversation. This is most important to the art of discussion, because if students are not sure exactly how to have meaningful discussions, then how can it be expected of them to learn from any discussions they are involved in.

So, in general, discussion is of course utilized for the benefit of the students, but not simply to learn material, topics, or subjects, but to also teach students how to become well integrated, functioning members of their society. According to Larson, Bridges (1987) is direct when he states, "it

seems reasonable to expect that an education which is intended, among other things perhaps, to initiate young people into (democratic) processes should include preparation in the art of discussion or more specifically those forms of discussion associated with the processes of deliberation and decision making."

1. Group Discussion

Brilhart (1986) expounds upon the theory of what are the standards for an ideal discussion group. Brilhart (1986) reasserts the fact that the quality of any discussion group can only be determined from its outputs, its effectiveness. Members, obviously, are a necessary component. He states that members share basic values and beliefs relevant to the purpose of their being a group and toward each other. Smaller groups are more effective, but that they should be large enough to supply a wide variety of knowledge and skills necessary to fulfill the requirements of high quality discussion. In relation to this, Brilhart also states that a divergence of backgrounds and perspectives within the numbers would provide the ideal discussion group. Yet, another variable that Brilhart mentions is resources. Discussion groups need adequate, reliable resources to ensure that the objectives of the group are achieved. Brilhart states that when reliable facts are at the disposal of members of a group, then reasoned opinions and ideas could be either taken from the facts themselves or generated by the group.

In conclusion, the statement above is key to a discussion group, and key to the learning process of individual members of a group. This should be clear, simply because if they (both the group as a whole and its individual members) can organize knowledge based on what resources they have and through discussion in the group, then the goal of having the group discussion in general has been achieved.

2. Group Discussion as Teaching

Townsend (1993) stated that genuine classroom discussion (the exchange of questions and perspectives among all participants) seems most likely to nurture expressions of wondering. He defined the term wondering as being a largely internal dialogue, which defies prediction and precise measurement. Townsend (1993) states wondering discourse is the exploratory talk embedded in discussion. Dillon (1979) stated that students have a propensity to elaborate more fully in response to their peers' comments or questions than to those of the teacher.

Based on above statements, the researcher suggests for discussion to be effective in the classroom, teachers must know how to allow the students to take control of the discussion. This seems logical, since students are more likely to debate and discuss various subjects and materials with an individual on their intellectual level rather than with an individual who they feel is on a higher, more advanced intellectual level, such as their teacher. As a teaching strategy in the classroom, the researcher suggest that discussion can works to incorporate the combined knowledge of mainly

the students involved, with minimal yet important guidance and assistance from the teacher, to facilitate the spread and assimilation of knowledge.

C. Group Discussion Methods and Procedures

According to Beane and Apple in Peixxoto (2006), group discussion was applied as the first treatment.

The researcher who acts as counselor Steinberg(2001) and Carpenter (1968) described methods and procedures as follow :

1. Panel

   In panel discussion, a small group of individuals (from three to five) who are knowledgeable about a particular subject discuss the topic among themselves ideas through conversation.

2. Dialogue

   This method is very similar to a panel discussion, but only two individuals take part in discussing the subject in front of an audience.

3. Symposium

   In a symposium, a small number of speakers who knowledgeable about a particular subject make a short presentations in succession. These presentations usually range from five to fifteen minutes each.

4. Forum

   This form of discussion allows for participation by the audience. There are several types of forum. The most common are:

   -Open forum : Members of the audience are allowed to participate at any time during the meeting.

-Panel forum : Members of an audience hear a panel discussion and are then allowed to ask questions or to comment on the subject under discussion.

- Symposium forum : Members of an audience hear presentations by invited speakers and are then allowed to question, discuss, or comment.

-Dialogue forum : Members of an audience are allowed to question, discuss, or comment after the dialogue.

-Lecture forum : After a formal presentation by a knowledgeable speaker, audience members are given the opportunity to question, comment, seek clarification, or discuss the information presented.

5. Colloque

This method combines a panel discussion with a forum. During the course of panel discussion, audience members may be invited to comment or ask questions if panel members or the chair perceive a need to clarify points, avoid neglecting an issue, or assure that a misperception is not allowed to stand. Any interruptions of the panel discussion must be focused on the point at hand. When the matter has been resolved, the organized discussion among panel members resumes.

6. Buzz session

The audience is divided into groups of six to eight persons for discussion of relevant questions posed by the leader. One individual from each group may be asked to summarize the group’s discussion and report to the entire audience.

7. Audience reaction team

Three to five members of the audience are preselected to listen to a presentation and respond by offering a brief summary and interpretation of the information presented. This discussion method can be used effectively in large group settings and when time is limited.

8. Question period

Members of the audience are provided an opportunity to ask question of program participants after their formal presentations have been competed. Usually, a time limit is set for each question and for the entire question-and-answer period.

9. Brainstorming

Members of the audience are encourage to participate by sharing their ideas or suggestions for solving a problem. No discussion of ach point is allowed until all ideas have been expressed. Since the intent of this discussion method is to generate a wide range of ideas, no contributor is allowed to defend the information presented. The atmosphere should be open and encouraging.

10. Discussion group

A group of people meet informally to discuss a topic of mutual concern.

11. Workshop

A small group of people (25 or fewer) with a common interest meet to study, research, and discuss a specific subject or to enhance their individual knowledge and proficiency.

12. Seminar

A group of people who are studying a specific subject meet for a discussion led by a recognized authority.

13. Conference

Large or small group of people having similar interest meet to hear formal presentations to the entire group; they also meet in similar groups to discuss specific aspects of the conference's general topic.

The researcher explains about the class activities before the students were asked to work in groups to apply the discussion strategy. The group discussion concept here was that everybody has their opinion and group discussion was one of the collaborative strategies that can explore it. The class will be indicate by sharing ideas, using critical reflection and analysis, and promoting the common good. In this context, it does not mean that students do only what they inclined to do. Rather, it is a process of giving students a share of the authority in the classroom, but not differing to them.

D. The Definition of Writing

1. Concept of Writing

According to J.D Angelo (1989:5), writing is a form of thinking. It means that writing is an activity to express ideas, issues, events, feeling or thinking to the others through written form. Cohen and Reil in Kusumaningsih (2001:1) say that writing can be defined as communicate act, a way of sharing observation, thought, or ideas with ourselves and others. It is a tool of thinking. By writing we can tell about people, remember the facts and ideas.

Based on the statement above, it can be concluded that writing is expressing ideas, facts, feeling, experience, and thought in written form.

In writing, the aspects include the use of vocabulary, structure of the sentence, composition of the sentence, spelling, and punctuation. These aspects are important to master in order to be able to produce good writing.

Writing, one of the productive skills, is considered difficult, especially writing in a foreign language. According to Axelord and cooper in Ma'mun (2004:5), writing is a complex process and such contains element of mastery and surprise. When students want to write something they should have a lot of information, ideas, and thought in their mind so that they will be able to express them into sentences, paragraphs, and an essay.

The writing ability is the main activity of composition. The writing should be systematic and detail. A knowledge or study about good writing or how to write composition is much needed.

2. Type of Writing

Finnochiaro (2007) stated that naturally, the type of writing system exists in the native language in an important factor in determining toeasy of speech with which students learn to write. According to Finnochiaro, there are two types of writing:

a. Factual or Practical Writing

This type of writing deals with facts. The writer can find it in the writing of letter and summaries.

b. Imaginary Creative Writing

This type of writing usually exists in literature. The examples of imaginary writing are novel, romance, fantasy, science fiction, adventure, etc. The type of writing above which are given to the students to do will depend on their age, interest and level. For example, we can ask beginners to write a simple poem. When teacher sets a task for young learners students, teacher will make sure that the students will get enough words to do it and also for intermediate and advance students.

3. Procedural Text

Procedure is a text that shows a process in order. Its social function is to describe how something is completely done through a sequence of series. The purpose is to help someone do a task something. It can be set of instruction or direction (Purcell-Gates, Duke, & Martineau, 2007). It can concluded that a procedural text is to tell the reader how to do or make something. The information is presented in a logical sequence of events

which is broken up into small sequenced steps. These texts are usually written in the present tense.

There are three definitions of general of the procedure text :

1. Texts that explain how something works or how to use instruction / operation manuals e.g. how to use the video, the computer, the tape recorder, the photocopier, the fax.

2. Texts that instruct how to do a particular activity e.g. recipes, rules for games, science experiments, road safety rules.

3. Texts that deal with human behaviour how to live happily, how to succeed.

Generic structure of Procedure text :

1. Goal (purpose or goal)

2. Materials Needed (material / equipment / materials required)

3. Methods or Steps (Methods / steps)

4. Teaching Writing

Writing is the most complicated skill in English for foreign or second language learners. Richard & Renandya (2002) said that the difficulty is due not only to the need to generate and organize ideas using an appropriate choice of vocabulary, sentence, and paragraph organization but also to turn such ideas into a readable text. To solve the problems, we can apply and choose some approaches which are suitable with the purpose of writing itself. In relation to this, Thanatkun Tangpermpoon (2008: 2) says that there are three characteristics of writing types. One of the type is Genre-based as the way to language and literacy education that combines an understanding

of genre and genre teaching together in the writing class (Hammond and Derewianka, 2001).

a. Purpose of Teaching Writing

Harmer (2004: 86) states that writing is a process and that we write is often heavily influenced by constraints of genres, then these elements have to be present in learning activities. In communicative approach, the focus of writing is to integrate the knowledge of a particular genre and its communicative purpose, these help learners to produce their written products to communicate to others in the same discourse community (Tangpermpoon, 2008: 6).

In this research, the researcher focuses in procedure text as one of the kind of text that should be mastered. It includes from the instruction and the standard in the course itself. In developing writing as a communicative skill, students should constantly be aware that particular topics in writing fit particular situations and confirm to particular conventions.

According to Anthony (1963: 63-7), an approach is a set of correlative assumptions dealing with the nature of language teaching and learning. It is generally agreed that writing is the most difficult skill to aster for foreign or second-language learners. The difficulty is due not only to the need to generate and organize ideas using an appropriate choice of vocabulary, sentence, and paragraph organization but also to turn such ideas into a readable text (Richards & Renandya, 2002). In this research, the researcher focus on a discussion to the teaching of writing in describing a lesson plan.

In teaching writing, students need to produce the language through written. It means the goal in writing is students can supported their written with their communicative language. Richards (2006) says that communicative competence includes the following aspects of language knowledge:

a. Knowing how to use language for a range of different purposes and functions.

b. Knowing how to vary our use of language according to the setting and the participants.

c. Knowing how to produce and understand different types of texts.

d. Knowing how to maintain communication despite having limitations in one language knowledge.

b. Teaching Procedural Text Writing

According to Write (1991), the hints to teach students to write a procedure text are :

1. Focuses on generalized people rather than individuals (first you take, rather than first I take).
2. The reader is often referred to in a general way, for example pronouns (you or one).
3. Use action verbs (imperative verbs), (cut, fold, twist, hold etc), simple present tense (you cut, you fold, you mix), linking words to do with time (first, when, then) are used to connect the text.

4. Detailed information on how (carefully, with the scissors); where (from the top); when (after it has set) and detailed factual description (shape, size, colour, amount).

From the definitions above ,it comes to the steps on how to teach procedure text writing :

1. Show students pictures of some food/drinks. Ask them to guess what food/drinks they are.
2. Give students leading questions, e.g. Have you ever drunk some tea?, How does it taste?, Do you know how to make it?
3. Teach students vocabulary items, e.g. equipments and ingredients to make some tea. Teacher may use matching pictures and names or play a vocabulary game.
4. Give students model text of procedure text of making a cup of tea.
5. Ask students to underline imperative verb. This is useful to make students to be aware of imperative sentences used in procedural text.
6. Ask students to identify the goal, ingredients and steps of the procedure text.
7. Ask students to choose some drinks and tell them to compose procedure text as the model text.
8. Ask students to exchange their worksheet and check their friends' work. Tell them to check the spelling and imperative sentences whether right or wrong.
9. Ask the students to read one by one of their works

Teachers should start teaching writing with one approach and then adapt it by combining the strengths of other approaches in the class. In addition, teachers also can apply social interaction or asked students to do in group or in pairs. Through discussion, learners will improve their writing from their partners and instructors comment and also develop their critical thinking skills. Teachers still keep on track to help students in self-correct when they writing progress. Teachers will keep attention to help students writing development start from beginning until the end. Writing a Procedure text

One factor which accounts for differences in text is the purpose for which the text is being used. When constructing a piece of text, the researcher makes choice of words will depend again on the purpose and context of the text. Procedure text are common factual genres that provide instructions on how to do something. Further, Anderson & Kathy (1998: 2) explained that a procedure is a piece of text that tells the reader or listener how to do something. The purpose of procedure text is to provide sequenced information or directions so that people can successfully perform activities in safe, efficient, and appropriate ways.

Procedure text is already familiar with people's daily life, for example in giving instructions to make something, in games rules, in recipes, manual steps, directions of destination (Derewianka. 2004: 23-27). The context consists of three parts:

a. Title/goal

b. List of material

c. Steps/method/procedures

To arrange a good procedure text, we need the common text organization that should be applied in writing procedure text. Derewianka (1995: 27) mentions, the text organization of a procedure text as follows:

a. The focus of instructional texts is on a sequence of actions

b. The structure is easily recognized

c. Each stage serves a particular function

d. The text may also include comments on the usefulness, significance, danger, fun, etc.

e. Headings, subheadings, numbers, diagrams, photos are often utilized to make instructions as clear and easy to understand as possible.

Then, Anderson & Anderson (1997: 52-55) cited in SitiAimah (2008: 154) states that the generic structure of a procedure text contains:

a. An introductory statement that gives the aim or goal. This maybe the title of the text or an introductory paragraph.

b. A list of the materials that will be needed to complete procedure:

a.) This may be a list or a paragraph.

b.) This step may be left out in some procedures.

c. A sequence of steps in the order they need to be done:

a.) Numbers can be used to show first, second, third, and so on.

b.) The order is usually important; such word as now, next, and after this can be used.

c.) Usually the steps begin with a command such as add, stir, or push.

Using sequences must be considered important. As Mangubhai and Pritchard (1996, p. 64) conclude that sequence or order, is very important in both describing a process or reporting a procedure and they help to link the sentences. Sequences such as then, next, after this, make clear the sequence in which events or stages in a process occur. The sequences are usually placed at, or near, the beginning of a sentence. After looking the clarity principle, we might decide to use a sequence to make each step of the process clear. On the other hand, using the reality principle, we might decide that sequence are not needed because the process is described in natural time order and the readers knowledge of the world will make the sequence clear to her or him.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHOD

A. Research Design

This research is an experimental study of the experimental class and controlled class. In this research, the researcher taught the students in experimental class by using discussion technique and controlled class by using Teacher Centered.

There were two variables: independent variable and dependent variable. An independent variable is the conditions influencing the appearance of an indication or called treatment variable. In this research the independent variable is group discussion. While dependent variable is an indication appearing because of the implementation of an experiment and also called as effect variable. The test given was same in qualities and quantities to keep the reliability of the research. It gives to know how effective of discussion technique toward students' in writing ability. In the first stage, the researcher gave the students pre-test and then continued by the implementation of group discussion. Finally for the last stage the students were given the post- test.

The researcher used Pre test – Post test control group design was chosen as the design of this study. The scheme is as follows:

E : O_1 X $O2$

P : $O1$ $O2$

E : The symbol for experimental group

P : The symbol for control group

O1 : Pre- Test

O2 : Post-Test

X : Treatment

B. The Population and Sample of the Research

1. The Population

The population of this study involved students of SMAN 5 Kota Serang from eleventh grade in academic year 2014/2015.

Table 1

The population of research

Class	**Number**
XI MIA 1	33
XI MIA 2	31
XI MIA 3	30
XI MIA 4	32
XI S 1	34
XI S 2	35
XI S 3	31
XI S 4	32

The total populations are 258 students.

2. The Sample

The total of students at second grade class in SMAN 5 Kota Serang is 258, divided into 8 classes students by using cluster random sampling. To get the effective data in this research, the researcher took XI MIA 2 and XI MIA 3 from the cluster random sample. It means that the total of sample are 61 students. As Arikunto said, if the subject is great in number It can be taken between 10-15 % or 20-25 % or more (Arikunto, 1983). This

sample is considered to represent the second class student of SMAN 5 Kota Serang in academic year 2014/2015.

C. Research Instrument

Arikunto (2003) stated that research instrument is a device used by researcher while collecting data to make his work becomes easier and to get better result, complete, and systematic in order to make the data easy to be processed.

Based on the definition above, the researcher used instrument as the device while collecting data to make the work becomes easier and getting a better result, complete, and systematic in order to make the data easy to be processed. An instrument could be in form of questionnaire, observation list, and test. In this study the researcher used a test as research instrument.

The writing test is to write a procedure text, in which the students will be asked to select one of the topics given and they wrote the text.

The researcher used criteria of assessment that is since the content of students writing covered the generic structures. The elements of writing were content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics.

Before collecting the data, the researcher made an instrument such as pre- test, and post test. In this research, the writer concerned with writing mastery of the eleventh grade students of SMA N 5 Serang. The researcher gave score 100 for right answer and score 0 for the wrong answer. The scoring formula:

$$S = \frac{R}{T} \times 10$$

Which:

S : Score

R : The right answers

T : The total maximum right answer

10 : The highest score

1. Validity

According to Arikunto (2002), a test will be called to be valid if there is sufficient evidence that test score correlated fairy highly with actual ability in the skills being tasted, and then we may feel reason ably safe in assuming that the test is valid for our purpose. The researcher will correct all of the items to know whether each of them valid or not.

It will be counted using Pearson product moment formula.

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

Notice:

Rxy : question correlation coefficient

N : number of students

X : number of each item score

Y : number of total score

After getting the result, the researcher categorized it into the standard validity as follows:

Table 2

Validity Standard

Value	Category
0, 80 - 1,00	Very Valid
0, 60 - 0,79	Valid
0, 40 - 0,5	Valid Enough
0, 20 - 0,39	Less Valid
0, 00 - 0,19	Not Valid

A test is said valid when it actually what is intended to measure. Calculation result of rxy (question correlation coefficient) is compared with r table of product moment by 5% degree of significance. If rxy is higher than r table, the item of question is valid.

2. Reliability

The Instrument is called reliable if it is enough to be believed. Then it can used to collect the data. Reliability is another important quantify in the preparation and use of achievement test. The reliability of the test refers to consistency. It is also said Arikunto instrument that has been believe of its reliability will result the data can be believe too.

The researcher applied the spear brown formula:

$$r_{11} = \frac{2 \times r_{xy}}{1 + r_{xy}}$$

In which:

r_{11} = Index reability

r_{xy}= Index validity

After getting the result, the researcher categorized it into standard of reliability as follow: In which:

Table 3

Reability Standard

Value	Category
0, 80 - 1, 00	Very reliability
0, 60 - 0, 79	Reliability
0, 40 - 0, 5	Rarely reliable
0, 20 - 0, 39	Less reliable
0, 00 - 0, 19	Not reliable

After classifying the test items, the researcher gave score for each item. Based on Huges (2003) writing criteria score, the score criteria :

1) Content :

30-27 Excellent to very good: knowledgeable substantive, thorough development of thesis, relevant to assigned topic.

26-22 Good to average: some knowledgeable of subject, adequate range, limited development of thesis, mostly relevant to topic, but lacks detail.

21-17 Fair to poor: limited knowledgeable of subject, title substance, inadequate development of topic.

16-13 Very poor: doesn't show knowledgeable of subject, non substantive, non pertinent, or not enough to evaluate.

2) Organization

20-18 Excellent to very good: fluent expression, ideas clearly stated, succinct, well-organized, logical sequencing, cohesive.

17-14 Good to average: somewhat choppy, loosely organized but main ideas stand out, limited support, logical but incomplete sequencing.

13-10 Fair to poor: not-fluent, ideas confused/disconnected, lacks logical sequencing and development.

9-7 Very poor: does not communicate, no organization, or not enough to evaluate.

3) Vocabulary

20-18 Excellent to very good: sophisticated range, effective word/ idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register.

17-14 Good to average: adequate range, occasional of word/ idiom form, choice, usage, bit meaning is not obscured.

13-10 Fair to poor: limited range frequent errors of word/ idiom form, choice, usage but meaning confused or obscured.

9-7 Very poor: essentially translation, little knowledge of English vocabulary, idioms, word form, or not enough to evaluate.

4) Language Use

25-22 Excellent to very good effective complex construction, few errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions.

21-18 Good to average: effective but simple construction, minor problems, in complex construction, several errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, preposition but meaning seldom obscured.

17-11 Fair to poor: major problems in simple/ complex construction, frequent errors of negation, agreement, tense, number, word

order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions and/or fragments, run-ons, deletions, meaning confused or obscured.

10-5 Very poor: virtually no mastery of sentence construction rules, dominated by errors, does not communicate, or not enough to evaluate.

5) Mechanic

5 Excellent to very good: demonstrates mastery of conventions, few errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing.

4 Good to average: occasional errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing but meaning not obscured.

3 Fair to poor: frequent errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing, poor handwriting, meaning confused or obscured.

2 Very poor: no mastery of conventions, dominated by errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing, paragraphing, handwriting illegible, or not enough to evaluate, effective word/ idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register.

Total Score 1-100.

After collecting the data, the researcher analyzed it. In giving scoring of the writing test, the researcher processed the result of the students test. The researcher gave the score for each element of writing follows:

1 Content : the lowest score is 13 and the highest score is 30
2 Organization : the lowest score is 7 and the highest score is 20
3 Vocabulary : the lowest score is 7 and the highest score is 20
4 Grammar : the lowest score is 5 and the highest score is 25
5 Mechanic : the lowest score is 2 and the highest score is 5

D. Technique of Data Collection

In gaining the data, the researcher attempted to employ these following methods.

1. Test

Test is a set of question and exercises used to measure the achievement or capability of the individual or group. This method was used to get data about score of the pre-test and post-test was given for both of groups. The experiment class and control class.

a. Pre- test

Before the researcher deliver new material by using questions, the researcher gave a test to the students. Pre- test was given to the experiment class and the control class. This test will be given before the experiment runs.

b. Post- test

The test was given in order to know the improvement of students' ability in procedural text writing using group discussion. Post- test was given to the experiment class and the control class. The post- test was given to the experiment class and control class after receiving treatment. The experiment class was taught in group discussion. The control class was taught without using group discussion.

2. Treatment

In this section, the reasearcher used the topic about procedure text on experimental class. The way of this text is showing some pictures to make something. The students wrote procedure text based on steps of the picture. Where as to control class, the researcher taught them with Teacher Centered or without group discussion. The last step on the lesson, the researcher asked some questions to find out how far they understood about writing. Then, the researcher found that the students can use the pattern such as pour the hot water (V1 + O). So, the use procedure text in writing learning can develop students' writing ability and it is a good alternative way in learning process.

E. Technique of Data Analysis

In analyzing the data, the researcher used *Bivariat Comparational Analysis Technique*. The technique is used to test the hypotheses whether there is a significant difference between two variables which are tested.

Before the researcher analyzed the data, it was necessary to calculate the data into the statistic calculation. The researcher used $\mathbf{t_{test}}$ formula to calculate the data. $\mathbf{t_{test}}$ is used to find whether there is a significant difference between the score of students' achievement in learning procedural text by using group discussion. The experiment class is X variable and the control class is Y variable.

The formula of $\mathbf{t_{test}}$ is expressed as follows:

$$t_o = \frac{Mx - My}{SE\ Mx - My}$$

Note :

Mx = Mean of Variable X

My = Mean of Variable Y

SE = Standard Error

Prior the calculation of $\mathbf{t_{test}}$, there are several procedures to be taken. They are as follows:

1. Determining Mean of Variable X, with formula:

$$SE_{M_X} = \frac{SD_X}{\sqrt{N1-1}}$$

2. Determining Mean of Variable Y, with formula:

$$SE_{M_Y} = \frac{SD_Y}{\sqrt{N2-1}}$$

3. Determining Standard of Deviation Score of Variable X, with formula:

$$SD_X = \sqrt{\frac{\sum x^2}{N1}}$$

4. Determining Standard of Deviation Score of Variable Y, with formula:

$$SD_Y = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_Y 2}{N2}}$$

5. Determining Standard Error of Mean of Variable X, with formula:

$$SE_{M_X} = \frac{SD_X}{\sqrt{N1-1}}$$

6. Determining Standard Error of Mean of Variable Y, with formula:

$$SE_{M_Y} = \frac{SD_Y}{\sqrt{N2-1}}$$

7. Determining Standard Error of Difference of Mean of Variable X and Variable Y, with formula:

$$SE_{M_X - M_Y} = \sqrt{SE_{M_X}{}^2 + SE_{M_Y}{}^2}$$

8. Determining $\mathbf{t_o}$ with formula:

$$t_o = \frac{M_X - M_Y}{SE_{M_X - M_Y}}$$

9. The Testing of Hypotheses:

Ha : There is a significant difference *Mean* between Variable X and Variable Y.

Ho : There is no significant difference Mean between Variable X and Variable Y.

10. Determining t_{table} in significance level 5% with Degrees of Freedom (df):

$$df = (N_1 + N_2) - 2$$

1. Normality

The normality distribution is use to check whether the distribution of score of each group in pre-test and post-test are normal or not. In analyzing normality distribution, the first step is stating the hypothesis and setting the level of significance at 5% (0.05) (two-tailed test), which are:

H_0 = the scores of the experimental group and the control group are normally distributed.

H_1 = the score of experimental group and the control group are not normally distributed.

The second stepis to find out the$t_{count}$by using chi square formula, as follow:

$$i^2_{value} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{(f_o - f_h)^2}{f_h}$$

Note:

i^2_{value} = Chi square value

f_o = Frequency observed

f_h = Frequency that is hoped

(Sugiyono,2012, p.241)

The third step is to find out the t_{table} with the level of significance at 5% (0,05) (two-tailed test).The last step is comparing the significance for testing the hypothesis with the criteria, as follow:

- if $t_{count} < t_{table}$, it indicates that the null hypothesis is accept..
- if $t_{count} \geq t_{table}$, it indicates that the null hypothesis is not accept.

2. Homogenity

The homogeneity is useto measure the quality of two groups in pre-test and post-test. In calculating homogeinity varience, the first step in measuring data is stating the hypothesis, which are:

H_0= the variance of the experimental group and the cotrol group are homogeneous.

H_1= the variance of the experimental group and the control group are not homogeneous.

The second step is analyzing the homogeneity of variance by using F-test formula, as follow:

$$F_{count} = \frac{vb}{vk}$$

Note:

F_{count} = Homogeneity

Vb = The higher variance

Vk = The lower variance

(Sugiyono, 2012, p. 175)

The third step is to find out the F_{table}. The last iscomparing the significant value of significance for testing the hypothesis with criteria, as follow:

- if $F_{count} \leq F_{table}$, it indicates that the null hypothesis is accept.

if $F_{count} > F_{table}$, it indicates that the null hypothesis is not accepted.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Data Description

1. Introduction of activities.

The Experiment Research was conducted from 1st December until 3rd December 2014. The researcher implemented group discussion based on the schedule that had been arranged by the researcher. The researcher did the experiment of two classes, one class is experiment class used the group discussion and the one is control class used teacher centre.

In academic years 2014/2015, SMA N 5 Kota Serang has two hundred fifty eight (258) students in the eleventh grade. It was divided into four classes of social and four classes of science. Each class consists of around thirty (30) students. The research subject of this research was the first semester of eleventh grade students at SMA N 5 Kota Serang. The school is located at Jl. Ayip Usman No. 26 Kaligandu, Serang, Banten.

Based on the condition, the researcher was interested and curious to do the research in this school. The researcher did the experiment at the eleventh grade in SMA N 1 Kota Serang focused on class XI MIA 2 and the control class on XI MIA 3

2. The Description of Data

The researcher conducted field research. The researcher collected the data from students' pre-test and post-test of both classes. The data is described into table 3 which is presented the students' achievements in the experiment class and the control class before the writer does the research (pre-test), and table 4 which is presented the students' achievements in the experiment class and the control class after the writer did the research (post-test). Each table has four columns. The first column shows the students' number identification (N1) of XI MIA 2 as the experiment class (X), the second column shows the scores of students XI MIA 2 as the experiment class (X), the third column shows the students number identification (N2) of XI Science 3 as the control class (Y), and the last column shows the scores of students XI Science 3 as the control class (Y).

Table 3 describes that the lowest gained score in Post-Test and pre-Test is 5 and the highest score is 35. Therefore, it can be summarized that the lowest and highest gained scores in post-test is higher than pretest (See Appendix 8 and 9).

Ratio Scale Interval of The Result of Pre Test & Post Test of Experiment Class (Through Group Discussion)

R= 90 – 65 = 30

K= 1 + 3.3 log n

= 1 + 4.2

= 5.2 = 5

I= R/K = 31/5 = 6.2

NO	Score	F	Lower Limit	Higher Limit	Xi	f.Xi
1	65 – 70	2	64.5	70.5	67.5	135
2	71 – 76	3	70.5	76.5	73.5	220.5
3	77 – 82	12	77.5	82.5	79.5	954
4	83 – 88	8	82.5	88.5	85.5	684
5	89 – 94	6	87.5	94.5	91.5	549
Total		31				2542.5

Mean : $\frac{\sum fxt}{n} = \frac{2542.5}{31} = 82$

Median $= l + \left(\frac{1/2n - fkb}{Fi} \right)$

$= 82 + \left(\frac{16 - 7}{6.2} \right)$

$= 82 + \left(\frac{9}{6.2} \right)$

$= 82 + 1.5$

$= 83.5$

Modus $= l + \left(\frac{S1}{S1 + S2} \right) i$

$= 83.5 + \left(\frac{4}{4 + 0} \right) 6$

$= 83.5 + \left(\frac{24}{4} \right) 6$

$= 83.5 + 4 = 87.5$

Ratio Scale Interval The Result of Pre Test & Post Test of Control Class

(Teacher Centered)

R= 85 – 50 = 35

K= 1 + 3.3 logn

= 1 + 4.2

= 5.2 = 6

I= R/K = 35/6 = 5.8 = 6

NO	Score	F	**Lower Limit**	**Higher Limit**	**Xi**	**f.Xi**
	50 – 55	4	49.5	55.5	52.5	210
	56 – 61	0	55.5	61.5	58.5	0
	65 – 70	1	64.5	70.5	67.5	67.5
	71 – 76	10	70.5	76.5	73.5	735
	77 – 82	8	77.5	82.5	79.5	636
	83 – 88	6	82.5	88.5	85.5	513
	89 – 94	0	87.5	94.5	91.5	0
Total		31				2161.5

Mean : $\frac{\sum fxt}{n} = \frac{2161.5}{30} = 72$

Median $= l + \left(\frac{1/2n - fkb}{Fi} \right)$

$= 72 + \left(\frac{15 - 0}{10} \right)$

$= 72 + \left(\frac{15}{10} \right)$

$= 72 + 1.5$

$= 73.5$

$$\text{Modus} = l + \left(\frac{S1}{S1 + S2} \right) i$$

$$= 73.5 + \left(\frac{6}{6 + 0} \right) 6$$

$$= 73.5 + \left(\frac{6}{6} \right) 6$$

$$= 73.5 + 6 = 79.5$$

B. The Data Analysis

Before the researcher analyzed the data, the researcher has calculated the data into the statistic calculation. The researcher used $\mathbf{t_{test}}$ formula to find the empirical evidence statistically and to make the testing of the hypotheses. So this research will be easier. Prior the calculation of $\mathbf{t_{test}}$, the researcher made the calculation table to gain Mean and Deviation Standard from two variables, the table as follows:

Table 4

The Comparison Scores of Each Student in Experiment Class and Control Class

Students X	**Students Y**	**X**	Y	X	Y	x.x	y.y
S1	S1	10	10	-7	0	0	49
S2	S2	20	15	3	4.5	20.25	9
S3	S3	15	15	-2	4.5	20.25	4
S4	S4	20	5	3	-5.5	30.25	9
S5	S5	15	25	-2	14.5	210.25	4
S6	S6	10	5	-7	-5.5	30.25	49
S7	S7	17	15	0	-4.5	20.25	0
S8	S8	18	10	1	-0.5	0.25	1
S9	S9	16	10	-1	-0.5	0.25	1
S10	S10	25	5	8	-5.5	30.25	64
S11	S11	20	10	3	-0.5	0.25	9
S12	S12	25	15	8	4.5	20.25	64
S13	S13	15	5	-2	-5.5	30.25	4
S14	S14	20	20	3	9.5	90.25	9
S15	S15	16	10	-1	-0.5	0.25	1
S16	S16	17	10	0	-0.5	0.25	0
S17	S17	30	10	13	-0.5	0.25	169
S18	S18	20	10	3	-0.5	0.25	9
S19	S19	15	15	-2	4.5	20.25	4
S20	S20	5	0	-12	-10.5	110.25	144
S21	S21	10	10	-7	-0.5	0.25	49
S22	S22	17	0	0	-10.5	110.25	0
S23	Ss23	16	20	-1	10.5	110.25	1
S24	S24	19	5	2	-5.5	30.25	4
S25	S25	20	10	3	-0.5	0.25	9
S26	S26	30	0	3	-10.5	110.25	9
S27	S27	10	35	-7	24.5	600.25	49
S28	S28	18	10	1	-0.5	0.25	1
S29	S29	10	10	-7	-0.5	0.25	49
S30	S30	17	0	0	-10.5	110.25	0
S31	-	18		1		1	
Mean		**17**	**10.6**				
N1=31	**N2=30**	**534**	320	0	0	1626.75	1295

The resercher calculated the data based on the procedure of the calculation. The formulation as follows:

1. **Determining Mean of Variable X, with formula**

$$M_x = \frac{\sum_x}{N1}$$
$$= \frac{534}{31}$$
$$= 17$$

2. **Determining Mean of Variable Y, with formula**

$$M_Y = \frac{\sum_Y}{N1}$$
$$= \frac{320}{31}$$
$$= 10.5$$

3. **Determining Standard of Deviation Score of Variable X, with formula**

$$SD_X = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{x^2}}{N1}}$$
$$= \sqrt{\frac{1626.75}{31}}$$
$$= \sqrt{81.33}$$
$$= 9.18$$

4. **Determining Standard of Deviation Score of Variable Y, with formula**

$$SD_y = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{y^2}}{N2}}$$
$$= \sqrt{\frac{1295}{30}}$$
$$= \sqrt{64.75}$$
$$= 8.04$$

5. Determining Standard Error of Mean of Variable X, with formula

$$SE_{MX} = \frac{SDx}{\sqrt{N1-1}}$$

$$= \frac{9.18}{\sqrt{30}}$$

$$= \frac{9.18}{4.36}$$

$$= 2.10$$

6. Determining Standard Error of Mean of Variable Y, with formula

$$SE_{MY} = \frac{SDy}{\sqrt{N2-1}}$$

$$= \frac{8.04}{\sqrt{29}}$$

$$= \frac{8.04}{5.38}$$

$$= 1.49$$

7. Determining Standard Error of Difference of Mean of Variable X and Variable Y, with formula

$$SE_{MX} - SE_{MY} = \sqrt{SEmx^{2+}}\ SEmy2$$

$$= 2.2$$

8. Determining t_0 with formula

$$t_o = \frac{MX-MY}{SEmx-My}$$

$$= \frac{17-10.5}{2.23}$$

$$= 2.91$$

9. Determining t_{table} in significance level 5% with Degrees of Freedom

df = (N1 + N2) – 2

= (31 + 30) – 2

= 59

10. The Testing of Hypotheses

The researcher formulated the Null Hypothesis (Ho) and the Alternative Hypothesis (Ha) as follow:

Ho : There is no a significant difference achievement in writing procedural text between the students who are taught by using Group Discussion and the students who are taught by using Teacher Centered Method.

Ha : There is a significant difference achievement in writing procedural text between the students who are taught by using Group Discussion and the students who are taught by using Teacher Centered Method. The assumption of this hypothesis as follows: If $\mathbf{t_o} \geq \mathbf{t_{table}}$, the Null Hypothesis (Ho) is rejected. It means there is a significant difference achievement in writing procedural text between the students who are taught by using Group Discussion and the students who are taught by using Teacher Centered Method

If $\mathbf{t_o} \leq \mathbf{t_{table}}$, the Null Hypothesis (Ho) is accepted. It means there is no a significant difference achievement in writing procedural text between the students who are taught by using Group Discussion and the students who are taught by using Teacher Centered Method. Based on the description of the calculation above, it can be inferred that:

1) The value of t_{table} in the significance 5% is 0.474.

2) The value of t_o 2.91

Having analyzed the data of pre-test and post-test by using t-test formula, the result shows that the coefficient is 2.91. it means that there is a significance difference in teaching reading comprehension by using Group Discussion. From the result of calculation, it is obtained the value of the t observation (to) is 2.91 the degree of freedom (df) is 59 (obtained from (N1+N2- 2)=(31 + 30) – 2 =59). The researcher used the degree of significance of 5%. In the table significance, it can be seen that on the degree of significance are 2.00 and 2.65. if the *to* compared with each value of degrees of significance, the result is 2.00 < 2.91>2.65. since to score obtained from the result of calculating, the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted and the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected.

1) If the result of t observation is higher than t table (to>tt), the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected and alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted. It means that there is a significance difference between variable X and variable Y.

2) If the result of t observation is lower than t table (to<tt), the null hypothesis (Ho) is accepted and alternative hypothesis (Ha) is rejected. It means that there is no significance between variable X and variable Y.

Therefore, it can be inferred that the use of Group Discussion is more effective in teaching writing procedural text thanTeacher Centered method. It simply illustrates that the students who are taught by Group Discussion have a significant difference achievement in writing procedural text between the students who are taught by using Teacher Centered.

The researcher summarized that $t_o \geq t_{table}$, it means that the Null Hypothesis (Ho) is rejected and the Alternative Hypothesis (Ha) is accepted. The researcher analyzed the result of calculation that (Ho) is rejected and (Ha) is accepted. It might have been due several factors that are mentioned below:

1) The teacher who is conducting teaching through Teacher Centered Method offering translating activity between the students to the teacher while the teacher who is conducting teaching through Group Discussion offering more varied activity including discussion, questioning and answering between students, and sharing the difficulty of learning with other students. The varied activity in the classroom will make the students more interest to learn.

2) The interaction during process of learning and teaching Teacher Centered Method are only from the teacher to the students while there are interactions between the teacher to the students, students to other students, and the students to the teacher in Group Discussion. The interaction in Group Discussion will help students clarify in their own minds what they have already learned and understood.

3) The role of the teacher in Control Class is . It means that the teacher is an authority in the classroom and the role of students is that do what the teacher's said while in Group Discussion classroom the teacher's role is facilitator, creator, etc. The students' role in Group Discussion is not only do what the teacher's said but also gate-keeper, checker, etc. The roles in Group Discussion classroom will make the process of learning and teaching more relax.

4) The activity in Group Discussion classroom can be made students more active than the activity in Grammar Traslation Method. So it can make students in

Group Discussion classroom to improve their knowledge better than in Teacher Centered Method.

11. Validity and Reliability of Instrument

A good test must be valid and reliable. To get the coefficient of correlation, the researcher applied the product moment formula and then continued to the spearman-brown formula. The formula of product moment to search the validity as follow:

N= 31 ΣY= 1295

ΣXY = 2106641 ΣX^2= 2646315

ΣX= 1626.75 ΣY^2= 2195025

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

$$r_{xy} = \frac{(31)(2106641) - (1295)(1626.75)}{\sqrt{\{(31)(4024036)\} - \{(1626.75^2)(30)(2195025) - (1295^2)\}}}$$

r_{xy} = 0.4736

The result of r_{xy} is applied to the reability formula:

$$r_{xy} = \frac{2\ x\ rxy}{1 + rxy}$$

$$r_{xy} = \frac{2\ x\ 0.474}{1 + 0.474}$$

r_{xy} = 1.89

From the computation above, it is found out that r_{xy} *0.476* which is valid enough and (the total of reliability test) is 1.89, where as the number of subjects is

61 and the critical value for r-table with significance level 5% is 0.474. Thus, the value resulted from the computation is higher than its critical value. It could be concluded that the instrument used in this research is valid enough and reliable.

C. Normality Test

1. Test of Data Normality

The computation of normality distribution test was conducted by One-Sample Kolmogrov-Smirnof test in Microsoft Excel 2010. The level Significance was 0,05. The hypothesis which was used as follow:

H_0= the scores of the experimental group and the control group are normally distributed.

H_1= the score of experimental group and the control group are not normally distributed.

Table 7 presented the result of normality distribution test result on pre-test of the control group.

Table 5
Normality Distribution Test Result on Pre-test of Control Group

Sample	30
Mean	63.387
Standard Deviation	10.478
t_{count}	0.237
t_{table}	0.248
Normal	

Table 8 presented the result of normality distribution test result on pre-test of the experimental group.

Table 6
Normality Distribution Test Result on Pre-test of Experimental Group

N Sample	31
Mean	64
Standard Deviation	7.659
t_{count}	0.151
t_{table}	0.244
Normal	

Based on the tables above, the $t_{count}$of control group and experimental group was 0.237 and 0.151. While the t_{table} is 0.244 and 0.248. It mean that the $t_{count}$from both of group is lower than t_{table}. The result showed that the null hypothesis was accepted and data of both groups was normally distributed.

Table 9 presented the result of normality distribution test result on post-test of the control group.

Table 7
Normality Distribution Test Result on Post-test of Control Group

Sample	30
Mean	74.8
Standard Deviation	10.127
t_{count}	0.238
t_{table}	0.248
Normal	

Table 10 presented the result of normality distribution test result on post-test of the experimental group.

Table 8
Normality Distribution Test Result on Post-test of Experimental Group

N Sample	41
Mean	82.00
Standard Deviation	5.385
t_{count}	0.193
t_{table}	0.244
Normal	

Based on the tables above, the $t_{count}$of control group and experimental group was 0.193 and 0.273. While the t_{table} is 0.244 and 0.248. It means that the $t_{count}$from both of group is lower than t_{table}. The result showed that the null hypothesis was accepted and data of both groups was normally distributed.

D. Homogenity Test

1. Homogenity Test of Pre-test Data.

The computation of homogeneity distribution test was conducted by using formula as follow:

$$F_{count} = \frac{vb}{vk}$$

Variance = SD^2

Find F_{count} :

$$F_{count} = \frac{vb}{vk}$$

$$F_{count} = \frac{10.754}{7.659}$$

$$F_{count} = 1{,}40$$

Find F_{table} :

Dk quantifier = n – 1 = 30 – 1 = 29

Dk denominator = n – 1 = 31 – 1 = 30.

$F_{0,05}$ (29.30) = 2.00

From the calculation above $F_{count} < F_{table,}$ that is 1.40 < 20.00 That mean the data is homogeneous.

2. Homogeneity Test of Post-test Data.

The computation of homogeneity distribution test was conducted by using formula as follow:

$$F_{count} = \frac{vb}{vk}$$

Variance = SD^2

Find F_{count} :

$$F_{count} = \frac{vb}{vk}$$

$$F_{count} = \frac{10.127}{5.385}$$

$$F_{count} = 1.88$$

Find F_{table} :

Dk quantifier = n – 1 = 30 – 1 = 29

Dk denominator = n – 1 = 31 – 1 = 30.

$F_{0,05}$ (29.30) = 2.00

From the calculation above $F_{count} < F_{table,}$ that is 1.88 < 2.00. That mean the data is homogeneous.

B. Discussion

The objective of this research was to find out the influence of of group discussion in teaching procedural text writing the eleventh grade of SMAN 5 Kota Serang. To prove it, the researcher used writing test as the instrument.

The populations of this research were the eleventh grade of SMAN 5 Kota Serang and the sample was chosen by using random-sampling technique. The population were 258 students. The researcher had chosen two classes those were XI MIA 3 as experimental group which consisted of 31 students and XI MIA 2 as control group which consisted of 30 students. So, the samples of this research were 61 students.

In this research, the researcher conducted the research for three meetings. The first meeting, the researcher conducted pre-test to the both groups. It was conducted to find out students' score before they got treatment. The second meeting, the researcher conducted treatment in the experimental group, meanwhile in control group, the researcher only did conventional teaching. The last meeting, the researcher conducted post-test. It was conducted to find out students' score after they got treatment.

The first meeting was conducted on December1st 2014. While pre-test for experimental group was conducted on the same day. The researcher gave pre-test, the test was procedural text writing. After giving test, the researcher analyzed the result of students' pre-test. In analyzing the data, the researcher found that most of students in both groups had difficulties in writing such as they were lacking of vocabulary, weak in grammar, lacking of self-confidence, and they were afraid of making mistake when they were writing. Based on the reason above, the

researcher conducted a research to find out whether group discussion influenced toward students' procedural text writing ability or not in the eleventh grade of SMAN 5 Kota Serang.

The next meeting was conducted on December2nd 2014 in control group. Researcher did not give treatment to control group. On October3rd 2014 The researcher conducted the treatment in the experimental group. In this section, the reasearcher used the topic about procedure text on experimental class. The way of this text is showing some pictures to make something. The students wrote procedure text based on steps of the picture. Where as to control class, the researcher taught them with Teacher Centered or without group discussion. The last step on the lesson, the researcher asked some questions to find out how far they understood about writing. Then, the researcher found that the students can use the pattern such as pour the hot water.

The last meeting was conducted on December 3rd. The researcher did post-test in both of group. Group discussion utilized for the benefit of the students, but not simply to learn material, topics, or subjects, but to also teach students how to become well integrated, functioning members of their society. Furthermore, the researcher did the statistical computation results by using Microsoft Excel 2010 for windows. It was used to know the normality distribution test and homogeneity variance. The researcher did the computation of normality distribution test by using Kolmogrov Smirnov, it was used to find out whether the test was normally distributed or not. Meanwhile, the computation of homogeneity variance was computated manually using calculator as supporting device. It was used to know whether variance of the two groups were homogenous or not.

Statistical computation indicated that the distribution score of both groups were normal and the variances on their skills were equal. It was proven by the score of students' pre-test and post-test. In normality distribution result on pre-test and post-test score, the computation test showed that the pre-test score of experimental was higher than the level of significance and also the pre-test score of control group was higher than the level of significance. It means that the score of both groups were normally distributed.

In addition, the computation test on post-test score of experimental group was higher than the level of significance and the post test score of control group also was higher than the level of significance. So, the null hypothesis was accepted or the score of both groups were normally distributed.

Besides, in variance homogeneity result on pre-test and post-test score, the statistical computation showed that pre-test score of both groups were higher than the level of significance and also the post-test of both groups were higher than the level of significance. It means that the variances of two groups were homogenous or the null hypothesis was accepted.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

A. Conclusion

Answering the identification of the problem on how is the student's procedural text writing achievement by using group discussion and how is the difference between the student's learning achievement in studying procedural text writing with grammar translation method and with group discussion. Group discussion exposes students to various points of view and to the ways of supporting those view points; therefore, it helps students to learn procedural text writing , as well as teaches them how to know new content. Group discussion also can help the students, with or without teacher presence, actively bring meaning to the written word. The technique chosen not only promotes writing comprehension but also provides opportunities for students to learn to monitor their own learning and thinking.

The teacher is not only as the information giver but also as a facilitator she has to give students guidance and direction how to competence a procedural text writing. The effect of using group discussion in teaching writing comprehension has given impact to students. The students are more motivated. It can be concluded that using group discussion motivated the student's achievement on writing comprehension test espescially procuderal text.

Teaching procedural text writing by using group discussion technique is effective rather than translation grammar method. It can be seen from the result of

computation. It indicates that the average post test score of experimental group mean is 82 It is higher than the average post test score control group mean which is 74.8 The experimental has standard deviation (*sd*), which is 9.01 and the standard deviation of control group is 8.04 The data above show that there is significant difference between the experimental and the control group.

Discussion technique is a technique in which students work in group, Group discussion can be used in a variety of ways for variety goals, but it is primarily used for the acquisition and presentation of a new material, review, or informed debate.

The writing skill becomes very important in education field, students need to be exercised and trained in order to have a good writing skill. Writing is also something crucial and indispensable for the students, because the success of their study depends on the greater of their ability to write.

Based on the data analysis, there is an influence of group discussion technique on students' writing ability. So, the students have responsibility and feel enjoy the learning process. It means that group discussion can be used as one of the alternative to teach procedural text writing.

The result of t observation is higher than t table (to>tt), the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected and alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted. It means that there is a significance difference between variable X and variable Y. Further more, the value resulted from the computation is higher than its critical value. It could be concluded that the instrument used in this research is reliable.

The answer is the student's writing procedural learning achievement by using group discussion is increasing and the student's learning achievement in studying writing procedural text with group discussion is better than studying writing procedural text with conventional method first semester of the eleventh grade SMA Negeri 5 Kota Serang.

It can be concluded that the use of group discussion in teaching student's writing procedural is successful. It can be seen on the table of the students' scores that the students who learn writing procedural text with conventional method and with group discussion have a significant difference.

B. SUGGESTIONS

Based on the conclusion, the researcher would like to offer some suggestions as below:

1) The teachers have to know the various methods in learning and teaching in order to choose the suitable method for suitable materials in the classroom

2) The teachers are expected to be creative persons in order to make the teaching and learning process more interesting, effective, and comfortable for students.

3) The students need to realize that learning has two way process, not only teacher-center but also student-center. It means that they have significant role in achieving their success in study.

4) The students have to read more reading texts and practice writing procedural textin order to have more knowledge.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First of all the researcher would like to thanks to Allah SWT for the salvation and our great prophet Muhammad SAW. This research is dedicated to everybody whose being patience and giving support to create a title of Teaching Procedural Text Writing Through Group Discussion is effective at Grade XI of SMAN 5 Kota Serang as partial fulfillment of the requirement for S1 degree in our beloved English department. The researcher would like to express sincere gratitude to:

1. Siti Suharsih. M.Pd and Udi Samanhudi. M.Pd as the first advisor and the second advisor who have given suggestions, ideas, and comments to the researcher in finishing this research paper.
2. Sutrisno Sadji E. M.Pd, as the Chief of English Study Program of Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa University.
3. Drs. Suparman, M.M as the principal of SMAN 5 Kota Serang who has given a permission to the Researcher to do the research in the school.
4. All lecturers of English Language Teaching Department of University Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa who have been teach and train the research so that he can be a teacher and hopefully will make all of you proud.
5. All of my family member who have helped and supported the researcher in the process of completing this research paper.

The researcher realizes that in the main contents and arrangement of this research paper is still could be found a lot of shortages and imperfections. The researcher wishes for more suggestions and criticism to arrange better research next time.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

Lesson Plann

RENCANA PELAKSANAAN PEMBELAJARAN

(RPP)

Nama Sekolah : SMAN 5 Kota Serang

Mata Pelajaran : Bahasa Inggris

Kelas/Semester : XI (Sebelas) /2

Standar Kompeensi : Menulis

Mengungkapkan makna dalam teks tulis fungsional dan esai pendek sangat sederhana berbentuk *procedure* untuk berinteraksi dengan lingkungan terdekat.

Kompetensi Dasar : Mengungkapkan makna dalam teks tulis fungsional dan esai pendek sangat sederhana dengan menggunakan raam bahasa tulis secara akurat, lancar, dan berterima untuk berinteraksi dengan lingkungan terdekat.

Aspek/Skill : Menulis

Alokasi Waktu : 2 x 45 menit (1 X Pertemuan)

Tujuan Pembelajaran

Pada akhir pembelajaran, siswa dapat:

- Memahami makna dalam teks tulis fungsional dan esai pendek sangat sederhana berbentuk *procedure* untuk berinteraksi dengan lingkungan terdekat.

- **Karakter siswa yang diharapkan:** Dapat dipercaya (*Trustworthiness*)
  Rasa hormat dan perhatian (*respect*)
  Tekun (*diligent*)
  Tanggungjawab (*responsibility*)

Materi Pembelajaran

- Penjelasan tentang teks procedure
- Memberikan contoh tentang teks procedure
  Example:
  How to make a hot sweet tea
  1. Fill in the kettle with the water from the tap
  2. Put the kettle on the stove until the water boil
  3. While waiting for the hot water, put in the tea and the sugar into the cup
  4. After the hot water is ready, pour it into the cup
  5. Stir the mixture gently
  6. The tea is ready

Metode Pembelajaran: Group Discussion

Langkah-Langkah Kegiatan

A. Kegiatan Pendahuluan

Apersepsi :

- Guru memeriksa kerapihan siswa agar kegiatan belajar mengajar dapat terlaksana.
- Mengabsen siswa untuk memeriksa siswa yang hadir atau tidak hadir
- Menanyakan kembali materi yang telah diajarkan kemarin untuk mengasah daya ingat siswa.
- Tanya jawab mengenai percakapan transaksional dan interpersonal sangat sederhana untuk berinteraksi dengan lingkungan terdekat.

B. Kegiatan Inti

Eksplorasi

Dalam kegiatan eksplorasi, guru:

→ Tanya jawab berkaitan dengan materi;

→ Melibatkan peserta didik mencari informasi yang luas dan dalam tentang topik/tema materi yang dipelajari dari aneka sumber;

→ Mendengarkan dan merespon tentang topic materi yang akan disampaikan;

→ Membahas materi tentang procedure teks

→ Menggunakan beragam pendekatan pembelajaran, media pembelajaran, dan sumber belajar lainnya;

→ Memfasilitasi terjadinya interaksi antar peserta didik serta antara peserta didik dengan guru, lingkungan, dan sumber belajar lainnya;

→ Melibatkan peserta didik secaa aktif dalam setiap kegiatan pembelajaran; dan

→ Memfasilitasi peserta didik melakukan percobaan di laboratorium, studio, atau lapangan.

Elaborasi

Dalam kegiatan elaborasi, guru:

→ Membiasakan peserta didik membaca dan menulis yang beragam melalui tugas-tugas tertentu yang bermakna;
→ Memfasilitasi peserta didik melalui pemberian tugas, diskusi, dan lain-lain untuk memunculkan gagasan baru baik secara lisan maupun tertulis;
→ Memberi kesempatan untk berfikir, menganalisis, menyelasaikan masalah, dan bertindak tanpa rasa takut;
→ Memfasilitasi peserta didik berkompetensi secara sehat untuk menngkatkan prestasi belajar;
→ Memfasilitasi peserta didik membuat laporan eksplorasi yang dilakukan baik secara individual maupun kelompok;
→ Memfasilitasi peserta didik untuk menyajikan hasil kerja individual maupun kelompok;
→ Memfasilitasi peserta didik melakukan pameran, turnamen, festival, serta produk yang diselesaikan;
→ Memfasilitasi peserta didik melakukan kegiatan yang menumbuhkan kebanggaan dan rasa percaya diri peserta didik.

Konfirmasi

Dalam kegiatan konfirmasi, guru:

→ Memberikan umpan balik positif dan penguatan dalam bentuk lisan, tulisan, isyarat, maupun hadiah terhadap keberhasilan peserta didik;

→ Memfasilitasi peserta didik untuk memperoleh pengalaman yang bermakna dalam mencapai kompetensi dasar:

- Berfungsi sebagai narasumber dan fasilitator dalam menjawab pertanyaan peserta didik yang menghadapi kesulitan, dengan menggunakan bahasa yang baku dan benar;
- Membantu peserta didik menyelesaikan masalah;
- Memberi acuan agar peserta didik dapat melakukan pengecekan hasil eksplorasi;
- Memberi informasi untuk bereksplorasi lebih jauh;
- Memberikan motivasi kepada peserta didik yang kurang atau belum berpartisipasi aktif.

→ Guru bertanya jawab tentang hal-hal yang belum diketahui siswa;

→ Guru dan siswa bertanya jawab meluruskan kesalahfahaman, memberian penguatan dan penyimpulan.

C. Kegiatan Penutup

Dalam kegiatan penutup, guru:

→ Bersama-sama dengan peserta didik dan/atau sebdiri membuat rangkuman/simpulan pelajaran;

→ Melakukan penilaian dan/atau refleksi terhadap kegiatan yang sudah dilaksanakan secara konsisten dan terprogram;

→ Memberikan umpan balik terhadap proses dan hasil pembelajaran;

→ Merencanakan kegiatan tindak lanjut dalam bentuk pembelajaran remedy, program pengayaan, layan konseling dan/atau memberikan tugas baik tugas individual maupun kelompok sesuai dengan hasil belajar peserta didik;

Sumber belajar

- Buku teks yang relevan

- Script percakapan
- Gambar-gambar yang relevan

Penilaian

Indikator Pencapaian Kompetensi	**Teknik Penilaian**	**Bentuk Instrumen**	**Instrumen/ Soal**
• Memahami teks procedure • Menulis teks procedure	Tes tulis Tes tulis	Menjawab pertanyaan sesuai dengan teks Esai bebas	1. *Answer the question below based on the text on task 1* 2. *Make your own procedure text based on the picture*

- Instrumen

  Make your own procedure based on the picture

- Rubrik Penilaian

Content	Organization	Vocabulary	Language Use	Mechanic

Serang, 4
Desember 2014

Peneliti,

Nurhidayati
NIM. 2223082407

Mengetahui

Kepala Sekolah SMAN 5 Kota Serang

APPENDIX 2

Pre Test :

Make your own procedure based on the picture

APPENDIX 3

Post Test

Make your own procedure based on the picture

APPENDIX 10

The value in the significance 5% and 1 %

df atau db	Harga Kritik "t" pada Taraf Signifikansi:	
	5 %	1 %
1	12,71	63,66
2	4,30	9,92
3	3,18	5,84
4	2,78	4,60
5	2,57	4,03
6	2,45	3,71
7	2,36	3,50
8	2,31	3,36
9	2,26	3,25
10	2,23	3,17
11	2,20	3,11
12	2,18	3,06
13	2,16	3,01
14	2,14	2,98
15	2,13	2,95
16	2,12	2,92
17	2,11	2,90
18	2,10	2,88
19	2,09	2,86
20	2,09	2,84
21	2,08	2,83
22	2,07	2,82
23	2,07	2,81
24	2,06	2,80
25	2,06	2,79
26	2,06	2,78
27	2,05	2,77
28	2,05	2,76
29	2,04	2,76
30	2,04	2,75
35	2,03	2,72
40	2,02	2,71
45	2,02	2,69
50	2,01	2,68
60	2,00	2,65
70	2,00	2,65
80	1,99	2,64
90	1,99	2,63
100	1,98	2,63
200	1,97	2,60
500	1,96	2,59
1000	1,96	2,58

APPENDIX 11

Normality Distribution Test Result on Pre-test of Control Group

Var I	Freq	Cumul	$S_n(x)$	Z-Score	F(x)	Difference
40	1	1	0,033333333	-2,179066178	0,014663	0,018669957
40	1	2	0,066666667	-2,179066178	0,014663	0,05200329
45	1	3	0,1	-1,701898402	0,044387	0,055612792
45	1	4	0,133333333	-1,701898402	0,044387	0,088946126
50	1	5	0,166666667	-1,224730626	0,110338	0,056328301
50	1	6	0,2	-1,224730626	0,110338	0,089661634
55	1	7	0,233333333	-0,747562849	0,227362	0,005971393
60	1	8	0,266666667	-0,270395073	0,393428	0,126761498
60	1	9	0,3	-0,270395073	0,393428	0,093428165
65	1	10	0,333333333	0,206772703	0,581906	0,248572979
65	1	11	0,366666667	0,206772703	0,581906	0,215239646
65	1	12	0,4	0,206772703	0,581906	0,181906312
65	1	13	0,433333333	0,206772703	0,581906	0,148572979
65	1	14	0,466666667	0,206772703	0,581906	0,115239646
65	1	15	0,5	0,206772703	0,581906	0,081906312
65	1	16	0,533333333	0,206772703	0,581906	0,048572979
65	1	17	0,566666667	0,206772703	0,581906	0,015239646
65	1	18	0,6	0,206772703	0,581906	0,018093688
65	1	19	0,633333333	0,206772703	0,581906	0,051427021
65	1	20	0,666666667	0,206772703	0,581906	0,084760354
70	1	21	0,7	0,683940479	0,752994	0,052993624
70	1	22	0,733333333	0,683940479	0,752994	0,019660291
70	1	23	0,766666667	0,683940479	0,752994	0,013673042
70	1	24	0,8	0,683940479	0,752994	0,047006376
70	1	25	0,833333333	0,683940479	0,752994	0,080339709
70	1	26	0,866666667	0,683940479	0,752994	0,113673042
75	1	27	0,9	1,161108255	0,877201	0,022798939
75	1	28	0,933333333	1,161108255	0,877201	0,056132272
75	1	29	0,966666667	1,161108255	0,877201	0,089465606
80	1	30	1	1,638276032	0,949318	0,050682063

Statistik	Var I
N Sampel	30
Mean	62,833
Simpangan Baku	10,478
D_n =	0,237
KS Tabel	0,248
Normal	

APPENDIX 12

Normality Distribution Test Result on Pre-test of Experiment Group

Var I	Freq	Cumul	$S_n(x)$	Z-Score	F(x)	Difference
50	1	1	0,032258065	-1,861541957	0,031334	0,000924224
50	1	2	0,064516129	-1,861541957	0,031334	0,033182288
55	1	3	0,096774194	-1,208738782	0,113382	0,016607415
56	1	4	0,129032258	-1,078178147	0,140477	0,011444873
58	1	5	0,161290323	-0,817056877	0,206948	0,04565764
60	1	6	0,193548387	-0,555935607	0,289127	0,095579051
60	1	7	0,225806452	-0,555935607	0,289127	0,063320986
60	1	8	0,258064516	-0,555935607	0,289127	0,031062922
60	1	9	0,290322581	-0,555935607	0,289127	0,001195143
60	1	10	0,322580645	-0,555935607	0,289127	0,033453207
61	1	11	0,35483871	-0,425374972	0,335282	0,019557036
61	1	12	0,387096774	-0,425374972	0,335282	0,0518151
62	1	13	0,419354839	-0,294814337	0,384068	0,035286982
62	1	14	0,451612903	-0,294814337	0,384068	0,067545046
62	1	15	0,483870968	-0,294814337	0,384068	0,099803111
62	1	16	0,516129032	-0,294814337	0,384068	0,132061175
65	1	17	0,548387097	0,096867568	0,538584	0,009802879
65	1	18	0,580645161	0,096867568	0,538584	0,042060944
65	1	19	0,612903226	0,096867568	0,538584	0,074319008
65	1	20	0,64516129	0,096867568	0,538584	0,106577073
68	1	21	0,677419355	0,488549473	0,68742	0,010000299
68	1	22	0,709677419	0,488549473	0,68742	0,022257766
68	1	23	0,741935484	0,488549473	0,68742	0,05451583
68	1	24	0,774193548	0,488549473	0,68742	0,086773895
68	1	25	0,806451613	0,488549473	0,68742	0,119031959
68	1	26	0,838709677	0,488549473	0,68742	0,151290024
70	1	27	0,870967742	0,749670743	0,773273	0,097694258
75	1	28	0,903225806	1,402473917	0,919613	0,016387307
75	1	29	0,935483871	1,402473917	0,919613	0,015870758
80	1	30	0,967741935	2,055277092	0,980074	0,01233194
85	1	31	1	2,708080267	0,996616	0,003383683

Statistik	Var I
N Sampel	31
Mean	64,258
Simpangan Baku	7,659
D_n =	0,151
KS Tabel	0,244
Normal	

APPENDIX 13

Normality Distribution Test Result on Post-test of control Group

Var I	Freq	Cumul	$S_n(x)$	Z-Score	F(x)	Difference
50	1	1	0,033333333	-2,452174467	0,0071	0,026233544
50	1	2	0,066666667	-2,452174467	0,0071	0,059566877
55	1	3	0,1	-1,958448064	0,025089	0,07491127
55	1	4	0,133333333	-1,958448064	0,025089	0,108244604
65	1	5	0,166666667	-0,970995259	0,165775	0,000891347
70	1	6	0,2	-0,477268856	0,316585	0,116585343
75	1	7	0,233333333	0,016457547	0,506565	0,273231982
75	1	8	0,266666667	0,016457547	0,506565	0,239898648
75	1	9	0,3	0,016457547	0,506565	0,206565315
75	1	10	0,333333333	0,016457547	0,506565	0,173231982
75	1	11	0,366666667	0,016457547	0,506565	0,139898648
75	1	12	0,4	0,016457547	0,506565	0,106565315
75	1	13	0,433333333	0,016457547	0,506565	0,073231982
75	1	14	0,466666667	0,016457547	0,506565	0,039898648
75	1	15	0,5	0,016457547	0,506565	0,006565315
75	1	16	0,533333333	0,016457547	0,506565	0,026768018
80	1	17	0,566666667	0,510183949	0,695039	0,128372035
80	1	18	0,6	0,510183949	0,695039	0,095038702
80	1	19	0,633333333	0,510183949	0,695039	0,061705369
80	1	20	0,666666667	0,510183949	0,695039	0,028372035
80	1	21	0,7	0,510183949	0,695039	0,004961298
80	1	22	0,733333333	0,510183949	0,695039	0,038294631
80	1	23	0,766666667	0,510183949	0,695039	0,071627965
80	1	24	0,8	0,510183949	0,695039	0,104961298
85	1	25	0,833333333	1,003910352	0,842289	0,008955754
85	1	26	0,866666667	1,003910352	0,842289	0,02437758
85	1	27	0,9	1,003910352	0,842289	0,057710913
85	1	28	0,933333333	1,003910352	0,842289	0,091044246
85	1	29	0,966666667	1,003910352	0,842289	0,12437758
85	1	30	1	1,003910352	0,842289	0,157710913

Statistik	Var I
N Sampel	30
Mean	74,833
Simpangan Baku	10,127
D_n =	0,234
KS Tabel	0,248
Normal	

APPENDIX 14

Normality Distribution Test Result on Post-test of control Group

Var I	Freq	Cumul	$S_n(x)$	Z-Score	F(x)	Difference
70	1	1	0,032258065	-2,228344058	0,012929	0,019329274
75	1	2	0,064516129	-1,299867367	0,096823	0,032307087
75	1	3	0,096774194	-1,299867367	0,096823	4,90221E-05
76	1	4	0,129032258	-1,114172029	0,132603	0,003570438
78	1	5	0,161290323	-0,742781353	0,228807	0,067516711
78	1	6	0,193548387	-0,742781353	0,228807	0,035258646
78	1	7	0,225806452	-0,742781353	0,228807	0,003000582
78	1	8	0,258064516	-0,742781353	0,228807	0,029257483
78	1	9	0,290322581	-0,742781353	0,228807	0,061515547
78	1	10	0,322580645	-0,742781353	0,228807	0,093773612
78	1	11	0,35483871	-0,742781353	0,228807	0,126031676
80	1	12	0,387096774	-0,371390676	0,355173	0,03192349
80	1	13	0,419354839	-0,371390676	0,355173	0,064181554
80	1	14	0,451612903	-0,371390676	0,355173	0,096439619
80	1	15	0,483870968	-0,371390676	0,355173	0,128697683
80	1	16	0,516129032	-0,371390676	0,355173	0,160955748
80	1	17	0,548387097	-0,371390676	0,355173	0,193213812
85	1	18	0,580645161	0,557086015	0,711266	0,130620507
85	1	19	0,612903226	0,557086015	0,711266	0,098362443
85	1	20	0,64516129	0,557086015	0,711266	0,066104378
85	1	21	0,677419355	0,557086015	0,711266	0,033846314
85	1	22	0,709677419	0,557086015	0,711266	0,001588249
85	1	23	0,741935484	0,557086015	0,711266	0,030669815
85	1	24	0,774193548	0,557086015	0,711266	0,06292788
85	1	25	0,806451613	0,557086015	0,711266	0,095185944
90	1	26	0,838709677	1,485562705	0,931303	0,09259291
90	1	27	0,870967742	1,485562705	0,931303	0,060334845
90	1	28	0,903225806	1,485562705	0,931303	0,028076781
90	1	29	0,935483871	1,485562705	0,931303	0,004181284
90	1	29	0,935483871	1,485562705	0,931303	0,004181284
90	1	30	0,967741935	1,485562705	0,931303	0,036439348

Statistik	Var I
N Sampel	31
Mean	82,000
Simpangan Baku	5,385
D_n =	0,193
KS Tabel	0,244
Normal	

APPENDIX 10

The value in the significance 5% and 1 %

df atau db	Harga Kritik "t" pada Taraf Signifikansi:	
	5 %	1 %
1	12,71	63,66
2	4,30	9,92
3	3,18	5,84
4	2,78	4,60
5	2,57	4,03
6	2,45	3,71
7	2,36	3,50
8	2,31	3,36
9	2,26	3,25
10	2,23	3,17
11	2,20	3,11
12	2,18	3,06
13	2,16	3,01
14	2,14	2,98
15	2,13	2,95
16	2,12	2,92
17	2,11	2,90
18	2,10	2,88
19	2,09	2,86
20	2,09	2,84
21	2,08	2,83
22	2,07	2,82
23	2,07	2,81
24	2,06	2,80
25	2,06	2,79
26	2,06	2,78
27	2,05	2,77
28	2,05	2,76
29	2,04	2,76
30	2,04	2,75
35	2,03	2,72
40	2,02	2,71
45	2,02	2,69
50	2,01	2,68
60	2,00	2,65
70	2,00	2,65
80	1,99	2,64
90	1,99	2,63
100	1,98	2,63
200	1,97	2,60
500	1,96	2,59
1000	1,96	2,58

APPENDIX 11

Normality Distribution Test Result on Pre-test of Control Group

Var I	Freq	Cumul	$S_n(x)$	Z-Score	F(x)	Difference
40	1	1	0,033333333	-2,179066178	0,014663	0,018669957
40	1	2	0,066666667	-2,179066178	0,014663	0,05200329
45	1	3	0,1	-1,701898402	0,044387	0,055612792
45	1	4	0,133333333	-1,701898402	0,044387	0,088946126
50	1	5	0,166666667	-1,224730626	0,110338	0,056328301
50	1	6	0,2	-1,224730626	0,110338	0,089661634
55	1	7	0,233333333	-0,747562849	0,227362	0,005971393
60	1	8	0,266666667	-0,270395073	0,393428	0,126761498
60	1	9	0,3	-0,270395073	0,393428	0,093428165
65	1	10	0,333333333	0,206772703	0,581906	0,248572979
65	1	11	0,366666667	0,206772703	0,581906	0,215239646
65	1	12	0,4	0,206772703	0,581906	0,181906312
65	1	13	0,433333333	0,206772703	0,581906	0,148572979
65	1	14	0,466666667	0,206772703	0,581906	0,115239646
65	1	15	0,5	0,206772703	0,581906	0,081906312
65	1	16	0,533333333	0,206772703	0,581906	0,048572979
65	1	17	0,566666667	0,206772703	0,581906	0,015239646
65	1	18	0,6	0,206772703	0,581906	0,018093688
65	1	19	0,633333333	0,206772703	0,581906	0,051427021
65	1	20	0,666666667	0,206772703	0,581906	0,084760354
70	1	21	0,7	0,683940479	0,752994	0,052993624
70	1	22	0,733333333	0,683940479	0,752994	0,019660291
70	1	23	0,766666667	0,683940479	0,752994	0,013673042
70	1	24	0,8	0,683940479	0,752994	0,047006376
70	1	25	0,833333333	0,683940479	0,752994	0,080339709
70	1	26	0,866666667	0,683940479	0,752994	0,113673042
75	1	27	0,9	1,161108255	0,877201	0,022798939
75	1	28	0,933333333	1,161108255	0,877201	0,056132272
75	1	29	0,966666667	1,161108255	0,877201	0,089465606
80	1	30	1	1,638276032	0,949318	0,050682063

Statistik	Var I
N Sampel	30
Mean	62,833
Simpangan Baku	10,478
D_n =	0,237
KS Tabel	0,248
Normal	

APPENDIX 12

Normality Distribution Test Result on Pre-test of Experiment Group

Var I	Freq	Cumul	$S_n(x)$	Z-Score	F(x)	Difference
50	1	1	0,032258065	-1,861541957	0,031334	0,000924224
50	1	2	0,064516129	-1,861541957	0,031334	0,033182288
55	1	3	0,096774194	-1,208738782	0,113382	0,016607415
56	1	4	0,129032258	-1,078178147	0,140477	0,011444873
58	1	5	0,161290323	-0,817056877	0,206948	0,04565764
60	1	6	0,193548387	-0,555935607	0,289127	0,095579051
60	1	7	0,225806452	-0,555935607	0,289127	0,063320986
60	1	8	0,258064516	-0,555935607	0,289127	0,031062922
60	1	9	0,290322581	-0,555935607	0,289127	0,001195143
60	1	10	0,322580645	-0,555935607	0,289127	0,033453207
61	1	11	0,35483871	-0,425374972	0,335282	0,019557036
61	1	12	0,387096774	-0,425374972	0,335282	0,0518151
62	1	13	0,419354839	-0,294814337	0,384068	0,035286982
62	1	14	0,451612903	-0,294814337	0,384068	0,067545046
62	1	15	0,483870968	-0,294814337	0,384068	0,099803111
62	1	16	0,516129032	-0,294814337	0,384068	0,132061175
65	1	17	0,548387097	0,096867568	0,538584	0,009802879
65	1	18	0,580645161	0,096867568	0,538584	0,042060944
65	1	19	0,612903226	0,096867568	0,538584	0,074319008
65	1	20	0,64516129	0,096867568	0,538584	0,106577073
68	1	21	0,677419355	0,488549473	0,68742	0,010000299
68	1	22	0,709677419	0,488549473	0,68742	0,022257766
68	1	23	0,741935484	0,488549473	0,68742	0,05451583
68	1	24	0,774193548	0,488549473	0,68742	0,086773895
68	1	25	0,806451613	0,488549473	0,68742	0,119031959
68	1	26	0,838709677	0,488549473	0,68742	0,151290024
70	1	27	0,870967742	0,749670743	0,773273	0,097694258
75	1	28	0,903225806	1,402473917	0,919613	0,016387307
75	1	29	0,935483871	1,402473917	0,919613	0,015870758
80	1	30	0,967741935	2,055277092	0,980074	0,01233194
85	1	31	1	2,708080267	0,996616	0,003383683

Statistik	Var I
N Sampel	31
Mean	64,258
Simpangan Baku	7,659
D_n =	0,151
KS Tabel	0,244
Normal	

APPENDIX 13

Normality Distribution Test Result on Post-test of control Group

Var I	Freq	Cumul	$S_n(x)$	Z-Score	F(x)	Difference
50	1	1	0,033333333	-2,452174467	0,0071	0,026233544
50	1	2	0,066666667	-2,452174467	0,0071	0,059566877
55	1	3	0,1	-1,958448064	0,025089	0,07491127
55	1	4	0,133333333	-1,958448064	0,025089	0,108244604
65	1	5	0,166666667	-0,970995259	0,165775	0,000891347
70	1	6	0,2	-0,477268856	0,316585	0,116585343
75	1	7	0,233333333	0,016457547	0,506565	0,273231982
75	1	8	0,266666667	0,016457547	0,506565	0,239898648
75	1	9	0,3	0,016457547	0,506565	0,206565315
75	1	10	0,333333333	0,016457547	0,506565	0,173231982
75	1	11	0,366666667	0,016457547	0,506565	0,139898648
75	1	12	0,4	0,016457547	0,506565	0,106565315
75	1	13	0,433333333	0,016457547	0,506565	0,073231982
75	1	14	0,466666667	0,016457547	0,506565	0,039898648
75	1	15	0,5	0,016457547	0,506565	0,006565315
75	1	16	0,533333333	0,016457547	0,506565	0,026768018
80	1	17	0,566666667	0,510183949	0,695039	0,128372035
80	1	18	0,6	0,510183949	0,695039	0,095038702
80	1	19	0,633333333	0,510183949	0,695039	0,061705369
80	1	20	0,666666667	0,510183949	0,695039	0,028372035
80	1	21	0,7	0,510183949	0,695039	0,004961298
80	1	22	0,733333333	0,510183949	0,695039	0,038294631
80	1	23	0,766666667	0,510183949	0,695039	0,071627965
80	1	24	0,8	0,510183949	0,695039	0,104961298
85	1	25	0,833333333	1,003910352	0,842289	0,008955754
85	1	26	0,866666667	1,003910352	0,842289	0,02437758
85	1	27	0,9	1,003910352	0,842289	0,057710913
85	1	28	0,933333333	1,003910352	0,842289	0,091044246
85	1	29	0,966666667	1,003910352	0,842289	0,12437758
85	1	30	1	1,003910352	0,842289	0,157710913

Statistik	Var I
N Sampel	30
Mean	74,833
Simpangan Baku	10,127
D_n =	0,234
KS Tabel	0,248
Normal	

APPENDIX 14

Normality Distribution Test Result on Post-test of control Group

Var I	Freq	Cumul	$S_n(x)$	Z-Score	F(x)	Difference
70	1	1	0,032258065	-2,228344058	0,012929	0,019329274
75	1	2	0,064516129	-1,299867367	0,096823	0,032307087
75	1	3	0,096774194	-1,299867367	0,096823	4,90221E-05
76	1	4	0,129032258	-1,114172029	0,132603	0,003570438
78	1	5	0,161290323	-0,742781353	0,228807	0,067516711
78	1	6	0,193548387	-0,742781353	0,228807	0,035258646
78	1	7	0,225806452	-0,742781353	0,228807	0,003000582
78	1	8	0,258064516	-0,742781353	0,228807	0,029257483
78	1	9	0,290322581	-0,742781353	0,228807	0,061515547
78	1	10	0,322580645	-0,742781353	0,228807	0,093773612
78	1	11	0,35483871	-0,742781353	0,228807	0,126031676
80	1	12	0,387096774	-0,371390676	0,355173	0,03192349
80	1	13	0,419354839	-0,371390676	0,355173	0,064181554
80	1	14	0,451612903	-0,371390676	0,355173	0,096439619
80	1	15	0,483870968	-0,371390676	0,355173	0,128697683
80	1	16	0,516129032	-0,371390676	0,355173	0,160955748
80	1	17	0,548387097	-0,371390676	0,355173	0,193213812
85	1	18	0,580645161	0,557086015	0,711266	0,130620507
85	1	19	0,612903226	0,557086015	0,711266	0,098362443
85	1	20	0,64516129	0,557086015	0,711266	0,066104378
85	1	21	0,677419355	0,557086015	0,711266	0,033846314
85	1	22	0,709677419	0,557086015	0,711266	0,001588249
85	1	23	0,741935484	0,557086015	0,711266	0,030669815
85	1	24	0,774193548	0,557086015	0,711266	0,06292788
85	1	25	0,806451613	0,557086015	0,711266	0,095185944
90	1	26	0,838709677	1,485562705	0,931303	0,09259291
90	1	27	0,870967742	1,485562705	0,931303	0,060334845
90	1	28	0,903225806	1,485562705	0,931303	0,028076781
90	1	29	0,935483871	1,485562705	0,931303	0,004181284
90	1	29	0,935483871	1,485562705	0,931303	0,004181284
90	1	30	0,967741935	1,485562705	0,931303	0,036439348

Statistik	Var I
N Sampel	31
Mean	82,000
Simpangan Baku	5,385
D_n =	0,193
KS Tabel	0,244
Normal	

HOW TO MAKE INDOMIE FRIED NOODLE

MATERIALS :
- One pack of instant noodle
- Water

PROCEDURE :
- First, boil two glasses of water in a pan.
- Then, open the package of Indomie fried noodles.
- While waiting for the water to boil, pour the seasoning: chili sauce, soya sauce and oil into a bowl.
- After the water is boiled, drain the noodles.
- Next, throw away the water.
- Then, pour the noodles into the bowl.
- After that, mix the noodles with the seasoning, sauce, and the other ingredients.
- Now, your noodles are ready.


MI GORENG


MI GORENG

LIST OF TABLE

REFERENCES

Aimah, Siti. (2008). *Demonstration as a Medium in the Teaching of Writing Procedure Text*: An Action Research via http://jurnal.unimus.ac.id access on 13th June 2012 at 8.00 am

Anderson, Mark and Kathy Anderson,. 1997.*Text Types in English 1*, South Yarra: Machmillan Education Malaysia,

Anthony, E. M. 1963. *Approach, method and technique Enqlish Language Teaching* 17: 63-7

Arikunto, Suharsimi. 1983. *Prosedur Penelitian.* Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

_____ (2002). *Prosedur Penelitian*. Edisi Revisi V. Jakarta: PT. Rineka Cipta

_____ (2003). *Prosedur Penelitian*. Edisi Revisi VI. Jakarta: PT. Rineka Cipta

Asmani, Jamal Ma'mur. 2011. *Penelitian Tindakan Kelas*. Jogjakarta: Laksana

Barber, Posh. (1984) . *Testing English as a Second Language*. New Jersey: Mc. Graw Hill-Hall Book Company

Bridges, D. (1987). *Education, democracy and discussion*. Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press.

Brilhart, J. (1986) *Effective Group Discussion*. Wm. C. Brown: Dubuque, Iowa.

Carpenter, G.M. (1968). *How To Teach Writing*. New York: Longman Inc

C.J. Brumfit and K. Johnson (1979). *The communicative approach to language teaching*. Oxford : Oxford University Press

C.J. Brumfit, J. T. Roberts. (1983). *Introduction to Language and Language Teaching*. London : Paperback

Dillon, J. T. (Ed.). (1974). *Deliberation in education and society*. Norwood: Ablex.

Finnochiaro ,Marry, *English as a Second Language*: from theory to Practice. NY: Regents Publishing Company, Inc., 1974.

Hammond, Jennifer and Derewianka, B. (2001). Genre. In Carter, R. And Nunan, D. *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Language*. (pp.186-193). Cambridge University Press.

Harmer, Jeremy. 2004. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Great Britain: Pearson Education Limited

John, Biarri. (1967). *Language Assessment Principles and Classroom Practice*. New York: Longman

Larsen, Freeman D . 1986 . *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Maloch, B. (1999) Shifting to Student-Centered, Collaborative Classrooms: *Implementing Student-Led Discussion Groups*. (Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association): Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

Mangubhai, Francis and Pritchard, Ruth. (1996). *English on Cue-Developing Skills in English Language*. Queensland: USQ Press

Mathews, D. (1994). *Is there a public for public schools?* Dayton: Kettering Foundation.

Newman, Lois and Angelo (1988). *Text-Based Syllabus Design*. Australia: Macquarie University

Richard, Jack and Willy A. Renandya, 2002. *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Teaching*,Cambridge : University Press.

Richards, Jack C and Theodore Rogers, 2001. *Approaches in Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Steinberg L, Morris AS. 2001. *Adolescent development*. New York : Peter Lang Publishment

Tangpermpoon, Thanatkun. (2008). *Integrated Approaches to Improve Students Writing Skills for English Major Students*. Retrieved June 10th 2012 from ABC Journal Vol. 28, No. 2

Takala K.M. (1988). *Text Type in English 2*. Australia: Mackmillan

Townsend, J. (1993) *Wondering Discourse in the Classroom*. (Paper presented at the 83rd Annual Meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English): Pittsburgh, PA

Willen . ,White, P. (1991). Civic virtues and public schooling*: Educating citizens for a democratic society*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Table 3

The Result of Pre Test & Post Test of Experiment Class
(Through Group Discussion)

No	Name	Pre Test	Post Test	Gained (d) score Post Test – Pre Test
1	Albert Firdaus	80	90	10
2	Alvi Maulana	70	90	20
3	Anra Kurnia M	60	85	15
4	Bahrul Ulum	50	70	20
5	Chevin Islamy A S	75	90	15
6	Dede Masrul Ulum S	75	85	10
7	Dedeh Septia W	68	85	17
8	Dika Handoko	61	77	16
9	Dwiria Tirani	62	78	16
10	Egi Rahmawan	65	90	25
11	Eka Melyana A	50	75	25
12	Eka Nur Hajijah	50	75	25
13	Emilya	65	80	15
14	Erlin Monica F	68	85	20
15	Ffni Savitri Agatha	62	78	16
16	Fariz Badruzaman	61	77	16
17	Fifana Maryanti	55	90	35
18	Fitri Dwi Cahyani	55	70	15
19	Fitriah	65	80	15
20	Gufronah	85	90	5
21	Holipatul Rohmah	75	85	10
22	Ihsan Amal M	68	85	17
23	Jannatuha Serli R	62	78	16
24	Maria Ulfah	61	77	16
25	Marsani	60	65	5
26	Meileni	60	90	30
27	Mufrodi	75	85	10
28	Mutia Larasati	60	70	10
29	Neneng Latifah	65	75	10
30	Ratu Selfia Setiani	68	85	17
31	Rima Iswanti	62	78	16
Total		**2100**	**2542**	**527**
Mean		**64.75**	**82**	**17**

Table 4

The Result of Pre Test & Post Test of Control Class
(Through Traditional Method)

No	Name	Pre Test	Post Test	Gained (d) score Post Test – Pre Test
1	Adinda Ayu S	65	85	20
2	AfuRachmad	65	80	15
3	Ayu Citra Novianti	65	80	15
4	DesiPrianti	75	80	5
5	DiahEkawati	65	85	25
6	FaniNoviani	80	90	10
7	FarizGustiana Putra	70	85	15
8	Farrihah	65	75	10
9	FegaPurnamaDewi	65	75	10
10	FeronikaSella K	80	85	5
11	Hidayatullah	70	80	10
12	IrfanMuis	65	80	15
13	IhfatunSholihat	50	70	20
14	Indah NurFitriyani	50	75	15
15	ImanOktora	65	75	10
16	Irma Wati	70	80	10
17	IsmatulHanifiyah	65	75	10
18	IstiKhoirunnisa F	65	75	10
19	Khoirunnisa	70	85	15
20	Muhammad R G	75	75	0
21	NengRini M	70	80	10
22	Novi Dachliviyani	75	75	0
23	Randi	60	80	20
24	Rati Tiara Safira	45	50	5
25	ReisyGustiAliansih	40	50	10
26	RinduAmaliah	55	55	0
27	RiskaAmalia	50	85	35
28	RismaAnggreani	65	85	20
29	TantoAdil	65	75	10
30	UdinPagama	65	70	5
TOTAL		**1965**	**2287**	**315**
MEAN		**65.55**	**76.25**	**10.5**