CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the background of the study, problem statements, objectives, and the benefits of the research that was conducted at the Second Semester of Sistem Informasi (SI) Students of STMIK Duta Bangsa Surakarta in academic year of 2013/2014.

A. Background of the Study

Writing is one of the language skills that must be required by the learners when learning languages. As stated by Weigle (2002: 1), writing has become a necessary tool for students in today’s global community. It requires them to understand how to make a good process and product in writing. It becomes a process of discovery for the students as they discover new ideas and new language forms to express them. Moreover, learning to write is viewed as a developmental process that helps students to write as professional authors do. It requires the students to choose their own topics and genres, and write from their own experiences or observations. According to Hammond in Nunan (1991: 86), it is essential to understand the relationships between oral and written language in order to develop an effective pedagogy of teaching. The students have to master both spoken and written, especially writing because there are some books written in English.
Furthermore, writing entails both physical and mental act. Writing is believed as physical act because the students have to be able to create words into good sentences. The students also need to prepare writing tools such as paper, pen. The students need time and opportunity to write. On the other hand, mental act is the students’ ability to use their knowledge to express their ideas using a good composition into good sentences to be easy to understand (Nunan, 1998: 88).

Angelo (1980: 1) states that writing would still be important in education because writing can help one think critically, to clarify thoughts, and the deeper perception. Meanwhile, Fowler (1969: 40) points out that the written word is increasing demand in the business world both as a key to get job and the success in it. It means that writing English can also increase opportunities for career.

In making a good writing, there are some skills that a student should master: 1) writing a topic sentence. Students are required to have the ability to write correct and appropriate main idea or opinion; 2) writing supporting sentences. It is necessary for students to have the ability to develop main idea or topic sentence by adding more information; 3) writing grammatical sentences. Students have to possess the ability to construct the sentence (word order, verb and noun systems, modifiers, phrases, clauses, etc.); 4) writing cohesive devices. It means that students should have the ability to use conjunction in their writing.

As stated, one of the skills in making a good writing is the ability to make a correct and appropriate topic sentence or main idea. Based on the main idea, the students should be able to make some supporting sentences to develop the
paragraph. Beside, writing performance is different from other skills because it needs the accurate situation or context, and of course, the structure of every sentence must be right to avoid misunderstanding. In this case, the students’ critical thinking is needed.

Critical thinking has been considered a valuable tool for teaching and learning since the time of Socrates. One of the important goals in education is to develop and enhance students’ abilities to think critically about their knowledge, their actions, and their beliefs. More recently, researchers and educators have described the need of critical thinking as important as ever, particularly in today’s information age. With access to more and more information, students must be able to analyze that information systematically to solve certain problems (Alexander et al., 2010).

Furthermore, Halpern (2003) states that the ability to think critically is important in today’s world and as we know that world is getting more complex, knowledgeable and technical than before. The individuals need to understand and learn new concepts critically and differently. However there is no proper or standardize definition of critical thinking because everyone has different perspective of word ‘critical’. Some thoughts about critical thinking are related to the argumentation, problem solving, decision making or reasoning so forth. But many psychologists have proposed definition of critical thinking is a cognitive skill which help person to think more in-depth which led them towards the desirable outcome. It involves reasoning, problem solving, offer alternative explanation and draw wise decision on the certain problem.
Yenice (2011) explains that critical thinking is a learning ability that should be taught to all the students during the teaching process. The most important role of the teacher in developing students’ critical thinking is to create application and learning environments that support students’ critical thinking. Allowing students to comment on subjects, incidents, conceptions, and events from different points of view is vital to improve critical thinking of students.

In the point of fact, the lecture format of learning, in higher education, is usually focused on content delivery which frequently does not encourage active learning or critical thinking on the part of the students. Those new to the teaching profession often adopt the lecture format because it is both teacher centered and comes with strong academic tradition. Unfortunately, it is very difficult to increase a student’s critical thinking with that kind of lecture format. Topics are discussed sequently rather than critically, and students tend to memorize the material since the lecture method facilitates the delivery of large amounts of information. The student is placed in a passive role rather than in an active since the teacher does the talking, the questioning, and thus, most of the thinking (Maiorana, 1991).

In enhancing the students’ critical thinking, there are some indicators that should be accomplished. As proposed by Cottrell (2005: 2): (1) a critical thinker should be able to identify other people’s position, arguments, and conclusions, (2) a critical thinker should reflect on issues in a structured way, bringing logic and insight to bear, (3) a critical thinker should be able to draw conclusions about whether arguments are valid and justifiable based on good evidence and sensible
assumptions; and (4) a critical thinker should have the skill to present a point of view in a structured, clear, well-reasoned way that convinces others. Moreover, Facione and Facione (1994) say a critical thinker should be able to (1) accurately interpret evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc; (2) identify the relevant arguments (reasons and claims) pro and con; (3) thoughtfully analyze and evaluate major alternative points of view; (4) draw careful, non-fallacious conclusions; (5) Justify key results and procedures, explain assumptions and reasons; (6) fair-mindedly follow where evidence and reasons lead. Therefore, from the characteristics mentioned above, it can be concluded that a critical thinking should be able to:

1. Providing relevant arguments.
2. Providing evidence, statements or facts to support the arguments.
3. Presenting alternative point of view.
4. Giving sensible assumptions and reasons.
5. Draw clear and non-fallacious conclusion.

In fact, what I found are different with the ideal characteristics of the critical thinking itself. Based on the observation, the students were not able to think as critical as expected. It could be seen from the answers they provided when the teacher asked them to write down their answers of a question “What happened if computer didn’t exist?”. The illustration of the level of the students’ critical thinking is shown through the students’ work in table 1.1.
Table 1.1 The Illustration of the Level of The Students’ Critical Thinking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Critical Thinking Problems</th>
<th>Problem Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student DHM</td>
<td>If computer didn’t exist, the growth of the country will be slow. The warmth smile of the people is gone. Then, finding something will also be slow and need long time.</td>
<td>- Lack of evidence.</td>
<td>- Indicator 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Only giving negative point of view.</td>
<td>- Indicator 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Giving assumption without reasons.</td>
<td>- Indicator 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Giving irrelevant statement. It is shown in the second sentence.</td>
<td>- Indicator 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student ZRP</td>
<td>The computer is very important in the life of many people for processing documents. Other than that, if there is no computer, it will difficult for many people to make documents, it will take long time for writing documents.</td>
<td>- Lack of evidence.</td>
<td>- Indicator 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Only giving negative point of view.</td>
<td>- Indicator 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Giving assumption without reasons.</td>
<td>- Indicator 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student WH</td>
<td>We will lack of knowledge. We will seek information only from newspaper. It does not matter to me. We will less advanced in technology.</td>
<td>- Lack of evidence.</td>
<td>- Indicator 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Only giving negative point of view.</td>
<td>- Indicator 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Giving assumption without reasons.</td>
<td>- Indicator 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Giving irrelevant arguments. It is shown in the third sentence.</td>
<td>- Indicator 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student APR</td>
<td>If in this world no computer, I will make the device like computer but much better. That’s what will I do if no computer.</td>
<td>- Lack of evidence.</td>
<td>- Indicator 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Not able to interpret the question given.</td>
<td>- Indicator 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Giving irrelevant answers.</td>
<td>- Indicator 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- No assumptions</td>
<td>- Indicator 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student RDS</td>
<td>I will use other device to get information. For example: newspaper, television, book, dictionary. I can use other device, for example: handphone tablet, etc.</td>
<td>- Lack of evidence and reasons.</td>
<td>- Indicator 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Not able to interpret the question given.</td>
<td>- Indicator 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Giving irrelevant answers.</td>
<td>- Indicator 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- No assumption.</td>
<td>- Indicator 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the illustration above, it can be stated that the problem indicators are:

(1) The students are not able to give relevant arguments. Student DHM gave irrelevant argument in the second sentence and students WH in the third sentence. Meanwhile, students APR and RDS were not able to interpret the question and it
resulted in the irrelevant answers they gave. (2) The students are not able to provide evidence, statements or facts to support the arguments. The students might be able to give arguments but they did not provide their arguments with evidence, statements or facts to strengthen them. (3) The students are not able to present alternative point of view. As an example, student DHM, students WH and students ZRP only provided the negative point of view. Meanwhile, there were students who only gave the positive point of view. Even so, there were students who presented answers from both point of views. (4) The students are not able to give assumption and reasons. There were students who assumed but giving no reason. They only stated what they had in mind without elaborating it with reasons. Even worse, there were students who didn’t present any assumptions, students APR and student RDS were the examples. (5) The students give no conclusion. The students did not draw any conclusion. It was because they only write short responses for the question given. So there were not enough sentences to be given a conclusion. The problems occur not because they were unable to do those activities, but it is because they did not know that there were some activities they should accomplish in order to improve their critical thinking and the importance of the critical thinking itself.

Other than that, writing itself still doesn’t fulfill the requirements. For example, they still found difficulty to organize their ideas and when they should begin to write. The vocabulary choice was sometimes not correct in writing the paragraph. And then, the sentences they made sometimes were irrelevant to the topic or the main idea.
In addition, when the students were given assignments to make a paper, they did it by copy-pasting what they found from the internet. They didn’t even write the source from which they got their material. Most of the students think that the thicker their papers, the better. Not many of them understood exactly what they did in their own papers. Other than that, when the students got a task to answer questions based on certain text, they wrote down the answers exactly the same as what written in the text without trying to paraphrase or use their own words. It seems like they already get used to do the activity that way. This shows the students’ low writing skill and their inability to think critically.

Also, in year 2013, STMIK Duta Bangsa, for the first time, joined the debate competition held by Politeknik Indonusa. Over 20 groups of the private universities in Surakarta participated in the debate contest. Each university sent two groups of debaters. Each group consisted of three debaters. They were given ten notions to study before the contest and the notion debated announced in the arena. In this contest, STMIK Duta Bangsa got the 9th and 15th place. Reasons for this result were, first, the students participated in the debate had never joined a debate contest before. Therefore they were not familiar with the rules and procedures of the contest. Second, even though they were good in speaking and stating their arguments, they didn’t have enough data or facts to support their opinions or arguments. Third, they couldn’t master all the notions given by the committee. As a result, they got stuck when they got a notion which they didn’t master. It indicates the difficulty of the students in developing their critical thinking.
From the situations explained, the causes of the problems can be stated as follows: the first is the topics discussed aren’t understandable enough for the students. The students are not interested to actively do the exercises given. The next cause is the monotonous writing exercises. The students are mostly asked to make papers as a take-home assignment where they can copy-paste the material blindly without trying to understand the content itself. Other than that, they are often given a text and questions to answer, the same exercise they used to get when they were in high school. Not only causing boredom to the students, this activity also doesn’t give the students a chance to think more critically. In other words, the activities given to the students still couldn’t expose the students’ critical thinking.

The low confidence of the students in speaking is also one of the influences why they are still not able to think critically. Though they have ideas, opinions and arguments, they don’t have enough confidence to express them and only give short statements without elaborating them. To maximize their conveying ideas, I decide to have it written. Writing is one of the authentic and reliable ways of getting thoughts to others. It is believed that writing could help the students who usually have bad mark in speaking, to be more confident in writing.

Having no ideas, opinions or arguments were the next major problem. It was caused by the lack of inspiration and knowledge of the prompts given by the teacher. The inspiration as well as the knowledge could be gained by absorbing friends’ thoughts. The more the students share their knowledge, the more they
gain some information from it. This sharing activity can be done by applying the collaborative learning in the teaching-learning process.

Collaborative Learning gives the clueless students to learn more from the students who are expert on something. Students can relate to one another easily rather than to a teacher. Working in a group means having other people's ideas pooled together. Each member of the group has something unique that he/she can contribute. When it comes to solving a problem, the other group members may be able to think of things that the one individual may not have on his/her own. People often get stuck in their own unique ways of thinking; listening to another person's ideas helps them to broaden their horizons. Their opinions are shaped and strengthened as they hear other sides to the story and other angles of the problem. Many different solutions result instead of their own one-sided argument. People can help solve problems or bring up new ideas that they may not be able to come up with or solve themselves.

Collaborative Learning not only allow student to respect other’s opinion during the exchange ideas but it also supports them to view the emerging idea critically and freedom of presenting own thoughts before the group members. Collaborative Learning activities can include collaborative writing, group projects, joint problem solving, debates, study teams, and other activities. Students need to be able to think creatively, solving problems, and make decisions as a team. Therefore, the development and enhancement of critical thinking skills through collaborative learning is one of the primary goals of education.
On the other side, it is important for the students to be able to state what they have in mind. They have to be able to express their ideas, opinions and arguments in order to have a brighter future. They should have the ability to think critically. This will influence their actions or beliefs in terms of decision making, point of view and also their way of solving problems. Writing and critical thinking are seen as closely linked, and expertise in writing is seen as an indication that students have mastered the cognitive skills required for their work. Or, in other words, and evident lack of writing expertise is frequently seen as a sign that students do not possess the appropriate thinking and reasoning skills that they need to succeed (Shangariham & Mamipour, 2011).

Considering the reasons above, I decided to use one of the Collaborative Learning techniques, that is Roundtable technique, to enhance students’ critical thinking. In Roundtable technique, the students take turns responding to a prompt by writing phrases or sentences before passing the paper along to other the students who do the same. There is usually one piece of paper and one pen for the team. One student makes a contribution and then passes the paper and pen to the student on his or her left. The paper or pen literally goes around the table.

Equal contribution among group members is guaranteed in Roundtable technique. It also exposes multiple viewpoints and ideas of the students. Besides, the students who have difficulties in expressing their ideas orally in front of the class or classmates will find writing is easier way to express their thoughts (Barkley, et al., 2005: 241).
Based on the advantages of Roundtable technique, I was encouraged to use the technique to overcome the problems that exist. I conducted a research entitled The Implementation of Roundtable Technique to Improve Students’ Critical Thinking in Writing (A Classroom Action Research of the Second Semester Students of STMIK Duta Bangsa Surakarta in the academic year of 2013/2014).

B. Statements of the Problem

1. Does and to what extent the implementation of Roundtable technique improve the critical thinking of the the Second Semester of Sistem Informasi (SI) Students of STMIK Duta Bangsa Surakarta in the academic year of 2013/2014?

I try to find out whether there is improvement or not to the students’ critical thinking in writing analytical exposition text. The improvements in the aspect of content are known through the better achievement of some indicators which has been explained in the previous section. The improvements are known through the observation during the teaching and learning process. The tests are also distributed in every cycle to know the improvement of critical thinking which is shown from the score improvement. By analyzing the results of observation and tests, it is known whether there is improvement or not in students’ critical thinking in writing.

2. What are the difficulties that occur in implementing Roundtable technique in improving students’ critical thinking in writing?
I try to find the difficulties of Roundtable technique when it is implemented in the class. The difficulties are known during the observation and after reflecting the teaching and learning process. By knowing the difficulties of the teaching learning process, I can propose better solution for the improvement of the teaching and learning process.

C. Objectives of the Study

The objectives of this research are:

1. To describe whether and to what extent the implementation of Roundtable technique improves students’ critical thinking in writing.
2. To describe the difficulties which occur in implementing Roundtable technique in improving students’ critical thinking in writing.

D. Benefits of the Study

From the research result, it is expected that there will be benefits given to the teachers, the students, the institution and me myself.

1. For the teacher

This study is expected to give understanding about teaching and learning critical thinking in writing. This is also attempt to give clear change in the steps of teaching and learning of writing for English teachers so that the learning quality will improve.
2. For students

This study will be helpful for the students to think more critically in expressing their ideas, arguments or thoughts in writing. Besides, working in a group will help the students broaden their knowledge about something they don’t understand before.

3. For the other researchers

The result of the study can be used as a starting point for further research conducted in the future in order to create a better teaching learning process.

4. For Institutions

The result of the study can provide information about the learning innovation development for the other teachers and motivate them to develop another innovation in different teaching strategy.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In order to sharpen the theoretical framework of this study, this chapter is devoted to review some relevant theories and studies. It reviews some aspects including theoretical backgrounds about writing, critical thinking and Roundtable technique.

A. Theoretical Description

1. Writing

a. Definition of Writing

As stated by Byrne (1997: 1), writing is the acts of forming symbols, letter or combination of letters, which relate to the sound we speak, making marks on flat surface of some kind, arranging according to certain conventions to form words and word arranged to form sentences. However, writing is not only the formations of graphic symbols just as speech is not only the production of sounds but more than that. Writing involves the act of arranging symbols accordingly to certain conventions to form words and the words have to be arranged in such a way to form sentences.

According to Nunan (1998: 88), writing is the process of thinking to invent ideas, thinking about how to express into good writing, and arranging the ideas into statement and paragraph clearly. In line with Byrne and Nunan, Daniels in Ager (2008: 1) defines that writing is used to represent or express...
the ideas or feelings in such way that it can be recovered more completely of a system of more or less permanent symbols. This is supported by Farbain and Winch (1996: 32) that writing is about conveying meaning by using words that have been selected and put together in a written or printed form.

Moreover, Brown (2001: 335) states written products are often the result of thinking, drafting, and revising procedures that require specialized skill, skill that not every speaker develops naturally. Writing requires a number of things: a high degree of organization in the development of ideas and information; a high degree of accuracy so that there is no ambiguity of meaning; the use of complex grammatical devices for focus and emphasis; and a careful choice of vocabulary, grammatical patterns, and sentence structures to create a style which is appropriate to the subject matter and eventual readers (Malay, 1988: 5).

Furthermore, as defined by Blanchard and Root (1998: 1), learning to write in a new language is not always easy. It is challenging but is also fun. If the students are learning to speak and read in a new language, they will be ready to begin to write too. They will think that writing in English is easy if they are in comfortable environment, especially in the classroom. That is why, classroom has an important role for the students to practice their writing in English because the society, in this case is their classmates, have the same range capability.
b. Aspects of Writing

Dealing with the aspects of writing a student should master, Brown (2001: 356-358) classifies the aspect of writing into some aspects. Those are content, organization, discourse, syntax, vocabulary, and mechanics. Content deals with thesis statement, related ideas, development of ideas through personal experience, illustration, facts, and opinions. Organization covers the effectiveness of introduction, logical sequence of ideas, conclusion, and appropriate length. Next, the topic sentence, paragraph unity, transitions, discourse markers, cohesion, rhetorical conventions, reference, fluency, economy, and variation are included in discourse, meanwhile, spelling, punctuation, citation of reference, and neatness and appearance consist in mechanics.

Harris (1969: 56) mentions that there are five components which can be used to evaluate writing. They are: contents, grammar, word choice, organization and mechanics. In addition, Madson (1983: 10) states that there are great numbers of aspects in writing that can be evaluated: mechanics (including spelling and punctuation), vocabulary, grammar, appropriate content, diction (or word selection), rhetorical matters of various kinds (organization, cohesion, unity; appropriateness to the audience, topic and occasion).
**c. Micro and Macro Skill of Writing**

Micro skills are part of the academic writing that focus on working at the sentence and paragraph level e.g. defining, classifying, and exemplifying. Here are six micro skills presented in teaching principle by Brown (2004: 221):

1). Produce grapheme and orthographic patterns of English;
2). Produce writing at an efficient rate of speed to suit the purpose;
3). Produce an acceptable core of words and use appropriate word order patterns;
4). Use acceptable grammatical systems (e.g tense, agreement, pluralization, patterns and rules);
5). Express a particular meaning in different grammatical forms;
6). Use cohesive devices in written discourse.

Micro skills of writing are appropriately applied to imitative and intensive types of writing task, while macro skills writing are essential for the successful mastery of responsive and extensive writing. Macro skills are parts of academic writing that focus on working at the section and whole text level. Brown (2004: 221) presents macro skill as follows:

1). Use the rhetorical forms and conventions of written discourse.
2). Appropriately accomplish the communicative functions of written texts according to form and purpose.
3). Convey links and connections between events, and communicate such relations as main idea, supporting idea, new information, given information, generalization, and exemplification.
4). Distinguish between literal and implied meanings when writing.

5). Correctly convey culturally specific references in the context of the written text.

6). Develop and use battery of writing strategies, such as accurately, assessing the audience’s interpretation, using prewriting device, writing with fluency, in the first drafts, using paraphrases and synonyms, soliciting peer and instructor feedback, and using feedback for revising and editing.

d. Process of Writing

There are many conceptions dealing with the writing process. According to Research and Evaluation Report in Graves, et al (2007) writing process consists of: pre-writing, drafting and writing, sharing and responding, revising and editing, and publishing. Meanwhile, as stated by Oshima in Simpson (2008: 1), there are four main stages in the writing process: pre-writing, writing, revising, and evaluation. O’Melley (1996: 139) cites there are three stages in writing process namely: pre-writing, writing, and post-writing. Ghalth (2002: 4) mentions that the stages of writing process are pre-writing, planning, drafting, and post-writing. Besides, Langan (2001: 17) points out that the writing process includes four stages: pre-writing, writing the first draft, revising, and editing. Harmer (2004: 4-5) suggests that the process of writing has four main elements: planning, drafting, editing (reflecting and revising), and final version. Then, according to McRimmon (1984: 10), the writing process is divided into three stages: planning, drafting, and revising.
e. Importance of Writing

The importance of writing for teachers and students, as explained by Byrne (1995: 6), are: first, teachers give space for a range of learning styles and needs in the practice of some forms of writing. It helps the students, who usually have bad mark in speaking, to be more confident in writing. It makes comfortable and relaxed zone to write. Next, students identify some real evidence that they make progress in the language process by written work. Third, writing gives various classroom activities, such as a break from speaking activities and increase the amount of language contact through work that can be set out from the classroom. The last, writing is also needed for formal and informal testing of students’ competency in language.

Writing English can also increase opportunities for career as Fowler (1965: 40) points out that the written word is increasing demand in the business world both as a key to get job and the success in it. Another opinion, as stated by Angelo (1980: 1), writing would still also be valuable in education because writing can help one think critically, to clarify thoughts, and the deeper perception.

f. Problems in Writing

Writing activity itself has been given to the students since they are in elementary school. Yet the students still find it difficult to express ideas in writing a composition or a text. In the teaching learning process, a teacher should give more help, practices, and chances to the students to explore and
express their ideas. Generally, the teaching course is focused on grammar or on an elaborate discussion of the theory of writing only. This condition makes the students easily get bored and sleepy throughout the lesson.

Moreover, Byrne (1995: 4) posited that there are three factors which influence writing process, they are:

1). Psychological problem

Writing is basically a solitary activity and the fact that people are required to write on their own draft, without the possibility of interaction or the benefit of feedback, in itself makes the act of writing difficult. Writers have no immediate feedback to let them know how they are doing and whether they should change their approach. There is no immediate interaction between the producer and the receiver.

2). Linguistics problem

The language used in written language is different from the language used in oral language. The language used in written language is either simplified (list, telegram, note, etc.) or more elaborate, and more formal. In a foreign language, this process is more difficult as there may be interference on a cultural level, not just the linguistics, between mother tongue and the foreign language.

3). Cognitive problem

Writing is learned through process of instruction. The written form of the language and certain structures, which are less used in speech, should be
mastered and learned. The way to organize the ideas is also important for effective communication which has to be learned in writing.

g. The Scoring Guide of Writing

Jacobs in Genesee and Upshur (1996: 206) proposed that the criteria of scoring writing covers five aspects: components; content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics.

Table 2.1 The Scoring Rubric of ESL Composition Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30–27</td>
<td>Excellent to Very Good</td>
<td>Knowledgeable, substantive development of thesis, relevant to assigned topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26–22</td>
<td>Good to Average</td>
<td>Sure knowledge of subject, adequate range, limited development of thesis, mostly relevant to topic but lacks detail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–17</td>
<td>Fair to Poor</td>
<td>Limited knowledge of subject, little substance, inadequate development of topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16–13</td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>Doesn’t show knowledge of subject, non-substantive, not pertinent, or not enough to evaluate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–18</td>
<td>Excellent to Very Good</td>
<td>Fluent expression, ideas clearly stated/supported, succinct, well-organized, logical sequencing cohesive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17–14</td>
<td>Good to Average</td>
<td>Somewhat choppy, loosely organized but main ideas stand out, limited support, logical but incomplete sequencing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13–10</td>
<td>Fair to Poor</td>
<td>Non-fluent, ideas confused or disconnected, lack logical sequencing and development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9–7</td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>Does not communicate, no organization, or not enough to evaluate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vocabulary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20–18</td>
<td>Excellent to Very Good</td>
<td>Sophisticated range, effective word/idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17–14</td>
<td>Good to Average</td>
<td>Adequate range, occasional errors of word/idiom form, choice, usage, but meaning not obscured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13–10</td>
<td>Fair to Poor</td>
<td>Limited range, frequent of word/idiom form, choice, usage, meaning confused or obscured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9–7</td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>Essentially translation, little knowledge of English vocabulary, idioms, word form, or not enough to evaluate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Critical Thinking

a. Nature of Critical Thinking

There have been many definitions of critical thinking over the years. Norris (1985) posited that critical thinking is deciding rationally what to or what not to believe. Elder and Paul (1994) suggested that critical thinking is best understood as the ability of thinkers to take charge of their thinking (Duron, et al., 2006). Further, Elder and Paul (2008) say that critical thinking is self-guided, self-disciplined which attempts to reason at the highest level of quality in a fair-minded way. People who think critically consistently attempt to live rationally, reasonably and emphatically.

According to Halpern in Mandernach et al., (2009) critical thinking refers to the use of cognitive skills or strategies that increases the probability of
a desirable outcome. Critical thinking is purposeful, reasoned, and goal-directed. It is the kind of thinking involved in solving problems, formulating inferences, calculating likelihoods and making decisions. Critical thinkers use these skills appropriately, without prompting, and usually with conscious intent, in a variety of settings. That is, they are predisposed to think critically. When we think critically, we are evaluating the outcomes of our thought processes—how good a decision is or how well the problem is solved.

Meanwhile, Yenice (2011) states that critical thinking is a learning ability that should be taught to all the students during the teaching process. The most important role of the teacher in developing students’ critical thinking is to create application and learning environments that supports students’ critical thinking. It is essential to allow students to comment subjects, incidents, conceptions and events from different point of view to improve critical thinking of students.

Some people are still confused about the difference between critical thinking and thinking itself. The differences of thinking and critical thinking are illustrated in table 2.1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thinking</th>
<th>Critical Thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On information: data, facts, examples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On ideas: opinions, positions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizing and making connections between pieces of information or ideas, sometimes making basic inferences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The theory of critical thinking started primarily with the works of Bloom (1956), who identified six levels within the cognitive domain, each of which related to a different level of cognitive ability. Knowledge focused on remembering and reciting information. Comprehension focused on relating and organizing previously learned information. Application focused on applying information according to a rule or principle in a specific situation. Analysis was defined as critical thinking focused on parts and their functionality in the whole. Synthesis was defined as critical thinking focused on putting parts together to form a new and original whole. Evaluation was defined as critical thinking focused upon valuing and making judgments based upon information. In this context, critical thinking is deemed to take place when students are required to perform in the Analysis, Synthesis and Evaluation levels of Bloom’s Taxonomy. To provide the greatest benefits to students, teachers should provide many opportunities for the students to engage in the upper levels of Bloom’s taxonomy where critical thinking takes place.

b. Stages of Critical Thinking Development

According to Elder and Paul (2007: 22), there are six stages of critical thinking development that people go through. It is possible for one person to be
at more than one stage. People can think in different ways in different times. The stage of critical thinking development is shown in figure 2.1.

![Figure 2.1 Stage of Critical Thinking Development](image)

1) Stage One: Unreflective Thinker

This kind of thinkers doesn’t think about their thinking. As a result, they don’t practice and don’t develop the way they think. They hardly use standards for evaluating thinking and may not know that standards exist. They may be biased and unwilling or unable to think past their own opinions.

2) Stage Two: Challenged Thinker

Challenged thinkers are those who start to realize that their ways of thinking don’t work well for them and cause them problems. They may not be able to
figure out what is wrong or how to improve their thinking. They don’t have a clear idea about standards for evaluating thinking. Even though they some critical thinking skills, they don’t apply them consistently. This can also cause problems.

3) Stage Three: Beginning Thinker

Beginning thinkers begin to make changes in how they think, starting by paying attention to how they think. They have some ideas, but they are not consistent in how they are trying to improve their thinking. They don’t fully understand the deeper problems in how they think. They don’t have a clear plan for improving their thinking.

4) Stage Four: Practicing Thinker

Practicing thinkers know some of the better thinking habits they need to use consistently. Though they are improving through practice, they are not able to see the deeper problems in how they think. They start to look for qualities in their thinking: clarity, accuracy, precision, relevance, depth, breadth and logic. They are aware that they use egocentric thinking, though they cannot always avoid it.

5) Stage Five: Advanced Thinker

Advanced thinkers actively think about their thinking and at a deeper level most of the time. They are probably not consistent all of the time in their depth of thinking. They notice how important thinking is. They try to make a habit of critical thinking. They try to be fair-minded, but sometimes they fall back to egocentric thinking. They need to be aware of where they have
contradictions in the way they live their lives. They need to continue to
grow empathy for the ideas of others in a consistent way and to be fair-
minded all the time.

6) Stage Six: Master Thinker

Master thinkers are the ones with the high level of thinking. They show
qualities of clarity, accuracy, precision, relevance, depth, breadth and logic
steadily. They are constantly working to improve their thinking in all areas.
Critical thinking is a habit, and they are also aware of their use of thinking
skills. They can eliminate most of their egocentric thinking in most areas of
their lives. They understand that thinking, emotions, desires and behavior
influence each other. Master thinkers are valued for their insights with
complex issues, therefore, people wants to hear what they have to say.

c. The Importance of Critical Thinking

Critical thinking is an important and necessary skill because it is
required in the workplace, it can help people deal with mental and spiritual
questions, and it can be used to evaluate people, policies and institutions,
thereby avoiding social problems (Hatcher and Spencer, 2005).

Furthermore, Cottrell (2005: 4) says that good critical thinking skills
bring numerous benefits, such as improve attention and observation, more
focus reading, improve ability to identify the key points in a message, improve
their ability to respond to the appropriate points in a message, increase
knowledge of how to get one’s own point across more easily and improve
skills of analysis that one can choose to apply in a variety of situations. She adds that critical thinking involves the development of a range of ancillary skills of observation, reasoning, decision-making, analysis, judgment and persuasion.

Critical thinking includes the ability to evaluate information, to formulate solutions for given problems, to analyze details for trends and patterns, and to apply previous experiences to current situations. They are vital to schooling, job performance and handling numerous problems in life. Teachers should assess students not just to see if they are absorbing classroom information, but if they can apply critical thinking skills appropriately. The ability will serve them well as they enter adulthood and embark upon a career.

d. The Scoring Guide of Critical Thinking

According to Upper Iowa University, critical thinking is not a measurable concept. It is an underlying construct and can be measured with a series of traits. Facione and Facione (1994) propose four level scoring rubric of how to measure one’s critical thinking:

Table 2.3 Critical Thinking Scoring Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4     | Consistently does all or almost all of the following:  
  - Accurately interprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc.  
  - Identifies the relevant arguments (reasons and claims) pro and con.  
  - Thoughtfully analyzes and evaluates major alternative points of view.  
  - Draws warranted, judicious, non-fallacious conclusions.  
  - Justifies key results and procedures, explains assumptions and reasons.  
  - Fair-mindedly follows where evidence and reasons lead. |
| 3     | Does most or many of the following:  
  - Accurately interprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc.  
  - Identifies relevant arguments (reasons and claims) pro and con.  
  - Offers analyses and evaluations of obvious alternative points of view.  
  - Draws warranted, non-fallacious conclusions. |
This four level rubric treats critical thinking as a set of cognitive skills supported by certain personal dispositions. To reach a well-judged, purposive judgment, a good critical thinker engages in analysis, interpretation, evaluation, inference, explanation, and meta-cognitive self-regulation. The disposition to pursue fair-mindedly and open-mindedly the reasons and evidence wherever they lead is crucial to reaching sound, objective decisions and resolutions to complex, ill-structured problems. So are the other critical thinking dispositions, such as systematicity, reasoning self-confidence, cognitive maturity, analyticity, and curiosity (Facione and Facione, 1994).

To make it more appropriate with the focus of the research, I made some modification in the critical thinking rubric. The scoring rubric of critical thinking proposed by Fascione and Fascione is modified for this research. Therefore, the four-level scoring rubric of the critical thinking aspects is formulated as follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Consistently does all or almost all of the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Offers biased interpretations of evidence, statements, graphics, questions, information, or the points of view of others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Fails to identify or hastily dismisses strong, relevant counter-arguments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ignores or superficially evaluates obvious alternative points of view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Argues using fallacious or irrelevant reasons, and unwarranted claims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Does not justify results or procedures, nor explain reasons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Regardless of the evidence or reasons, maintains or defends views based on self-interest or preconceptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Exhibits close-mindedness or hostility to reason.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Does most or many of the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Justifies some results or procedures, explains reasons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Fair-mindedly follows where evidence and reasons lead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Misinterprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Fails to identify strong, relevant counter-arguments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ignores or superficially evaluates obvious alternative points of view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Draws unwarranted or fallacious conclusions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Justifies few results or procedures, seldom explains reasons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Regardless of the evidence or reasons, maintains or defends views based on self-interest or preconceptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Consistently does most or many of the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Offers biased interpretations of evidence, statements, graphics, questions, information, or the points of view of others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Fails to identify or hastily dismisses strong, relevant counter-arguments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ignores or superficially evaluates obvious alternative points of view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Argues using fallacious or irrelevant reasons, and unwarranted claims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Does not justify results or procedures, nor explain reasons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Regardless of the evidence or reasons, maintains or defends views based on self-interest or preconceptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Exhibits close-mindedness or hostility to reason.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Consistently does all or almost all of the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Offers biased interpretations of evidence, statements, graphics, questions, information, or the points of view of others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Fails to identify or hastily dismisses strong, relevant counter-arguments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ignores or superficially evaluates obvious alternative points of view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Argues using fallacious or irrelevant reasons, and unwarranted claims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Does not justify results or procedures, nor explain reasons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Regardless of the evidence or reasons, maintains or defends views based on self-interest or preconceptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Exhibits close-mindedness or hostility to reason.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.4 The Modification of the Critical Thinking Scoring Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Giving strong and clear arguments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Giving good and clear enough arguments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Giving unclear/vague arguments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No argument identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accurately and clearly explains evidence, statements, fact, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good and clearly enough explain evidence, statements, fact, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unclear/vaguely explains evidence, statements, fact, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No evidence, statements, fact, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presenting clear and thoughtful alternative points of view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presenting good and clear enough alternative point of view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presenting unclear/vague alternative points of view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No alternative points of view presented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clearly and thoroughly explains assumptions and reasons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Well explained assumptions and reasons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unclearly/vaguely explains assumptions and reasons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No assumption and reasons explained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Draws clear and thoughtful conclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Draws clear enough conclusions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Draws vague/unclear conclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Draws no conclusion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Collaborative Learning

a. Nature of Collaborative Learning

To collaborate is to work with another or others. In practice, collaborative learning has come to mean students working in pairs or small group to achieve shared learning goals. It is learning through group work rather than learning by working alone (Barkley, et al., 2005: 4). Moreover, Barkley, et al. added that there are other terms of collaborative learning, such as cooperative learning, team learning, group learning, or peer-assisted learning.

Group work is presumed as an alternative way of learning by expressing and exploring diverse idea and experiences in collaborative atmosphere. It is not about competing with other students and winning, but about using the range of resources available in the group to expand...
understanding, to sharpen judgment and to extend knowledge. Mutual support and culture of shared commitment are needed. It is necessary to remember that individuals within such groups are assessed not only on their contribution to the project, but also their ability to work within a group, the ability to be involved in a collaborative way of solving problems.

Furthermore, Barkley, et al., (2005: 4) point out some essential features in collaborative learning. The first feature is intentional design. All too often, teachers simply tell students to get into groups and work. Then, in addition to intentional design, co-laboring is an important feature of collaborative learning. All members in the group must engage actively in working together toward the stated purpose. If one group member completes a group assignment while the others simply watch, then it is not collaborative learning. All students must contribute more or less equally. The third feature is that meaningful learning takes place. As students work together on a collaborative assignment, they must increase their knowledge or deepen their understanding of the course curriculum. The task assigned to the group must be structured to accomplish the learning objective of the course. Shifting responsibility to students and having the classroom vibrate with lively, energetic small-group work is attractive, but it is educationally meaningless if students are not achieving intended instructional goals, goals shared by the teacher and students. Collaborative learning, then, is two or more students laboring together and sharing the workload equably as they progress toward intended learning outcomes.
b. Collaborative Learning in Writing

Barkley, et al, (2005: 256) explain that in collaborative writing, student pairs or triads write a formal paper together. Each student contributes at each stage of the writing process: brainstorming ideas; gathering and organizing information; and drafting, revising, and editing the writing. It means that in pairs or triads, students will produce better work than when they worked alone. Collaborative writing will improve document quality by pooling the strengths of group members. At the same time, individual weaknesses are caught by the group and revised. Ultimately, collaboration can be a form of motivation for students as they become excited about working with a group as well as the prospect of learning from other students.

According to Barkley, et al., (2005: 256) there is seven guidelines for teacher in collaborative writing process. The following guidelines for teachers to keep in mind:

1) Students form pairs or triads at your direction or by choosing partners and then generate ideas by brainstorming together or conducting preliminary research.

2) Together, students organize their ideas and create an outline.

3) Students divide up the outline, selecting or assigning sections for each student to write initial drafts individually.

4) Teams read first drafts and discuss and resolve any significant disparities in voice, content, and style.

5) Teams combine individual sections into a single document.
6) Teams revise and edit their work, checking for content and clarity as well as grammar, spelling, and punctuation. After the final edit, teams submit their papers to the professor for assessment and evaluation.

Based on the guidelines above, I will apply the structure guidelines to make collaborative more effective, but the researcher makes different roles of the students. One of them plays a role as a helper and the other as a writer. Specific task need to be done by the helper and the writer when they write collaboratively.

c. Benefits of Collaborative Learning

Here are the benefits of Collaborative Learning (CL):

1) Develops higher level thinking skills.

2) Promotes student-faculty interaction and familiarity.

3) Increases student retention.

4) Builds self esteem in students.

5) Enhances student satisfaction with the learning experience.

6) Promotes a positive attitude toward the subject matter.

7) Develops oral communication skills.

8) Develops social interaction skills.

9) Promotes positive race relations.

10) Creates an environment of active, involved, exploratory learning.

11) Uses a team approach to problem solving while maintaining individual accountability.
12) Encourages diversity understanding.

13) Encourages student responsibility for learning.

14) Involves students in developing curriculum and class procedures.

15) Students explore alternate problem solutions in a safe environment.

16) Stimulates critical thinking and helps students clarify ideas through discussion and debate.

17) Enhances self management skills.

18) Fits in well with the constructivist approach.

19) Establishes an atmosphere of cooperation and helping schoolwide.

20) Students develop responsibility for each other.

21) Builds more positive heterogeneous relationships.

22) Encourages alternate student assessment techniques.

23) Fosters and develops interpersonal relationships.

24) Modelling problem solving techniques by students' peers.

25) Students are taught how to criticize ideas, not people.

26) Sets high expectations for students and teachers.

27) Promotes higher achievement and class attendance.

28) Students stay on task more and are less disruptive.

29) Greater ability of students to view situations from others' perspectives (development of empathy).

30) Creates a stronger social support system.
31) Creates a more positive attitude toward teachers, principals and other school personnel by students and creates a more positive attitude by teachers toward their students.

32) Addresses learning style differences among students.

33) Promotes innovation in teaching and classroom techniques.

34) Classroom anxiety is significantly reduced.

35) Test anxiety is significantly reduced.

36) Classroom resembles real-life social and employment situations.

37) Students practice modeling societal and work-related roles.

38) CL is synergistic with writing across the curriculum.

39) CL activities can be used to personalize large lecture classes.

40) Skill building and practice can be enhanced and made less tedious through CL activities in and out of class.

41) CL activities promote social and academic relationships well beyond the classroom and individual course.

42) CL processes create environments where students can practice building leadership skills.

43) CL increases leadership skills of female students.

44) In colleges where students commute to school and do not remain on campus to participate in campus life activities, CL creates a community environment within the classroom.
4. Roundtable Technique

a. Nature of Roundtable Technique

Barkley, et al., (2005: 241) explain that Roundtable technique is essentially the written version of Round Robin. In Roundtable technique, students take turns responding to a prompt by writing one or two words or phrases before passing the paper along to others who do the same. Moreover, Kagan & Kagan (2009: 10.21) describe that for Roundtable technique, there is usually one piece of paper and one pen for the team. One student makes a contribution and then passes the paper and pen to the student on his or her left. The paper or pen literally goes around the table, thus the name: Roundtable. If the contributions are oral rather than written, it is called RoundRobin. Roundtable technique can be used repeatedly in many subject areas, at a variety of places in the lesson plan. Roundtable technique can be used to create an anticipatory set for a lesson, to check for acquisition of information, or to liven up drill and practice.

b. Procedure of Roundtable Technique

The procedure of how Roundtable technique is done, according to Barkley, et al., (2005: 241-242) are as follow:

1) Teacher creates a prompt that students can respond to with a few words or sentences. Write this at the top of a sheet of paper, leaving the reminder blank for the student writing.
2) Teacher forms groups of four students and tell groups the prompt or distribute the handout.

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

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

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

6) Teacher informs the students when the time is up, or tells them in the instruction that the process is complete when all members have participated and all ideas are on the paper.

Meanwhile, according to Hollie (2011), the students make a group and each group sits around the table. Then they will be given a single sheet by their teacher. That single sheet contains a single question related to the topic of writing. Every member in a group should share their ideas by writing them on that sheet. After that, they deliver to the person next to them. The next person should write their ideas too. This activity will end if all members in a group have shared their ideas.

Although ideally every member of the groups should contribute, if a student cannot think of anything to write, it is better to pass than to hold up the process. Teacher should set a time limit, and allow a student to pass if he or she has nothing to write.
c. Advantages of Roundtable Technique

The advantages of having the students write their ideas as opposed to speaking them, as pointed out by Barkley, et al., (2005: 241 & 245), are that writing helps the students to focus their attention, gives them quite time to think about their responses, and provides a cumulative record. Besides, Roundtable technique guarantees equal participation among group members and exposes students multiple viewpoints and ideas. This collaborative learning technique also encourages the students to adjust their writing, in areas such as content, organization and vocabulary. The students who have difficulties in expressing their ideas orally in front of the class or classmates will find writing is easier way to express their thoughts. Because every student is required to contribute, Roundtable technique can help to address problems of inequitable participation.

d. Disadvantages of Roundtable Technique

Barkley, et al., (2005: 245) write some of the weaknesses of Roundtable. Roundtable technique requires the students to write in the presence of other group members who must sit quietly and it limits the type of the question that can be asked. This activity should be used for fairly simple task, such as helping the students review material, making straightforward applications, or brainstorming list. It should not be used for complex thinking and reasoning task, because the activity moves too slowly. Time is wasted and students will likely get bored.
B. Review of Related Research

The purpose of this review is to describe other researches which are similar to my subject of research. These related research conducted by other researcher is expected to have benefit to support this research and give positive input for this research. There have been several researches which are also related or similar with my subject of research. They will be explained briefly as follow.

Firstly, Ganis Suhesti writes a research entitled *Teaching Descriptive Text Writing through Roundtable Technique* which is done in 2011. The research is done to see whether Roundtable technique can be applied to increase the students’ writing ability in descriptive text at the first year of SMA Xaverius Pringsewu. This research was a quantitative research and the design was one-group pretest-posttest. The instruments used to collect the data here were writing pretest and posttest. In the pretest, they were asked to write descriptive text of one member of their family. And, in the posttest, they had to write a descriptive text of their favorite actors/actress. It was conducted in five meetings in Class X.3 of SMA Xaverius Pringsewu from September 30th up to October 14th 2011. The result of the tests shows that there is an increase from the mean of pretest to posttest after being taught through Roundtable technique. The students’ average score increases from 63.88 to 70.69. From the result of the research, it can be concluded that Roundtable technique can increase students’ writing ability in descriptive text.

Secondly, Anggi Sinta Hapsari writes similar research but with different genre of text, that is *The Use of Roundtable Technique to Improve Students’ Achievement in Writing Hortatory Exposition Text*. The objectives of this study
are to investigate whether the Roundtable technique gives contribution to improve students’ achievement in writing hortatory exposition text and to discover whether students of SMA Negeri 1 Batang have difficulties in applying Roundtable technique in writing hortatory exposition text. To achieve the objectives of the study, the research conducted an action research. She took class XI IPS 3 at SMA N 1 Batang in the academic year 2010/2011 as the subject of this study. Before getting the treatment, the students could not write the text well. After giving the treatment in two cycles, the students started to show some improvement in writing hortatory exposition text. From the findings, it can be concluded that the use of Roundtable technique in teaching writing Hortatory Exposition Text is very beneficial for students. It gives significant progress in students’ achievement in writing hortatory exposition text.

Next research is The Influence of Roundtable Technique and Students’ Intelligence in Teaching Writing. This research is done by Sri Handayani in 2012. The objective of this research is to identify whether: (1) round table technique is more effective than direct instruction in teaching writing for the tenth grade students of SMA Negeri 1 Ngaglik Sleman Yogyakarta; (2) the tenth grade students of SMA Negeri 1 Ngaglik Sleman Yogyakarta who have high intelligence have better writing skill than those having low intelligence; and (3) there is interaction between teaching techniques and students’ intelligence in teaching writing. The research was carried out at SMA Negeri 1 Ngaglik, Sleman, Yogyakarta from March to July 2012. It is an Experimental Research. The researcher took the data from the tenth grade students class XE and XF as the
sample of the research. The class XE was as an experimental class who were taught by using Roundtable Technique and class XF was as a control class who were taught by using Direct Instruction. Each of class consisted of 34 students. The data were in the form of quantitative data and they were taken from a test. They were the scores of students’ writing test after having eight times treatment for each class. The result of the study leads to the conclusion: first, the students who are taught using Roundtable technique have better writing skill than those who are taught using direct instruction. In other words, the use of Roundtable technique is more effective than direct instruction. Second, the students who have high intelligence have better writing skill than those who have low intelligence. Third, there is no interaction between teaching techniques and students’ intelligence level in teaching writing. Teaching techniques which are used by the teacher in teaching writing do not depend on the students’ intelligence level.

Meanwhile, Yudhi Pratama Tarigan writes a research entitled Improving Students’ Achievement in Writing Descriptive Paragraph through Simultaneous Roundtable Strategy. The subject of the research was class VIII-5 SMP N 2 Berastagi consisting of 30 students. This study was conducted by using classroom action research. This study attempts to improve students’ achievement in writing descriptive paragraph through simultaneous Roundtable strategy. The research was conducted in two cycles and consisted of seven meetings. The instruments for collecting data were writing tests as the quantitative data and diary notes, observation sheet, and questionnaire sheet as qualitative data. Based on the writing score, student scores kept improving in every test. In the first cycle test,
the mean of writing score was 61.43. In the second cycle test the mean of writing score was 75.13. Based on diary notes, observation sheet and questionnaire sheet, it was found that students were actively involved in writing process. The result of the research showed that Simultaneous Roundtable Strategy can improve student achievement in writing descriptive paragraph.

Sudjati Jantri writes a research entitled is *Enhancing Students' Motivation and Learning Outcome through Simultaneous Roundtable Cooperative Learning on Sociology Course*. This research is conducted on Sociology Course for X grade students in SMA Negeri 1 Mejayan in the year of 2012. Research question was formulated as follows: how the implementation of cooperative learning Simultaneous Roundtable can enhance student's motivation and learning outcomes on Sociology Course for X grade students in SMA Negeri 1 Mejayan. This study falls under the category of Classroom Action Research by implementing qualitative research due to the characteristics which exist in it, especially in the interpretation of what is going on in the learning process, both related to the initial conditions and the learning that occurred after the implementation of actions in the classroom. The results of the study can be described briefly as follows: (1) the increasing motivation to learn Sociology can be seen with the higher average of the score during pre-study (3.16) that goes well enough, then increased during the first cycle with an average score of 4.15 that goes well. Interestingly, this learning motivation keeps on increasing in the cycle II which reaches an average score of 4.37. (2) The measurement of the score from Sociology study also increased. During pre-study cycle, the average score of the students is 68.13. Then, the score
keeps increasing from 75.94 up to 82.34 in cycle II. It means that Roundtable technique is an effective way to improve students’ motivation and learning outcome on sociology course.

Furthermore, Eunike Tirsa Saktiono also did the similar research, *The Effectiveness Of Round Table to Teach Writing Viewed from Students’ Creativity*. The main objective of the research is to reveal whether: (1) Round Table is more effective than Free Writing to teach writing to the students of the eighth grade of SMPN 2 Madiun in the Academic Year of 2011/2012; (2) The students with the high creativity have better writing ability than those with low creativity; and (3) the interaction between teaching techniques and creativity in teaching writing to the students of the eighth grade of SMPN 2 Madiun. The result shows that teaching writing by using round table to the eighth-grade students of SMP Negeri 2 Madiun is more effective than the one using free writing, the writing ability of the eighth grade students of SMP Negeri 2 Madiun having high creativity level is better than the one of those having low creativity level; and then, there is an interaction between teaching techniques and the students’ creativity in teaching writing. Based on the research findings, it can be concluded that the use of Round Table is effective for teaching writing to the eighth-grade students of SMPN 2 Madiun.

Related to all the researches done by the researchers above, I have the similarity on using the Roundtable technique. The focus of the research is not the writing skill itself but the students’ critical thinking in writing. Through this
research, I expect that there will be a positive result between the technique used and the students’ critical thinking.

C. Rationale

The students have difficulties in expressing their ideas, arguments and opinions in the class. This can be caused by the topics discussed aren’t comprehensible enough for the students. The next cause is the repetitive writing exercises. The lack of confidence to speak up their minds becomes one of the issues. They tend to be passive when the teacher asks for their opinions, ideas or arguments to a certain prompt. On the other side, the teacher-centered learning applied in the class has also become one of the problems. The teacher teaches the students based on the textbook. The students don’t have much space to be more active in teaching learning process. Therefore, the use of Collaborative Learning is suggested in order to overcome those problems. This is supported by Gokhale (1995) in her research that:

“Proponents of collaborative learning claim that the active exchange of ideas within small groups not only increases interest among the participants but also promotes critical thinking. According to Johnson and Johnson (1986), there is persuasive evidence that cooperative teams achieve at higher levels of thought and retain information longer than students who work quietly as individuals. The shared learning gives students an opportunity to engage in discussion, take responsibility for their own learning, and thus become critical thinkers (Totten, Sills, Digby, & Russ, 1991).”

Roundtable as one of the techniques of Collaborative Learning is chosen to be used in this research. The students make a group and each group sits around the
table. Then they will be given a single sheet by their teacher. That single sheet contains a single question related to the topic of writing. Every member in a group should share their ideas by writing them on that sheet. After that, they deliver to the person next to them. The next person should write their ideas too. This activity will end if all members in a group have shared their ideas. Those ideas will help the students arrange the text. By collecting the ideas in a group, the students are expected not to get confused about what they should write because they already have some ideas as the references to write.

This technique is believed that it can encourage the students to adjust their writing, in areas such as content and organization. It will be easier for the students, who find it difficult in expressing their ideas orally in front of the class or classmates, to express their ideas, arguments and opinions. Every student is obliged to contribute, that is why Roundtable technique also can help to deal with problems of unequal participation. It also helps the students to expose their viewpoints and ideas. It allows student to respect other’s opinion during the exchange ideas. Students often get confused in their thinking. By understanding other students’ ideas, they can broaden their own knowledge and views. Other than that, Roundtable technique also supports the students to view the emerging idea critically and freedom of presenting their own thoughts before the group members.

Based on the previous explanation, it is assumed that the implementation of Roundtable technique will be able to help students improve their critical thinking in writing. With the strengths of Roundtable technique, I believe that the
students’ problems in thinking critically will be able to be solved through careful planning and implementation. In addition, I suppose that through a well-implementation of Roundtable technique, the students’ will be more motivated and critical in expressing their thoughts.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHOD

This chapter describes the context of the research, the research method, the techniques of collecting data, and the techniques of analyzing data which are going to be used in the research.

A. Context of the Research

This action research was carried out in STMIK Duta Bangsa which is located on Jl. Bhayangkara no.55-57, Tipes, Surakarta. STMIK Duta Bangsa Surakarta has quite complete facilities to support the teaching learning activities, such as: hotspot areas, computer rooms, and multimedia room. Each classroom is already equipped with LCD and air conditioner.

The research was conducted in the beginning of the second semester of Sistem Informasi (SI) students of STMIK Duta Bangsa Surakarta in academic year of 2013/2014. The research involved the basic procedures of action research. The steps involved identifying the problems, planning, acting, observing, and reflecting for every cycle. The detailed plan of the research schedule is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time of Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifying Problems</td>
<td>October - November 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning 1</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting 1</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing 1</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflecting 1</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning 2</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting 2</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were six classes of *Sistem Informasi* (SI) major. Each of the class had more or less 30 students with various levels of academic ability. In this research, I used one of the SI classes, which were SI 1, to be the research subject. The students of SI 1 tend to be more active in the class but the level of their intelligence couldn’t be included as high intelligence just yet.

As stated before, SI 1 students tend to be active during the teaching and learning process. Even so, they still faced difficulties when it came to writing assignment, especially when the assignment required them to state their opinions or arguments. Some students admitted that it took quite some times to understand the topic or the question given. They depended on other friends in understanding the topic or questions. They were afraid that their understanding about the discourse was different from any other friends and that they would give wrong answers. As a result, the answers they gave were not as satisfying as expected. They tend to write short answers and almost all the students wrote the same answers even though it was their opinions which were asked.

### B. Research Method

1. **Nature of Action Research**

   Burns (1999: 7) states that action research is a transformative means of responding to the changing profiles of teachers’ classes and developing new teaching strategies and approaches to meet their students’ heterogeneous needs.
Bogdan and Biklen in Burns (1999: 30) describe action research as the systematic collection of information that is designed to bring about social change. While Wallace (1998: 18) explains that action research is different from other more conventional or traditional types of research in that it is much focused on individual or small group professional practice and are not so concerned with making general statements.

Kemmis and McTaggart in Nunan (1992: 17) state that action research is a group activity. A piece of descriptive research carried out by a teacher in his or her own classroom without involvement of others, which is aimed at increasing our understanding rather than changing the phenomenon under investigation. Moreover Mills (2000: 6) defines action research as any systematic inquiry conducted by teacher researchers, principals, school counselors, or other stakeholders in teaching/learning environment to gather information about the ways how their particular schools operate, how they teach, and how well their students learn.

Burns, R. B (in Burns, 1999: 30) says that action research is the application of fact finding to practical problem solving in a social situation with a view to improving the quality of action within it, involving the collaboration and co-operation of researchers, practitioners and laymen.

It can be summarized that action research is a systematic action which is done by teachers, researchers, principals, school counselors, or other stakeholders in teaching learning environment to solve problems or change situation in order to get quality improvement of the teaching learning process itself.
2. Characteristics of Action Research

Kemmis and McTaggart in Nunan (1998: 17) point out three defining characteristics of action research are that it is carried out by practitioners rather than outside researchers; secondly, that it is collaborative and thirdly that it is aimed at changing things. In line with Kemmis and McTaggart, Cohen and Manion in Nunan (1998: 18) define a similar set of characteristics. They said that:

“Action research is first and foremost situational, being concerned with the identification and solution of problems in a specific context. They also identify collaboration as an important feature of this type of research, and state that the aim of action research is to improve the current state of affairs within educational context in which the research is being carried out.”

Moreover, Burns (1999: 30) states some characteristics of action research taken from some experts' definition as follows:

a. Action research is contextual, small-scale and localized. It identifies and investigates problems within a specific situation.

b. It is evaluating and reflective as it aims to bring about change and improvement in practice.

c. It is participator as it provides for collaborative investigation by teams of colleagues, practitioners and researchers.

d. Changes in practice are based on the collection of information or data which provides the impetus for changes.
3. Procedures of Action Research

Kemmis and McTaggart in Burns (1999: 32) state that action research occurs through a dynamic and complementary process, which consists of four essential moments: planning, action, observation and reflection. Each moment will be explained as follows:

a. **Moment of planning** is a process of developing a plan of critically informed action to improve what is already happening.

b. **Moment of acting** is a process of taking the action to implement the plan.

c. **Moment of observation** is a process of observing the effects of the critically informed action in the context in which it occurs.

d. **Moment of reflection** is a process of reflecting the effects as the basis for the future planning, subsequent critically informed action and so on, through a succession of stages.

Planning, action, observation, and reflection are covered in one cycle. In a research a researcher may have more than one or two cycle depends on how difficult the problem she faces. Each cycle is followed by another cycle where the previous cycle is used as the basis of deciding what should do in the next cycle. The cycle is stopped when the indicator can be achieved.

The Action Research in this context uses the model developed by Kemmis and McTaggart in Burns (1999: 32). According to the model, the implementation of the action research includes four steps:

a. Identifying problems and planning the action.

b. Implementing the action and observing or monitoring the action.
c. Reflecting the result of observation.

d. Revising the plan.

The spiral model is illustrated in figure 3.1.

![Figure 3.1: Kemmis and McTaggart Action Research Procedure](image)

C. Techniques of Collecting Data

The techniques for collecting data will be used in this research are observational and non-observational techniques. The following are the detailed explanation of each technique according to Burns (1999: 78 - 151):

1. Observational techniques

   I will do this observation as the teacher. Students’ behavior and students’ activities are observed during writing class. The observation will be focused on the development of students’ critical thinking in writing using Roundtable technique. It will be recorded on writing form called field notes. Field notes are used to record activities happening in the class. Besides, I will also use a researcher’s diary and photographs. Researcher’s diaries are some notes written by a researcher to record her analysis, interpretation, and reflection, while
photographs are picture record of activities happening in the class that could give real description about teaching learning process.

2. Non-observational techniques

The non-observational technique which will be used for collecting data is writing tests. There will be pre-test and post-test which are going to be used to collect the data of the improvement. The pre-test is done before the treatment. While the post test will be given after giving the treatment.

D. Techniques of Data Analysis

I analyzed the data from the result of observation and test. The data collected were analyzed by qualitative and quantitative ways. The qualitative data analysis is used to analyze observation data that happened in the teaching learning process. In my research, I used constant comparative for qualitative technique to analyze data. The qualitative data were analyzed through descriptive analysis. Burns (1999: 156-160) suggests five steps in analyzing qualitative data. Those are:

a. Assembling the data

The first step is to assemble the data which are collected over the period of the research such as field notes, research diaries, etc. At this stage, broad patterns should begin to show up which can be compared and contrasted to see what fits together.
b. Coding the data

Coding is a process of attempting to reduce the large amount of data that may be collected to more manageable categories of concepts, theme, and types. Once there has been some overall examination of the data, categories or codes can be developed to identify patterns more specifically.

c. Comparing the data

Once the data have been categorized, comparisons can be made to see whether themes or patterns are repeated or developed across different data gathering techniques.

d. Building interpretations

This stage is the point which moves beyond describing, categorizing, coding and comparing to make some sense of the meaning of the data. This stage is concerned with articulating underlying concepts and developing theories about why particular patterns of behaviors, interactions or attitudes have emerged.

e. Reporting the outcomes.

The final stage involves presenting an account of research for others. A major consideration is to ensure that the report sets out the major processes of the research, and that the findings and outcomes are well supported with examples from the data.

The quantitative data analysis was used to analyze data by comparing the result of the pre-test and post-tests. It was done to compare the students’ writing before and after each cycle or the result of pre-test and post-test showing whether or not there was improvement of the students’ critical thinking. The formulas for
the mean score of the pre-test and the post-test were calculated with the formulas as follows:

\[ \bar{x} = \frac{\sum x}{N} \]

\[ \bar{y} = \frac{\sum y}{N} \]

in which:

\( \bar{x} \) = the mean of pre-test scores

\( \bar{y} \) = the mean of post-test scores

\( N \) = the number of sample
CHAPTER IV
RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter describes how the research was implemented in the Second Semester of Sistem Informasi (SI) Students of STMIK Duta Bangsa Surakarta. This chapter explains some findings and discussions about the implementation of Roundtable (RT) technique to improve students’ critical thinking in writing. The research was aimed to identify whether and to what extent the implementation of RT as the teaching technique to improve students’ critical thinking and to find the difficulties in implementing Roundtable technique in improving students’ critical thinking in writing. The results will be described in detail and discussed in four sub-headings: Situation Prior to the Research, Research Implementation, Research Findings, and Discussion.

A. Situation Prior to the Research

Pre-observation was conducted before the action research implementation in order to know the condition of the English class in Sistem Informasi (SI) 1 program. I conducted pre-observation toward the teaching learning process. I found several problems arose in the classroom. Firstly, when the students were asked to write about their opinions, they seemed to have hard time to find the idea. Many of them asked their friends what they should write. Few misinterpreted the question and it caused irrelevant answers. Most of the students only gave one or two sentences without elaborating their explanation.
They still had difficulty to organize their ideas and when they should begin to write. The vocabulary choice was sometimes not correct in writing a statement. Some of the students made sentences which were irrelevant with the topic.

Secondly, there seemed to be monotonous tasks given to the students. For example, when they were given a task to make a paper or an essay, they copied their assignments from the internet. In their ideas, the thicker the paper, the better. They didn’t even understand the content of their own papers. This kind of assignment was originally given to the students to broaden their knowledge about something yet the students didn’t seem to understand the purpose of it. As a result, the students did the assignment by copying from internet without understanding the content of the material itself.

I gave the students pre-test in order to know the detail problems of the students’ critical thinking in writing. The students’ critical thinking can be seen from the content of the text they wrote. As stated by Guo (2013) critical thinking is the ability and willingness to assess arguments and make objective opinions on the basis of well-supported reasons and evidence. Meanwhile, according to Brown in Brown (2001: 357), thesis statement, related ideas/information, development of ideas through experience, illustration, facts, and opinion, the use of description, cause/effect, comparison/contrast to explain the arguments, and consistent focus are the five aspects to evaluate the content of the text. From the result, it was found that the mean score of the students’ writing was 66.2. The highest score was 76.5, while the lowest score was 40.5. As for their critical thinking, the mean score was 8.94 which was quite low compare to the maximum score that is 20.
The highest score was 12.5 and the lowest score was 5. Based on the results, the conclusion that can be drawn is that the students writing mostly had limited knowledge of the subject, little substance, inadequate development topic. The students had difficulties in finding related statements, evidence, reasons, facts and examples to strengthen their arguments. Some students did not even give enough content to be evaluated. The paragraph was too short and the arguments were explained vaguely. These results also indicated that the students’ critical were rather low. Moreover, most of the students did not provide their assumptions with the reasons. The sentences were rather inconsistent and most of them didn’t even write a conclusion.

The summary of the students’ pre-test is portrayed in the following table.

Table 4.1. The Scores of Writing Pre-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Maximum score</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>raw</td>
<td>std</td>
<td>raw</td>
<td>std</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Content</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organization</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Vocabulary</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Language Use</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mechanics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2. The Mean Scores of Writing Pre-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect of Writing</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw score</td>
<td>Standard score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Content</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organization</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Vocabulary</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Language Use</td>
<td>16.35</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mechanics</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.3. The Scores of Critical Thinking Pre-test

| Indicators                                      | Maximum score | Pre-test |           |            |           |
|------------------------------------------------|---------------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| 1. Giving related arguments.                   | 4             | 2.00     | 10.00     | 2.03      | 10.15     |
| 2. Providing evidence, statements or facts.    | 4             | 2.06     | 10.91     | 2.24      | 11.21     |
| 3. Presenting alternative points of view       | 4             | 1.36     | 6.82      | 1.36      | 6.82      |
| 4. Giving assumptions and reasons              | 4             | 1.64     | 8.18      | 1.76      | 8.94      |
| 5. Drawing conclusions                         | 4             | 1.55     | 7.73      | 1.73      | 8.64      |
| Total                                          | 20            | 8.73     | 9.15      | 8.94      |

Table 4.4. The Mean Scores of Critical Thinking Pre-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Giving related arguments.</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>10.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Providing evidence, statements or facts.</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>11.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Presenting alternative points of view</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Giving assumptions and reasons</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Drawing conclusions</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, the situation before the research is presented briefly in table 4.5 below.

Table 4.5. Situation Prior to Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Indicators</th>
<th>A. Writing Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The students had difficulties to state their thesis clearly.</td>
<td>Most of the students did not state the thesis in their text. The paragraphs were shorter and some were even not enough to be evaluated. The compositions were lack of supporting ideas/information. Some information was even irrelevant to the thesis. Only 10 students who were able to strengthen their arguments through illustration, reasons, opinion, cause/effect, comparison/contrast. Even so, some were still lack in supporting the thesis. Meanwhile, the rest of the students’ composition only provided vague generalization of arguments. The students did not state their thesis, or they were stated unclearly. The arguments are also explained vaguely. In the reiteration, they seemed to explain their position or their point of view but the arguments are totally irrelevant with their position or fail to prove their thesis. There were still some students who didn’t make a conclusion. It means the students writing mostly had limited knowledge of the subject, little substance,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The students had difficulties in providing related ideas/information to support the thesis and arguments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The students did not develop their ideas through experience, illustration, facts, opinion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The students did not explain the arguments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The students did not write with consistent focus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The students’ mean score of writing in pre-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The students had difficulties in providing relevant arguments.

The students did not provide evidence, statements, facts, etc. to strengthen the argument.

The students did not see the alternative point of view.

The students did not explain their assumptions.

The students failed to give a clear conclusion.

The students’ mean score of critical thinking was only 8.94 of the maximum score 20

Based on the primary research, it was identified that the students’ critical thinking in writing needed to be improved. I suggested the solution to improve it through a Collaborative Learning technique called Roundtable. Roundtable technique helps the students to focus their attention. This technique forces the students to think and finds their own ideas. It exposes the students’ view points and thoughts. Moreover, Roundtable technique provides equal participation among group members. Because every student must involve in the activity, Roundtable technique can help to deal with problems of inequitable participation.

B. Research Implementation

1. Cycle 1

a. Planning
In this stage, I made lesson plans for the whole meetings in cycle 1. It was planned to have three meetings which was conducted twice a week. Each meeting was conducted in 90 minutes. The teaching materials were taken from the textbook and the internet. Worksheets and instruments for the test were also prepared. The test was aimed to know the progress and improvement of the students’ critical thinking.

The teaching and learning process was done in the classroom. The wireless internet connection facilitated the teaching and learning process. The students would be able to access the internet to find necessary information for their task.

b. Implementing

1) First Meeting

a) Opening

I began my research on Friday, May 9th 2014. The lesson began at 8.00 a.m. and ended at 9.30 a.m. I explained to the students that I would conduct a research in their class, Sistem Informasi (SI) 1. The students already knew me since the previous semester so it was not hard to cooperate. I explained a little bit about my research and the benefits of it for them.

b) Main Activity

I started the lesson by asking the students about facebook. What they knew about facebook. I asked the students to raise their hands if they wanted to answer the question. Three students raised their hands and I
gave them a chance to state their opinions. The first to answer was RS. He was one of the students who were quite active in the class.

The next question I gave was "Is it necessary to have facebook?". This time I pointed out some students to speak. I pointed four students to give their opinion about the question. The pointed students only gave short answers. They didn’t speak much about their ideas. ZR was the only students of four pointed students that could answer the question well. He was quite fluent in his speech. He didn’t seem to have difficulties in delivering his own idea. While the others needed some pauses to find the correct words of what they were going to say.

Even so, I appreciated the students for their opinions. Then, I began explaining to them how to give opinions/arguments correctly. The students seemed attentive when I started explaining, even though there were some boys who chatted among themselves. They also made some notes of what I explained. After some time explaining, I asked the same questions as before and asked the same students to say their answers by using the correct form of giving opinions/arguments.

As a short practice I asked the students to write down their opinions of a question “Does facebook waste your time and money?”. I gave them five minutes to write down their answers. After that, I asked some of the students to say their answers without reading what they wrote. Some of them stated their answers quite well, even though they
still had to learn more to use appropriate grammar, and some had to read what they wrote.

After making sure that the students understood with the lesson, I started to arrange them into some groups. Each group consisted of four or five students to do roundtable. I explained the rules of the activity itself and some of the students complained already because the time that I would give was too short. The students started to arrange themselves into groups of five. Each group arranged their seats into a circle. Then, I distributed a piece of paper to each group. They had to decide the student who would have the first turn. When they were ready, I gave them the prompt or statement to be argued or commented. The first student started to write their ideas on the paper. Other students seemed to think about their own answers. But there were students who talked to each other and made some noise so that the first students who were thinking and writing got distracted. I warned the students to be quiet. As the time was up, I ordered the first students to read their answers and pass the paper to the second students. I kept doing so until the fifth students.

I asked the students to submit the papers. Then, with the students, I discussed the result of the activity. I asked some students about their answers as I read their writings. Most of the students only gave short answers. They complained that the time given was too short for them. I corrected the wrong pronunciation and grammar they made. Once in a
while, I asked them more questions to the ideas they stated in order to stimulate their thinking.

c) Closing

I concluded that day lesson and asked the students if they still had any difficulties. The class said they understood and that they had no questions. Before I closed the lesson, I asked the students to watch a movie entitled “The Social Network.” I informed them that we would discuss the movie in the next meeting and it was a must for them to watch it.

2) Second Meeting

a) Opening

The second meeting was conducted on Wednesday, May 14th 2014. It started at 08.00 a.m. and finished at 09.30 a.m. I greeted them and checked the students’ attendance. There were two students who were absent and one student who came late. Before starting the lesson, I reviewed the previous lesson. I explained what they would do during that day’s activities. The students paid attention well and they seemed ready for the lesson.

b) Main Activity

I started the lesson by asking the students about the last assignment I gave them. It was watching “The Social Network” movie.
The students said they did and started to chat to each other about the movie. I had to raise my voice to get their attention back. Then, I started to ask them what the movie was about. Again, the students answered it altogether so it sounded like a noise instead. I asked them to raise their hands but none did. So I had to appoint some students. The first one was DHM. He said he had to watch the movie twice because the storyline was complicated for him. Even so, he spoke about the movie confidently.

After DHM, I appointed HM, AAF, and WH to tell the class about the movie. AAF had hard time speaking so that he had to ask the friend beside him to help him arranging the sentences.

After quite some time talking about the movie, I began the activity that I had planned before, Roundtable. Since we did it in the previous meeting, I didn’t have to explain more about the rules and the students understood already that they then arranged themselves into some groups. First question was to explain their opinion/argument about “The Social Network” movie. I gave the time limit to each student. When the time was up, I ordered them to read their answer aloud and then pass the paper to the next students. We did this for four questions and the activity was done smoothly even though there were, no doubt, students who found it difficult to write, mostly because they didn’t know what to write.

The rest of questions were: Which one is your favorite scene? Why?; Why does the Facebook become so famous all over the world?; What were the obstacles that Mark Zuckenberg faced in creating the
Facebook? The answers were various. There were students who wrote long answers but there were students who wrote only one to two sentences.

I asked the students to submit their papers to me each time we finished doing a round. Then after finishing all rounds, I asked the students the same question and asked the students what they had written. MF was a noisy student. I purposely asked him to say what he had written. He said he forgot what he had written. But I still forced him to remember. Even though only short answer, in the end he managed to state his answer. I asked four students to speak for each questions. Sometimes, I had to correct their pronunciation and helped them to find the appropriate vocabulary to convey what they wanted to say clearly.

After finishing the roundtables and the discussion, we talked about their favorite movies. The students seemed to be more relaxed and interested in the topic. The class situation was not as serious as before. Some students were able to comment to other students’ favorite movie and sometimes they teased their friends’ choices. The students seemed to have more fun than before.

c) Closing

I asked the students whether they enjoyed the lesson or not, apart from the time limit in doing Roundtable, they said they enjoyed it. Before closing the lesson, I gave them a glimpse of what we were going to do in
the next meeting. I didn’t give any assignment but reminded the students to work more on their English.

3) Third Meeting

a) Opening

The third meeting of the first cycle was held on Friday, May 16th 2014. I started the lesson at 8.00 and finished at 9.30. I greeted the students and checked their attendance. The students were all present but there were three students who came late. I began the lesson by telling them that they were going to do a pair work. So I asked them to work with the friend sitting next to them.

b) Main Activity

I distributed worksheet that I had prepared before. Each pair got a worksheet. In the worksheet, there was a text and a column below it. I asked the students to read the text first. Then I asked one of the students to read it aloud. The text was an analytical exposition text. But I had not told the students what kind of text was it. I asked them if there were any difficulties in understanding the content of text. It was a simple text and the students seemed to understand it easily. To make sure of that, I requested some students to explain what the text was about.

After that, I asked them to fill the column below the text. The instruction was to write according to their understanding what the first,
second, third and fourth paragraph were about. This activity was still
done in a couple. I gave them 20 minutes to do this task. When they were
done, I asked some pairs to read their answers started from the first
paragraph. I did the same thing for the next three paragraphs.

I wrote the correct answers on the whiteboard. Almost all of the
pairs answered correctly for the first to the third paragraph. The fourth
paragraph was quite confusing because actually it was the conclusion of
the first to the third paragraph. But when I gave them the correct answer
they seemed to understand what the last paragraph told them about. Not
only giving them the correct answers but I also explained more about
Analytical Exposition text. The students took note of it.

Next, I asked the students to do Roundtable. They had to write
down the answer of a question Does laptop improve your social life?
Explain your answer!. After doing Roundtable, I asked each group to
read their answers. If in one group there was similar answer, I told the
students to consider it as one answer.

Unlike before, I didn’t ask the students to submit the papers. I
asked each group to make a text based on what they had written in the
Roundtable sheet. I told them that they had to use their answers to write
the argument part of the paragraph. It took more than 30 minutes for the
students to make the text. When I walked around the class to check their
work, I found that the students got confused on how to construct the
thesis or the first paragraph. I intentionally didn’t give them detailed
information about the generic structure of the analytical exposition itself and the language features because I wanted to know if the students understood about the text with only such example. When the assignment was done, I asked them to submit their worksheet to me to be analyzed and evaluated.

c) Closing

I close the lesson by summing up what we learnt that day. I asked the students if they had any questions. But no question given so I thank them for their attention and said goodbye.

c. Observing

1) The Students’ Critical Thinking in Writing

In the first cycle, I observed the whole teaching and learning process to see whether there was improvement in the students’ critical thinking after Roundtable technique was implemented. As stated before, critical thinking deals with how well the students give arguments and support them with evidence, statements and facts in their writing and how well the students giving reasons for their assumptions. Meanwhile, in writing, these critical thinking aspects can be seen from the content and the organization of a text in which ideas, knowledge and relevant aspect are stated.

During the first cycle, it can be seen that there was a slight improvement in the students’ critical thinking in writing. The students were able to write longer statements. Before the action, the students only gave
one or two sentences in their arguments. They had difficulties in providing relevant arguments. The arguments were somehow inconsistent. They also were not able to provide evidence, statements, facts, etc to support the arguments. After the implementation of Roundtable technique in cycle 1, some students started to develop their arguments by using evidence, statements, facts, etc. The assumptions given were clearer with the reasons. The students also started to see the alternative points of view of the arguments. More students started to be aware of the importance of giving conclusion. These can be seen from the improvement of their writing. The students wrote the thesis clearer. They also provided better related information to support the thesis. The paragraphs constructed were longer than in the pre-test. The detail score for both improvements of writing and critical thinking were shown in table 4.6 and table 4.8.

Table 4.6. The Scores of Students' Writing Improvement in Cycle 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Test 1</th>
<th>Rater I</th>
<th>Rater II</th>
<th>Rater I</th>
<th>Rater II</th>
<th>Rater I</th>
<th>Rater II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>raw</td>
<td>std</td>
<td>raw</td>
<td>std</td>
<td>raw</td>
<td>std</td>
<td>raw</td>
<td>std</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Content</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organization</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Vocabulary</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Language Use</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mechanics</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7. The Mean Scores of Writing Improvement in Cycle 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Test 1</th>
<th>raw score</th>
<th>std score</th>
<th>raw score</th>
<th>std score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Content</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organization</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Vocabulary</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Language Use</td>
<td>16.35</td>
<td>16.75</td>
<td>16.35</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mechanics</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66.25</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>66.25</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.8. The Scores of Students’ Critical Thinking Improvement in Cycle 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Test 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rater I</td>
<td>Rater II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>raw</td>
<td>std</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Giving related arguments.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Providing evidence, statements or facts.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Presenting alternative points of view.</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>6.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Giving assumptions and reasons</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>8.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Drawing conclusions</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>7.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8.73</td>
<td>9.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9. The Mean Scores of Critical Thinking Improvement in Cycle 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Test 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rater I</td>
<td>Rater II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>raw score</td>
<td>std score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Giving related arguments.</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>10.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Providing evidence, statements or facts.</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>11.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Presenting alternative points of view.</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>6.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Giving assumptions and reasons</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>8.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Drawing conclusions</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>8.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>10.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 shows that there was improvement in the writing score of the students, especially in content and organization aspect. Before Roundtable technique was implemented, the mean score of the content aspect was only 58.7 and the organization aspect was 71. After the implementation, the score of both aspects were increased. The content...
aspect was increased by 5.65% and became 64.3 while the organization aspect was improved by 6% from 71 to 77. In the pre-test, the mean of overall score of the writing was 66.2 and in the cycle I test, the mean score was 70.5. It means that the overall improvement of writing was 4.3%.

Meanwhile, a slight improvement happened in all five aspects of critical thinking. In the pre-test, the mean score for the first aspect, giving related arguments, was 10.08. It was improved by 13.9% to 10.86 in the cycle I test. The mean score of the second aspect, providing evidence, statements, facts etc., was only 11.06 of the maximum score 4. In the cycle I test, this score was improved by 5.4%. It became 12.15. The third aspect, presenting alternative points of view, was improved by 3.8%, from 6.82 to 7.57. A slight improvement also happened in the fourth aspect, giving assumptions and reasons. In the pre-test, the mean score was 8.65 and improved by 1.9% to 8.93. Most of the students did not write their conclusion in the pre-test. It resulted in the low mean score, that was 8.19, but then it is improved by 13.7% and the mean score of giving clear conclusion was improved to 10.93. The overall mean score of critical thinking pre-test was only 8.94. After Roundtable technique was implemented, the score improved to 10.08. The overall improvement of students’ critical thinking was 5.7%.

2) The Difficulties in Implementing Roundtable Technique in Improving Students’ Critical Thinking in Writing
In the first cycle, there were some difficulties found in the process. First, the students weren’t accustomed to the rules of Roundtable and it caused some problems during the activity. In cycle 1, it was quite hard to order the students to form their own group. I had to shout many times to ask them to form some groups without being so noisy. Moreover, there were groups which were not functioning well. The other members sat apart from other members. The next problem was the time limit. It had always been the problem since Roundtable was implemented. The time limit was too short that the students complained they could not think properly and write what they wanted to write.

Next problem was the undeniable situation where the students asked their friends about what they should write during the Roundtable. It was against the rule of Roundtable itself. In the technique, the students were not allowed to discuss with their friends. Furthermore, there were students who used their smartphone to find some answers or ideas. This was done while they were waiting for their turn. I had to warn them couple of times not to do that but they did not seem to care. Other than that, while waiting for their turns, most of the students chatted with their friends, even with the ones who sat apart from the rest. The class was so noisy and disturbing the ones who were having their turns writing in the Roundtable paper sheet.

As stated before, most of the students still couldn’t fulfill the steps in using Roundtable technique in the classroom. During the research, I tried to re-explain what the students should and should not do during the
Roundtable. In hope, on the next meeting, I would found some improvements on the students’ activities. Moreover, as stated by Reid in Jacobs (2006) it needs to be remembered that students who are unfamiliar with collaborative learning may need a while to adjust to this new format for learning as well.

d. Reflecting

In cycle 1, the students’ writing slightly improved, especially in the aspect of the content and organization of the text in which the critical thinking could also be seen. It was indicated by the improvement in students’ mean score of writing test. In post test of cycle 1 the students got 70.5 as the mean score. It was quite improvement compared to the pre-test in which the students only got 66.25 as the mean score. With the improvement of the writing skill, the students’ critical thinking had also improved. The mean of the pre test score for the students’ critical thinking was 8.94, and it was improved to 10.08.

Based on table 4.6, it can be seen that the students score improves in almost every aspect of writing. So does the students’ critical thinking. The improvement of the critical thinking is shown in details in table 4.8. Before they were given the treatment, the students had difficulties in providing relevant arguments. The students did not provide evidence, statements, facts, etc to support the argument. They did not see the alternative point of view. The students did not explain their assumptions by elaborating it with reasons and they failed to give clear conclusion. After being taught by using Roundtable
technique, more students were able to give relevant arguments. They provided longer explanation by using evidence, statements, facts, etc. Some students gave different point of view (pro and cons) in their arguments even vaguely. They students gave longer explanation/reasons to their assumptions. The students started to be aware of giving conclusion. They gave clearer conclusion.

Those critical thinking improvement can be indicated by the improvement of their writing. The students were more aware of the importance of thesis. Even though some students still wrote it vaguely, they wrote the thesis better than before. The ideas were stated clearly. It was more consistent than in their pre-test. They wrote longer paragraph and provided more supporting sentences.

Despite some improvements in writing skill and critical thinking, there were still some matters which have not been successfully achieved. Although more students showed improvement in writing, especially in content and organization, there were still some students who had not improved. Some students still did not write the thesis in their text. Some wrote the thesis but the content was vague. It seemed that supporting arguments by providing evidence, statements, facts, etc was still difficult for the students. Although some students had already started to strengthen the argument by using these aspects, there were a lot of students who still had difficulty and not using these aspects in their text. Most of students still faced difficulties in giving alternative point of view and some students were still not able to give a clear conclusion.
I recommend to solve the problems which still appeared in the first cycle by (1) trying to improve the students’ skill and knowledge by giving personal guidance in every activities, (2) re-explaining to the students about analytical exposition to make them understand more the function of a thesis, arguments and reiteration, (3) giving more clear examples and guiding the students to support their arguments and assumptions using evidence, statements, reasons, fact, opinion, etc, (4) trying to monitor the students more carefully and remind them to obey the rules of Roundtable technique, (5) encouraging every student to participate actively in the activity. Considering such unsolved problems in the first cycle, and to realize the recommendation in order to fix the problem, I recommend the research to be continued to cycle 2.

Here is the summary of the reflection in cycle 1 that is presented in table 4.10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before the Action</th>
<th>Cycle 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Critical Thinking in Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The students had poor content. For example, they had difficulties their thesis clearly. They had difficulties in providing related ideas/information to support the thesis and arguments. They did not develop their ideas through experience, illustration, facts, opinion and they did not write with consistent focus.</td>
<td>1. The content of the text was better. They started to be aware of the thesis function. 20 The students wrote longer paragraph by providing related information but the development of the paragraph was inadequate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The students’ organization was fair; even so, there were few students who had poor organization. They gave inconsistent ideas and not enough to evaluate.</td>
<td>2. The students’ had fairer organization. The ideas started to be consistent and the sequence was better organized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The errors of word/idiom form occasionally occurred. The students’ had less fair vocabulary.</td>
<td>3. The students’ vocabulary was better even though the word choice was still in limited range.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The students’ had simple construction of the language use.</td>
<td>4. The language use was improved. The construction was more complex than before.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The students’ had frequent errors of spelling, paragraphing and poor handwritings.</td>
<td>5. The errors in students’ mechanics were decreased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The students’ mean score of writing in pre-test was 66.2.</td>
<td>6. The students’ mean score of writing in cycle 1 test was 70.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ Critical Thinking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The students had difficulties in providing relevant arguments.</td>
<td>1. More students were able to provide relevant arguments and the ideas were clearer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. The students did not provide evidence, statements, facts, etc to strengthen the argument.
3. The students did not see the alternative point of view.
4. The students did not explain their assumptions.
5. The students failed to give clear conclusion.
6. The students’ mean score of critical thinking was only 8.94 of the maximum score 20

1. The students weren't accustomed to the Roundtable technique rules.
2. The group forming was noisy and took some minutes.
3. There were groups who did not function well. The other members sat apart from other members.
4. The time allotment was too short for the students.
5. Many students asked their friends about what they should write.
6. The students used smartphone to find some ideas.

B. The Difficulties In Implementing Roundtable Technique
1. 14 students provided longer explanation by using evidence, facts, etc.
2. The students started to provide relevant arguments.
3. 18 students gave different point of view (pro and cons) in their arguments even vaguely.
4. More students gave clearer conclusion.
5. The students’ mean score of critical thinking was 10.8. Improved by 4.3%.

C. Unsolved Problems/Weaknesses
1. There were still some students who did not write the thesis in their text and some still gave unclear ideas.
2. Many students still had difficulties in strengthening their arguments and assumptions using evidence, statements, facts, experience, reasons, or opinions.
3. Most of students were still not able to give alternative point of view.
4. The students were not accustomed to the rules of Roundtable.

D. Recommendation
1. Trying to improve the students’ skill and knowledge by giving personal guidance in every activity.
2. Re-explaining to the students about analytical exposition to make them understand more the function of a thesis, arguments and reiteration.
3. Trying to monitor more carefully and remind them to obey the rules of Roundtable technique.
4. Encouraging every student to participate actively in the discussion.

2. Cycle 2

a. Planning

In the end of cycle 1, there were some progresses on the students' critical thinking in writing, as described in table 4.10. However, there were some unsolved problems related to students’ writing skill and critical thinking in the first cycle that needed further action. Those problems were: (1) there were still some students who did not provide the thesis in their text. (2) The students still had difficulties in strengthen their arguments using evidence, statements, facts, experience, etc, and their assumptions using reasons. (3) Most of students were still not able to give alternative point of view and give
clear conclusion. (4) The students were not accustomed with the rules of Roundtable which generally influenced the situation of the class. Based on the condition in cycle 1, I revised the lesson plans. It was aimed to overcome the problems that still exist in cycle 1. The lesson plan was realized in 3 meetings in which Roundtable technique were implemented to improve students’ critical thinking in writing.

b. Implementing

1) First Meeting
   a) Opening

   The first meeting of cycle two was done on Friday, May 23rd 2014. The lesson started at 8.00 a.m. to 9.30 a.m. I checked the students’ attendance. A student was absent. Two students were late. In the previous meeting, I explained to the students a bit about Analytical Exposition text and in this meeting, I would explain more about Analytical Exposition, especially the thesis. I would also explain more about the language features of the text.

   b) Main Activity

   I used power point to show some explanation about Analytical Exposition text. I also gave them an example of the text. In the last meeting, I already gave them explanation about Analytical Exposition itself. So, in this meeting, I only repeated with more detailed information about it.
Firstly, I asked the students to read the text. Then, I started explaining the thesis, the arguments and the reiteration and their characteristics. Next, I showed them the language features of Analytical Exposition. When I was done explaining, I asked the students if they understood. They said they understood enough which meant they were still unsure about their own understanding. Just then I explained more about the thesis and how to construct a thesis.

For an exercise, I asked them to do Roundtable. I told them to write down sentences which could support the first sentence. The theme was “The Importance of Social Media”. The first sentence itself was given by me. It was “In today’s era, many people consider social media as the part of their lives”. Each student must write one sentence. This was done to create some supporting sentences. I told the students that it was better for them to have different idea for each student so none would write the same thing. But before doing the Roundtable, I asked them to make the title first based on the theme had been given. They did Roundtable before and got familiar with how it was conducted. There was no complaint about the time limit since they only had to write one sentence only. The activity was done smoothly.

When they’re done, I checked each group’s result. I corrected their grammar along the way. I asked them to omit one of the sentences that had the same idea. Then, I told them to make it into one paragraph.

commit to user
Before submitting the paper, each group had to read their paragraph. That was the end of the activity on that day.

c) Closing

Before closing, as usual, I asked if they had any question or difficulties. They said they understood so I said to them that in our next meeting we were going to discuss about the arguments of Analytical Exposition and I told them that it would be better if they could bring their laptop in the next meeting.

2) Second Meeting

a) Opening

The second meeting of the second cycle was held on Wednesday, May 28th 2014. I started the lesson at 8.00 and finished at 9.30. I greeted the students and checked their attendance. There were two students who came late and two were absent. I began the lesson by reviewing what we had learned in the previous meeting and telling them that we were going to learn.

b) Main Activity

I showed them a text and asked which ones were the arguments. It was easy because, in their understanding, as long as it was not in the first and last paragraph, they were the arguments. I asked them to read the text then asked for the main idea of the each paragraph. They seemed to understand the content of the text because they could answer it well.
Since they knew the content of each paragraph, I told them to focus on the argument paragraphs. I asked them what the arguments paragraph were written for, in other words, I asked them the function of the arguments. There was a student said that it was the generic structure and it must have arguments. There were students said that the arguments were written to give more explanation and there were some students who said that the arguments were the examples of the thesis. Their answers were not entirely wrong.

Then, I explained to them about the arguments in Analytical Exposition text and how to construct them. I told the students that the arguments were used to support the main idea of the writer. The more arguments they gave, the more they could convince the reader that his/her idea was correct. The arguments were usually supported by evidence, statements, opinions, reasons, facts, etc.

Roundtable was done to give them exercise. I asked them to make the groups the same as the previous meeting. Before doing the Roundtable, I gave them their last meeting Roundtable paperwork. Each group had the same idea of the thesis; therefore, I asked them for the main idea of the next paragraph they would make. After deciding for the main idea of the first argument, I asked them to write the first sentence of their argument paragraph. Then, I told them that each member of the group would have to continue the sentence which the previous member made so that none would write the same sentence. In other words, they...
would have to make relevant sentence to support the main idea and the previous member’s sentence.

When it was done, I asked them to check the result, whether their friends’ sentences were relevant to the main idea or not. After that, I asked them to make it into paragraph and read them aloud. Once in a while, I asked them to repeat some sentence because I didn’t understand and that I had to correct the sentence so it would be more understandable.

The second Roundtable was held to construct more argument. This time, I told them that each student had to find their own idea for the third paragraph. I gave them few minutes to look up some ideas in the internet. I emphasized that they were not allowed to write it down anywhere before the Roundtable, they were only allowed to write it when their turns came. It was then so noisy because each student wanted to be the first to have their turn. They were afraid that their idea might be the same as others. When things were settled, I began the Roundtable.

After doing the second Roundtable, I asked the students to submit their papers because I would personally checked their writing and promised them to give the paper back to them in the next meeting.

c) Closing

Since the time was up, I told the students if they had any questions they could see me personally or ask me in the next meeting. No assignment was given to the students. I informed them that the next meeting would be about the reiteration.
3) Third Meeting

a) Opening

On Friday, May 30th 2014, I conducted the third meeting of the second cycle. This meeting was the last meeting of the second cycle. No students were absent that day. I told the students that I would continue the explanation about Analytical Exposition then I reviewed what we had learnt in the last meeting.

b) Main Activity

In this meeting, I explained about the last part of Analytical Exposition text that is Reiteration. Before I started explaining, I distributed their worksheets of the previous Roundtable result. I asked the students to combine the first worksheet, that was the thesis, and the second worksheets, which were the arguments. Each group had the same topic but each group had different construction of a thesis and arguments. I didn’t do much explaining that day because the students understood that the reiteration is the conclusion of the entire paragraphs. It is used to convince the reader more about what they tried to explained or argued.

I asked the students if they really understood about reiteration. When they said they did, I, then, asked them to re-write the thesis and arguments in a sheet. They were also given a chance to add or fix the statements they had made before. Finally, they had to write the reiteration.
of their text. It was put on the very last paragraph. When it’s done, the
students submitted their final result to be evaluated.

c) Closing

Before the class ended, I reviewed what they had done that day
and asked the students how their feeling about doing Roundtable and if it
helped them. I told them that they did great job with the text and said
thank you. Then I closed the lesson and said goodbye.

c. Observing

1) The Students’ Critical Thinking in Writing

During cycle 2, I monitored what had happened during the teaching
and learning process to find out whether there was another improvement in
students’ critical thinking in writing, and also whether the problems which
appeared in the previous cycle had been solved. In the previous cycle, there
were still some students who did not write the thesis. In cycle 2, almost
students wrote their thesis in the text. They started to be aware that it was
important to state the thesis in the text and they did not forget to write it
down.

Many students still had difficulties constructing the text. Therefore,
in cycle 2, I re-explained to the students about analytical exposition to make
them understand more the function of a thesis, arguments and reiteration.
Another problem that still appeared in the previous cycle was that the
students still had difficulties to develop the arguments by using evidence,
statements, facts, etc and were still lack of reasons in their assumptions. I tried to give clearer examples and guiding the students to support their arguments using evidence, statements, fact, etc. As a result, more students had developed the arguments by using evidence, statements, fact, etc. the started to give alternative point of view and they were able to state their assumptions and the reasons better. The students were also able to write conclusion clearer and more consistent. Their final report in cycle 2 was better than in the cycle 1.

The improvement was proven by the improvement of the mean score of writing and its aspects. This improvement also happened to the students’ critical thinking. The improvement of the students’ critical thinking in writing is presented in table 4.11 and 4.13.

Table 4.11. The Scores of Students’ Writing Improvement in Cycle 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Test 1</th>
<th>Test 2</th>
<th>Test 1</th>
<th>Test 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rater I</td>
<td>Rater II</td>
<td>Rater I</td>
<td>Rater II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>raw</td>
<td>std</td>
<td>raw</td>
<td>std</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Content</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organization</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Vocabulary</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Language Use</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mechanics</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>75.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.12. The Mean Scores of Writing Improvement in Cycle 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Test 1</th>
<th>Test 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>raw score</td>
<td>std score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Content</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>64.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organization</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Vocabulary</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Language Use</td>
<td>16.75</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mechanics</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>74.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.13. The Scores of Students’ Critical Thinking Improvement in Cycle 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Test 1</th>
<th>Test 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rater I</td>
<td>Rater II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>raw</td>
<td>std</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Content</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organization</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Vocabulary</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Language Use</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>66.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mechanics</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.14. The Mean Scores of Critical Thinking Improvement in Cycle 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>Std Score</th>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>Std Score</th>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>Std Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Giving related arguments</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>12.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Providing evidence, statements or facts.</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>12.29</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>13.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Presenting alternative points of view</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>10.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Giving assumptions and reasons</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>8.86</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>10.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9.97</td>
<td>10.82</td>
<td>12.06</td>
<td>12.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In cycle 2, students wrote their thesis clearer. The students also wrote in longer paragraph and provide about 4 - 7 better related ideas. In addition, all students developed the ideas by using at least one of the aspects of evidence, statements, reasons, fact, opinion, etc. The students also started to give alternative point of view in their writing even though there were some students who did not provide their text with this. Even so, each of critical thinking aspects was improved. The mean score for providing evidence, statement, facts, etc was 13.79, for giving related arguments was 12.4, for providing alternative point of view was 10.43, for giving assumptions and reasons was 10.50, and for drawing conclusion was 13.64. The students’ critical thinking mean score in cycle 2 was 12.16.
2) The Difficulties in Implementing Roundtable Technique in Improving Students’ Critical Thinking in Writing

In cycle 2, the difficulties in implementing Roundtable technique were less than in the cycle 1. The students were calmer than before. When I asked them to form groups, they already could organize themselves. The seat arrangement was a bit unorganized in cycle 1 and in cycle 2, the students arranged themselves well. No one sat apart from their groups. While waiting for their turn to write, the students tried to figure out what they were going to write. They made some notes in their own notes so they would not forget or to make sure what they were going to write was correct. This situation was surely better than in the cycle 1 where the students were so noisy waiting for their turns.

However, the situation was not as smooth as it seemed. Even though the students had understood how Roundtable technique should be done, there were still students who did not seem to care about the rules. First example, when their turns were over, some students still insisted to finish their sentences instead of distributing the paper to the next students. It made the Roundtable activity took longer time than it should. Secondly, some students waiting for their turns took a chance to ask other members and told them about what they would write. They told their friends in the same group not to write certain arguments or opinions because they would write about it and told their friends to find other ideas. Thirdly, the different speed in
thinking of each student caused the ones with lower speed felt pressured. In addition, the topic chosen was also influenced the students’ thinking speed.

In conclusion, even though the situation was better than before, problems and difficulties were still exist. The situation was somehow undeniable.

d. Reflecting

There were a lot of things that had been successfully achieved during the last cycle. The first is the students’ critical thinking had improved. Their ability in giving evidence, statements, reasons, fact, opinion, etc had improved. This can be seen from the students’ content and organization in their writing. In post-test of cycle 2, all of the students wrote their thesis clearer within their composition. They also provided better relevant information to support the thesis, even though there were few of sentences that contained information which were irrelevant with the topic being written. Since they did Roundtable, they were given a chance to share their ideas and get some various ideas from their friends. Therefore, they were able to develop their arguments by using evidence, statements, fact, etc and started to elaborate their assumptions with reasons.

Those improvements were shown by the increasing mean score of content and organization in cycle 2. In the post test in cycle 1, the mean score of content was only 64.3. In cycle 2, the mean score was improved to 69.5. Mean while the mean score of organization aspect in the cycle 1 was 77 and in
cycle 2 it was improved to 81.25. The students overall mean score of writing was also improved since the cycle 1. In cycle 1, their mean score of writing was 70.5. In post-test of cycle 2, they achieved 74.9 as the mean score. There was improvement as much as 4.4% since the last post-test in cycle 1. The overall improvement since pre-test was 8.7%.

Meanwhile, in the cycle 2, each aspect of students’ critical thinking was increased. The mean score for giving evidence, statements, facts, etc 8.2%, that was from 12.15 to 13.79, for giving related arguments was increased by 7.9%, from 10.86 to 12.13, for providing alternative point of view was increased by 14.3%, that was from 7.57 to 10.43, for giving assumptions and reasons was improved by 7.9%, that was from 8.93 to 10.50, and for giving clear conclusion was improved by 13.6%, that was from 10.93 to 13.64. Then, the overall mean score for students’ critical thinking in the end of cycle 2 was improved by 10.4%, from 10.08 to 12.16.

Other than that, the class situation was better. The students were able to follow the procedure of Roundtable. The team forming was organized well and the seat arrangement was the way it should be. Most of them were able to adjust to the time limit given to them, even though few of them still insisted to finish their answers even though their turn ended. While waiting for their turn, the students were more. Instead of talking and making some noise, they sat calmly and thought about what they had to write. In addition, the topic choice influenced the way the students think. Therefore, it is suggested for teacher to
carefully choose the topic and make sure the topic is related to their major or interest.

There are some points that should be done and paid attention to for the better result of the teaching and learning process. It is important to provide the students with a suitable technique and guidance. Working in groups proposes the possibility of differing opinions and perspectives. Since there had been improvement in students’ critical thinking, I decided not to continue the cycle.

The summary of the achievement in the end of cycle 2 are presented in table 4.15 as follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cycle 1</th>
<th>Cycle 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Critical Thinking in Writing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>The content of the text was better.</strong> They started to be aware of the thesis function.</td>
<td>1. <strong>The content of the text was improved.</strong> Almost all students provided a thesis clearer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>The students’ had better organization. The ideas started to be consistent and the sequence was better organized.</strong></td>
<td>2. <strong>The students’ had better organization. The ideas started to be consistent and the sequence was better organized.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>The students’ vocabulary was better even though the word choice was still in limited range.</strong></td>
<td>3. <strong>The vocabulary was in adequate range. Fewer errors occurred.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>The language use was improved. The construction was more complex than before.</strong></td>
<td>4. <strong>The language use had more complex construction.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>The errors in students’ mechanics were decreased.</strong></td>
<td>5. <strong>The students’ mechanics were very good. Only few errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization occurred.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <strong>The students’ mean score of writing in cycle 1 test was 70.5.</strong></td>
<td>6. <strong>The students’ mean score of writing in cycle 2 was 74.9.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Students’ Critical Thinking**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>More students were able to provide relevant arguments and the ideas were clearer.</strong></td>
<td>1. <strong>25 students were able to provide longer explanation by using evidence, statements, facts, opinion, etc.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>14 students provided longer explanation by using evidence, facts, etc.</strong></td>
<td>2. <strong>17 students provided relevant arguments clearly.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>18 students gave alternative point of view in their arguments even vaguely.</strong></td>
<td>3. <strong>31 Students gave some alternative point of view in their arguments, even though some of them still wrote it vaguely.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>More students gave clearer conclusion.</strong></td>
<td>4. <strong>27 students gave clear and consistent conclusion.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>The students’ mean score of critical thinking was 10.8. Improved by 4.3%.</strong></td>
<td>5. <strong>The students’ mean score was improved by 10.4% became 12.16.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. It was hard to control the students who kept asking their friends about what they should write.
2. The students had to re-think if the previous students wrote down the same answers as their planned answers.
3. The students might adjust the time limit but there were students who were persistent to keep writing their answers. It caused the Roundtable took longer time than it should.
4. If the topic was not something they familiar with, the students tend to think slower.
5. Each student had different speed in thinking. The one with lower speed felt intimidated by the smarter students in the group.

C. Research Findings

The research findings were gathered from several sources of data, including the tests and field notes. The findings were related to the improvement of the students’ critical thinking in writing analytical exposition text and also the difficulties in implementing Roundtable technique to improve students’ critical thinking in writing. The overall findings and improvement were summarized in table 4.12 as follow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Findings</th>
<th>Before the Research</th>
<th>After the Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The students’ critical thinking in writing</td>
<td>1. The students had poor content. For example, they had difficulties their thesis clearly. They had difficulties in providing related ideas/information to support the thesis and arguments. They did not develop their ideas through experience, illustration, facts, opinion and they did not write with consistent focus.</td>
<td>1. The content of the text was improved. Almost all students provided a thesis clearer. The students wrote longer paragraph by providing related information. The students wrote the content clearly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The students’ organization was fair; even so, there were few students who had poor organization. They gave inconsistent ideas and not enough to evaluate.</td>
<td>2. The students stated the ideas clearly and well-organized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. The errors of word/idiom form occasionally occurred. The students’ had less fair vocabulary.</td>
<td>3. The vocabulary was in adequate range. Fewer errors occurred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. The students’ had simple construction of the language use.</td>
<td>4. The language use had more complex construction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.16. Summary of Research Findings
5. The students’ had frequent errors of spelling, paragraphing and poor handwritings. 5. The students’ mechanics were very good. Only few errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization occurred.

6. The students’ mean score of writing in pre-test was 66.2. 6. The students’ mean score of writing in cycle 2 was 74.9.

### Students’ Critical Thinking

1. The students had difficulties in providing relevant arguments. 1. 17 students provided relevant arguments clearly. Even so, some students still provided unclear explanation.

2. The students did not provide evidence, statements, facts, etc to strengthen the argument. 2. 25 students were able to provide longer explanation by using evidence, statements, facts, opinion, etc.

3. The students did not see the alternative point of view. 3. 31 Students gave different point of view in their arguments. They started to see the pro and con of positive and negative of a certain statement.

4. The students did not explain their assumptions. 4. Most students were able to elaborate their assumptions using reasons.

5. The students failed to give clear conclusion. 5. 27 students gave clear and consistent conclusion. They were able to restate their idea in the last paragraph.

6. The students’ mean score of critical thinking was only 8.94 of the maximum score 20. 6. The students’ mean score of critical thinking was improved by 10.4% became 12.16.

### The difficulties of implementing Roundtable technique occurred.

1. The students weren’t adjusted to the Roundtable technique rules. 1. The students weren’t adjusted to the Roundtable technique rules.

2. The group forming was noisy and took some minutes. 2. The group forming was noisy and took some minutes.

3. There were groups who did not function well. The other member sat apart from other members. 3. There were groups who did not function well. The other member sat apart from other members.

4. The time limit was too short for the students. 4. The time limit was too short for the students.

5. It was hard to control the students who kept asking their friends about what they should write. 5. It was hard to control the students who kept asking their friends about what they should write.

6. The students had to re-think if the previous students wrote down the same answers as their planned answers. 6. The students had to re-think if the previous students wrote down the same answers as their planned answers.

7. The students might adjust the time limit but there were students who were persistent. It caused the Roundtable took longer time than it should. 7. The students might adjust the time limit but there were students who were persistent. It caused the Roundtable took longer time than it should.

8. If the topic was not something they familiar with, the students tend to think slower. 8. If the topic was not something they familiar with, the students tend to think slower.

9. Each student had different speed in thinking. The one with lower speed felt intimidated by the smarter students in the group. 9. Each student had different speed in thinking. The one with lower speed felt intimidated by the smarter students in the group.

---

1. **The Improvement of the Students’ Critical Thinking in Writing**

The implementation of Roundtable Technique had improved the students’ critical thinking in writing analytical exposition text. As supported by Guo (2013) that critical thinking is the ability and willingness to assess arguments and make objective opinions on the basis of well-supported reasons and evidence. The
students’ critical thinking can be seen from the content of the text they wrote. There are five indicators mentioned by J.D. Brown (1991) in Brown (1994: 357), they are thesis statement; related ideas; development of ideas through personal experience, illustration, facts, opinions; use of description, cause/effect, comparison/contrast; and consistent focus.

Before the action, the students had problems in thinking critically in writing which was indicated by (1) having difficulties in explaining their arguments, (2) the students had difficulties in providing relevant arguments using evidence, reasons, opinions, or any other supporting statements, (3) the students did not see the alternative point of view, (4) the students failed to give clear conclusion. However, after the implementation of Roundtable technique, they were able to explain their ideas. They were better at explaining their arguments by providing evidence, reasons, opinions, or any other supporting information. They wrote the paragraph longer and more consistent. The students were able to thinking more critically than before.

Firstly, before the research the students had difficulties in providing relevant argument. It might not difficult to think of an idea of what they should write. However, it was hard for the students to convey their idea and provided further explanation with the relevant arguments. Some students gave irrelevant arguments to support the idea. Some did not even provide it. After the research, the students were able to find the related arguments to explain their idea. Even though most students still seemed a bit vague in conveying their idea, but 17 students were able to state their idea clearly.
Secondly, the research finding showed that students were able to provide longer explanation by using evidence, statements, facts, opinion, etc. Before the research, the students had difficulties in explaining their statements. Some students only gave an idea or a statement without elaborating it. After the research, the students were aware to give their ideas further explanation. 25 students were able to provide their ideas with more elaboration by giving some related statements, evidences, reasons and opinions.

Thirdly, the students were able to define alternative point of view. Before the research, the students did not see the alternative point of view. They only gave one point of view of an argument or idea which might exist. They only viewed one viewpoint. It was either the pro or the con, or the positive or negative view. After the research, the students started to understand that it was better for them to provide alternative point of view. Even though there were still students who did not provide it, the students who gave the alternative point of view were increased.

Fourthly, the students were able to write clear conclusion. Before the research, the students did not conclude their paragraphs. The text they made mostly stopped in the last argument. Only few of the students were aware of giving conclusion in the end of their paragraph. After the research, almost all students actually gave conclusion even if it were short. 27 students were able to give clear and consistent conclusion.

The overall improvement of students’ mean score of critical thinking and each aspect is presented in Table 4.14. In table 4.14, it can be seen that the students’ score constantly increased from each test. At the end of cycle 2, the
students’ score had improved as much as 10.4%. The score improvement of students’ critical thinking is described in the following chart.

Furthermore, the implementation of Roundtable technique not only improved students’ critical thinking but also improved the students’ writing skills, especially in aspects such as content and organization. In other words, the improvement of students’ critical thinking has affected the improvement of students writing. The students provided clearer thesis and the paragraph were longer. They provided their idea or arguments with relevant information. Some of
them used facts, illustrations, and opinions to expand their paragraphs. They content of the text was more consistent.

In addition, table 4.12 had presented the overall improvement of students’ mean score of writing test and each aspect of writing. It can be seen that the score of the students since pre-test until cycle 2 test was improved consistently. During the end of cycle 2, the students score had improved as much as 8.7%. Every aspects of writing skill also improved, especially the aspects of content and organization. The score improvement of students’ writing skill is described in the following chart.

![Chart 4.3. Improvement of Students’ Writing Scores](chart)

2. The Difficulties in Implementing Roundtable Technique in Improving Students’ Critical Thinking in Writing

During the implementation of Roundtable technique to teach critical thinking in writing, several difficulties of Roundtable had appeared.

a. The students weren’t accustomed with the Roundtable technique rules. This was the first time for the students to do Roundtable. It was understood that they
were pretty much not adjusted yet with the rules. I have to remind them of the rules and asked them not to break them so the activity could go well.

b. The group forming was noisy and took some minutes. In forming groups, students were given a chance to choose their own partners. But, the students were noisy. They shouted at each other asking one another to join their groups or rejecting the ones they did not want to work with.

c. There were groups who did not function well. The other member sat apart from other members. This could be caused by the unfamiliar feeling they got from never been working in a group with certain students.

d. The time limit was too short for the students. It was used for an excused that they could not think in that short of time. After they were accustomed with the rules, there were still students who were persistent to keep writing their responses even though their time was up. It caused the Roundtable took longer time than it should.

e. It was hard to control the students who kept asking their friends about what they should write. Some students just got nervous easily when their turn came. The idea that they might already have disappeared when they were nervous. Other than that, if the previous student had written down the ideas which were the same as their planned answers, they had to re-think.

f. If the topic was not something they familiar with, the students tend to think slower. Each student had different speed in thinking. The one with lower speed felt intimidated by the smarter students in the group.
D. Research Discussions

This section presents the discussion of the research findings focusing on the students’ critical thinking in writing and the difficulties of the implementation of Roundtable technique in the class. In more details, each of the findings is discussed as follows.

1. The Implementation of Roundtable Technique to Improve Students’ Critical Thinking in Writing

Roundtable is a technique which requires each student in a group to have input. Each group has a sheet which is passed from one student to another with each student reading a question and responding to the problem, question or situation. Each student reads his/her answer to the group and gives an explanation for the response. Students in the group respond in turn to a question or problem by stating their ideas aloud as they write them on the paper. After this is done, students discuss the answer and write a group response.

Stenlev and Siemund (2011) state that it is important that the ideas be vocalized for several reasons: (a) silence in a setting like this is boring, rather than golden; (b) other team members need to be reflecting on the thoughts; (c) variety results because teammates learn immediately that someone has come up with an idea they know now not to repeat; and (d) hearing the responses said aloud means that students do not have to waste valuable brainstorming time by reading the previous ideas on the page.

In this research, I applied Roundtable technique to improve students’ critical thinking in writing. I asked the students to make a group and each group
sat around the table. Then they were given a single sheet. That single sheet contained a single question related to the topic of writing. Every member in a group shared their ideas by writing them on that sheet. After that, they delivered to the students next to him/her. But, before delivering it to the next students, he/she had to read his/her response aloud. The next students, then, wrote their ideas too. This activity ended when all members in a group shared their ideas. Those ideas helped the students arrange the text. According to Hollie (2011: 162), by collecting the ideas in a group, the students will not get confused about what they should write because they already have some ideas as the references to write. They also can prepare to make it in a good organization.

Before implementing Roundtable technique, the students had low level of critical thinking. The students had difficulties in providing relevant arguments. They did not provide evidence, statements, facts, etc to strengthen the argument. They also did not see the alternative point of view of an argument. The students did not explain their assumptions and they failed to give clear conclusion. Some did not even write one. The students’ mean score of critical thinking was only 8.94 of the maximum score 20. After the implementation, the students’ critical thinking was raised. They were able to give details to their ideas. They were better at explaining their arguments by providing evidence, reasons, opinions, or any other supporting information. The students gave longer explanation/reasons to their assumptions. They were able to defined alternative point of view, even though some students seemed still having a hard time presenting it. They wrote the paragraph longer and more consistent. The conclusion was also stated clearly.
The students were able to thinking more critically than before. The mean score was increased by 8.7% since the pre-test. They achieved 74.9 as the mean score.

In Roundtable, the multiple answers encourage creativity and deeper thinking. This activity builds positive interdependence among team members because of the shared writing surface, but more importantly, it builds team cohesion and reinforces the power of teamwork because students see in action the value of multiple viewpoints and ideas (Stenlev and Siemund, 2011). Moreover, working together to achieve a common goal produces higher achievement and greater productivity than working alone (Johnson, & Johnson, 1994). In addition, Willis (2007) finds that when students learned with their group members they experienced a greater level of the understanding of concepts and ideas than in individualized classes.

2. The Difficulties of the Implementation of Roundtable Technique to Improve Students’ Critical Thinking in Writing

Roundtable technique is not the easiest way to adopt. It is an avoidable thing that there are several obstacles in implementing Roundtable technique to improve students’ critical thinking.

Not only in Roundtable technique that the problem of forming groups occurs, but also in any other collaborative learning techniques. When the students are given a freedom to choose their own team, they tend to choose the friends they are most comfortable with. The class will be noisy and the students will do more talking than doing what they’re supposed to be doing. According to the way to
form group, Felder and Brent (2001) suggest that groups can be formed at random, and groups can be formed on the basis of some commonality, such as quiz grades. They also suggested if a teacher wants to teach a course effectively, it is recommended to make ability heterogeneity in the primary criterion. The drawbacks of groups composed entirely of weak students are obvious, and groups of all strong students are likely to parcel out the work rather than engaging in the group discussions and informal tutoring sessions that lead to many of the proven instructional benefits of cooperative learning. In addition, Jacobs (2006) proposes two other options exist for forming groups, teacher can decide which students to work together, and students also can decide with whom they work together. No matter how teacher divides the groups, avoiding groups in which members of those minorities are isolated is an important element. Another proposal by Jacob (2006) is it takes a while for teachers to organize such groupings, and so, they would not want to have to do that every week. If students already know which group they are in, teachers do not have to spend as much class time getting them organized.

In the process of learning, teacher should monitor each group carefully. Sometimes, there are groups which are not functioning well. For example, one student sits apart from the other groups. Some students are shy or reserved and feel awkward when working with others. However, Gallese and Goldman in Jacobs (2006) say that physical arrangement of the group is important for three primary reasons: 1) if students are close together, they are more likely to communicate with one another, and it is easier for them to do so. 2) Students
sitting close together can use quiet voices, thus, lowering the noise level of the classroom. 3) The room needs to be arranged so that teachers can monitor all the groups. Working together can be especially difficult when students are placed in heterogeneous groups with classmates with whom they have not collaborated previously.

Students’ thinking speed has a significant influence in doing Roundtable. This is because individuals are different in skill level, interest, motivation, experience, and family background lead to more learning opportunities during collaborative activities. The time limit and the topic given by the teacher are the ones which can influence the thinking speed. In Roundtable technique, the time given to each group member is relatively short. If a student is not able to respond then it is better to pass. Even though, it is strongly suggested for the students not to pass. In the beginning I implemented Roundtable technique in the class, many students complained about the time setting. Then, I found out that there are actually two kinds of students exist in the class. The first one is the students who are able to think well under time pressure, the second one is the students who cannot seem to think anything at all under the time pressure. People need to go at different speeds, as we see in reality some students need more time than others to understand and absorb the information. In groups, slow students need to catch up which may cause tension because others are pulled back or delayed (Stenlev and Siemund, 2011).
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION, IMPLICATION, SUGGESTION

A. Conclusion

Based on the description of the data analysis, some findings are stated as follows:

1. The implementation of Roundtable technique improves the critical thinking of the Second Semester of Sistem Informasi (SI) Students of STMIK Duta Bangsa Surakarta in the academic year of 2013/2014.

   It is proven by the improvement of the students mean score of writing test. Students’ critical thinking can be seen from the content and organization of a text where evidence, reasons, opinions, statements, fact, etc are written. Before the implementation, the students of Sistem Informasi were not as critical as expected. The students had difficulties in providing relevant arguments. They were not able to strengthen their arguments by using evidence, statements, facts, etc. The students did not see the alternative point of view. They did not explain their assumptions and failed to give clear conclusion. Then, in the end of the research, after Roundtable technique was applied, the students’ level of critical thinking was increased. The students demonstrated more confidence in expressing their ideas in writing and their awareness of giving explanations for their arguments by using evidence. They provided longer explanation/reasons to their assumptions.

   Next, the improvements in other aspects of writing skill are also taken into account. The students performed better in organizing the ideas. The content was
more knowledgeable with more supporting information added. Not only the sentence constructions were better, but the grammatical mistakes were also decreased. Their compositions were able to be followed easily.

In addition, the benefits of implementing Roundtable technique to improve students’ critical thinking in writing are stated as follows:

a. **Roundtable Technique** improves the students’ language competence because Roundtable Technique integrates the four language skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) in the learning process.

b. **Roundtable Technique** makes students gain more knowledge.

c. **Roundtable technique** provides equal chance for the students to give their contribution.

d. **Roundtable technique** exposes multiple viewpoints and ideas of the students.

e. **Roundtable Technique** trains students’ responsibility.

f. **Roundtable Technique** increases students’ self-confidence and their ability to express themselves.

2. There are difficulties that occur in implementing Roundtable technique in improving students’ critical thinking in writing of the the Second Semester of *Sistem Informasi* (SI) Students of STMIK Duta Bangsa Surakarta in the academic year of 2013/2014.

   In the process, there were also some difficulties that I encountered such as: (1) The students weren’t accustomed with the Roundtable technique rules. This was the first time for the students to do Roundtable. Therefore, it was understandable. In this case, the teacher should remind the students about the
rules. (2) The group forming was noisy and took some minutes. The students were free to choose their group members. In the end, it wasted some time because everyone was talking about everything else except what they were supposed to be doing. (3) There were groups who did not function well. The other member sat apart from other members. Some students are shy or reserved and feel awkward when working with others. (4) Each student had different speed in thinking. The one with lower speed felt intimidated by the smarter students in the group. Especially when the time limit was short and the topic were not understandable enough for them. Some students needed more time than others to understand and absorb the information. (5) It was hard to control the students who kept asking their friends about what they should write. Some students just got nervous easily when their turn came. Other than that, if the previous student had written down the ideas which were the same as their planned answers, they had to re-think.

In conclusion, Roundtable technique appears to result in more positive effects for students, as reflected in improved academic achievement. It is an effective teaching technique to improve both students’ learning achievement and students’ critical thinking and also encourages students’ involvement in learning.

B. Implication and Suggestion

The conclusions of this research is that Roundtable technique improves students’ critical thinking in writing. Considering the conclusion of this research, there are some implication and suggestions addressed to English teachers, students, and institutions.
a. English Teacher

Based on the result of the research, it implies that Roundtable is an effective teaching technique to improve students’ critical thinking in writing. Roundtable technique is essentially the written version of Round Robin. In this technique, students take turns responding to a questions or motion by writing one or two words or phrases before passing the paper along to others who do the same. The writing class generally seems not so interesting for the students since most of them thought that it is a difficult skill to be learned. Consequently, teachers face many obstacles during the teaching and learning process. Therefore, the teachers should apply appropriate teaching method. Teacher should designs learning activities where the students are given plenty of opportunity to explore ideas and obtain knowledge and information. This way, the students will also learn to be more critical in their thinking. In addition, it is important for the teacher to let the students choose the topic they are interested in, because it would be easier to have the students learn since they are genuinely interested in the learning materials.

b. Students

Roundtable technique helps students to identify multiple view points and ideas. The multiple answers encourage creativity and deeper thinking. Therefore, it will develop their critical thinking as they develop their writing skill. This technique also allows the students to broaden their knowledge since people often get stuck in their own unique ways of thinking. Listening to another student’s idea helps them to find more information.
The students should be aware of the importance of thinking critically. Critical thinking includes the ability to evaluate information, to formulate solutions for given problems, to analyze details for trends and patterns, and to apply previous experiences to current situations. They are vital to schooling, job performance and handling numerous problems in life. Other than that, students also should to know the element of writing such as content, organization, vocabulary and mechanics as factors measured in writing. Moreover, for the students, since teaching technique is one of the factors that can influence their learning achievement, the students have to be more active in joining the English lesson in the classroom.

c. Institutions

The institution should encourage and support the English teachers to improve the quality of their teaching. It can be done through providing facilities that enable access to new materials and media of teaching and learning. The implementation of Roundtable technique to improve students’ critical thinking in writing assists the institution in creating an effective program for teaching and learning grammar. Consequently, the institution has an important role to facilitate the teachers to be able to implement this teaching method or technique well. Besides, the institution should also facilitate teachers to have forums that enable them to share any knowledge, information or experience in teaching English like MGMP, seminars, LPTK, workshop etc.

After the process of the implementation of the teaching technique, institution should also give more concern on the effects of teaching technique to
the students’ critical thinking in order to observe whether the implementation of this teaching technique is done properly or not. If the implementation does not run well, the institution should do some evaluation to find the reasons/problems in the process of implementing this teaching technique.
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