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Writing is one of the skills which is difficult to be mastered by students since it requires a higher level of productive language control than other skills. Therefore, in teaching writing teachers should have a creative way to make students learn writing easily. This study was concerned with the implementation of Roundtable and Think Pair Share combined with picture in teaching writing of descriptive text. The aims of this study: (1) to find out the effective techniques between Roundtable and Think Pair Share combined with picture as media, (2) to know students’ perception about those techniques. The data collection techniques used tests and questionnaire. The pre-test result in experimental group 1 and 2 were 60.86 and 60.69. The post-test result in experimental group 1 and 2 were 84.89 and 75.51. T-test post-test showed that Sig. (2-tailed) was 0.001 and t-test was 7.932. The test result showed significant improvement of students’ writing achievement in both group.Therefore, both techniques combined with picture were effective to teach writing of descriptive text. However, there was a significant difference between post-test scores in both group. It could be concluded that Roundtable combined with picture was more effective than Think Pair Share combined with picture in teaching writing of descriptive text. The questionnaire results showed both techniques combined with picture were interesting, some students in experimental group 1 got difficulty whereas many students in experimental group 2 got difficulty in writing, the learning process using both techniques were effective, and both techniques could be used in another meeting.
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## INTRODUCTION

#### In the process of teaching learning, students need to master not only knowledge but also are able to communicate with others. As stated by Pratama and Yuliati (2016) that students need to master of communication, critical and logical thinking, creativity, and problem solving. One form of communication is writing. Writing is one opf the skills that students need to master either at primary, secondary or tertiary level (Keshavarz, Shahrokhi, & Nejad, 2014). In reality, writing is a difficult skill to be mastered by students in those levels. As stated by Handayani (2012) writing is often perceived as the most difficult language skill since it requires a higher level of productive language control than other skills. Writing is much more than the simple mechanics of getting the words down, it also involves being creative, spelling, grammar, punctuation, choice of appropriate words, sentence linking, and text construction (Phillip, 2003). The reason that students cannot make a good writing is poor grammar knowledge, poor vocabularies, and other important aspects in writing. Meanwhile, those aspects are not taught explicitly in the process of teaching learning. They also have low motivation including in mastering writing skill so they look reluctant and do not work seriously in doing writing task (Astarina, 2011). That is what makes writing is a difficult thing for junior high school student. Moreover, teachers also have important role in the process of teaching writing. Methods and media that used by teachers in teaching writing also influence the result of writing. Based on the observation during teaching interinship in SMPN 3 Semarang, the development of learning media sometimes make teachers tend to use the easiest way to explain the materials. They still tend to use lecturing technique by explaining the material using media such as only showing materials using power point or other media. Moreover, most Indoesian EFL teachers tend to faithfully follow textbooks and student work sheets; they barely provide opportunities for students to use the target language to interact with their peers (Alwasilah, 2012; Lie 2007; Musthafa, 2009 cited in Astuti, 2016). With such kind of teaching technique, many students feel difficult to understand the materials because they do not have chance to discuss with their friend about the materials.

#### Learning process in education unit is organized interactive, inspiring, pleasant, challenging, motivating learners to participate actively and provide enough space for innovation, creativity, and independence in accordance with their talents, interests, and learners’ physical and psychological development (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2016). In curriculum 2013, teaching learning process has to use students centered learning approach, it is no longer using teacher centered learning approach. Students are required to be active in learning process. In the curriculum 2013, junior high school students are required to communicate both orally and written thorugh some of the genre texts, such as descriptive, recount, narrative, procedures, and report information. All those text are difficult for them if teachers only use conventional techniques in teaching.

#### Considering the problems above, teachers should find various teaching techniques and should be able to use media as much as possible. In this study, I offer teachers to use cooperative learning as an alternative in teaching writing because as stated by Astuti (2016) that cooperative learning hardly takes place in classrooms in Indonesia. According to Mandal (2009) Cooperative learning is is a successful teaching strategy in which small teams, each with students of different levels of ability, use a variety of learning activities to improve their understanding of a subject. The spirit of competitiveness and the domination of individualism may be reduced and lessened through adopting the approach of cooperative learning that provides a supportive learning environment for students in which they can acquire and exchange ideas, information and knowledge (Mahmoud, 2014). Therefore, I choose cooperative learning as an alternative in teaching writing.

#### There have been many researches exploring about cooperative learning technique in the various form such as Keshavarz, Shahrokhi, and Nejad (2014), Sari (2014) and Sumarsih and Sumanjaya (2013) conducted about Think Pair Share, Hapsari (2011) and Handayani (2012) conducted about Roundtable technique. Whereas, some researcher did not mention the form of cooperative leaning they used. They applied cooperative learning techniques mostly for university students and senior high school students. The area that has not been explored is comparing two cooperative learning techniques to teach students of junior high school.

#### In the study, I chose Roundtable and Think Pair Share to teach writing of descriptive text. It was be combined with picture as media in order to make process of learning are interesting. The reason I chose those techniques is they are rarely used in teaching learning process. By applying those techniques there will be renewal in teaching learning process. Those techniques also can be used in teaching writing. As stated by Barkley (2003) cited in Handayani (2012) one of the best techniques for stimulating ideas and finding a direction for a piece of writing is Roundtable. In Roundtable, each student takes turn responding to a prompt by writing one or two word or phrases. Meanwhile, in Think Pair Share (TPS) technique, students have opportunity to share their idea for writing and discuss their mistakes in writing into group. TPS technique creates a good environment in teaching learning writing in which students became active in the process of writing (Sumarsih & Sanjaya, 2013). In this study, I conducted which was more effective between Roundtable and Think Pair Share to teach writing especially teaching writing of descriptive text, so the results of this study could be used by teachers as an alternative way to teach writing of descriptive text. Moreover, I conducted the study to know students’ perception about those techniques.

## METHODOLOGY OF THE RESEARCH

#### This study employed a true-experimental study. I chose true-experimental research design because in this design the subjects were chosen randomly so that it gave equal opportunity to each subject to be selected. The randomization could neutralize differences that exist among the subjects so that the group or the class selected as the sample could be equalized in every way. The randomization could select two groups with same characteristics. Pre-test also assured that they had same prior knowledge or not. Therefore, this design had internal and external validity.

####  This study was conducted in SMP N 3 Semarang. The school was chosen because of the following considerations. First, SMP N 3 Semarang is located on Major Jend. Panjaitan street 58, Brumbungan, Semarang, Central Java. The location is strategic because it is in the center of city. Even though it is in the center of the city the school’s atmosphere is good and the noisy sound do not disturb the students’ concentration in the learning process. Furthermore, the location is not too far from where I live, so it makes me easily to conduct research. Second, SMP N 3 Semarang is one of the popular schools in Semarang which is famous with many achievements and the students are very active.

#### The population of the study was seventh grade students of SMP N 3 Semarang in Academic year 2016/2017. The polupation was 280 students. I chose the seventh grade students because of some reasons. First, the seventh grade students is the transition from elementary school to junior high school. Meanwhile in elementary school, they have not got English subject. Thus, they do not have a deep knowledge of English. Second, based on curriculum that is used today, the seventh grade students are required to be able to master the material about descriptive text and write good descriptive text.

#### In selecting the sample of the study, I used probability samping in the form of simple random sampling technique. There were eight classes of the seventh grade students in SMP N 3 Semarang. I chose two classes randomly, they were VII C class and VII E class. VII C class was experimental group 1 and VII E class was experimental group 2 Those two classes consisted of 35 students.

#### The research instruments used in this research were tests and questionnaire. During the study, I conducted the tests twice; pre-test and post-test and gave questionnaire sheet for both groups. The tests were used to know whether any significant difference between students who taught using Roundtable and Think Pair Share combined with picture as media. If the tvalue is higher than ttable, it means that there is a significant difference between students who taught using Roundtable and Think Pair Share combined with picture as media. On the other hand, if the tvalue is lower than ttable, it means that there is no significant difference between students who taught using Roundtable and Think Pair Share combined with picture as media. Before computing the t-test value, I computed the homogenity and normality of experimental group 1 and 2 to find out the data was homogenous and normally distributed. In addition, I also used questionnaire to know students’ perception about those techiques. I used likert scale in questionnaire. I determined score for students’ answer, calculated each students’ answer, and calculated the presentage of each item. From the presentage, I interpreted the students’ perception.

#### **RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

#### The results of this study were organized based on the technique of collecting the data. There were two categories of results. The first result was obtained from the test data and the second result was obtained from questionnaire sheet.

### Results of the Tests

#### The tests were held twice. The first test was pre-test and the second test was post-test. They were given to experimenta1 group 1 and experimental group 2. In measuring students’ achievement in writing descriptive text, I used analytical scoring design by Brown (2004). There were five aspects including (1) organization, (2) content, (3) grammar, (4) punctuation, and (5) vocabulary.

####  The pre-test was held to know students’ writing ability before they were given treatment. There was no building knowledge before the pre-test to know how far students’ understanding of writing descriptive text. Almost all of students had superficial knowledge about writing descriptive text. They still had difficulty in expressing their idea. Some of them did not know what they should write because they had less vocabularies. Some of them also had low knowledge about the grammar that used in writing descriptive text. Therefore, from the five aspects of assessing writing, the low score was in content, grammar, and vocabularies. The table below was the pre-test result of experimental group 1 and experimental group 2.

##### Table 3.1.

##### The Pre-test Result

| Descriptive Statistics |
| --- |
|  | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation | Variance |
| Experimental 1 | 35 | 54 | 69 | 60,86 | 3,549 | 12,597 |
| Experimental 2 | 35 | 53 | 69 | 60,69 | 3,306 | 10,928 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 35 |  |  |  |  |  |

#### The lowest pre-test score in experimental group 1 was 54.00 and in experimental group 2 was 53.00 Furthermore, the highest pre-test score in both groups was the same (69.00) The mean of pre-test score in experimental group 1 was 60.86 and the mean of pre-test score in experimental group 2 was 60.69.

#### From the result of pre-test, there was difference between the score of experimental group 1 and 2. However, it was not very significant because the difference was not to far. It could be seen in the figure below.

#### Diagram 3.1.

#### The pre-test result

#### From the figure above, the difference score between experimental group 1 and experimental group 2 was 0.17. It meant that the prior of writing ability between experimental group 1and 2 was relatively the same.

#### After calculating the pre-test, I calculated the homogenity and the normality of the pre-test between experimental group 1 and experimental group 2. Homogenity value (Fvalue) was 1.152. Meanwhile, Ftable was 1.494. Since Fvalue (1.1.152) < Ftable (1.494), it could be concluded that the population between experimental group1 and 2 were homogenous. Moreover, the normality pre-test could be seen in the table below.

##### Table 3.2.

##### The Normality Pre-test

| Tests of Normality |
| --- |
|  | Group | Kolmogorov-Smirnova | Shapiro-Wilk |
|  |  | Statistic | Df | Sig. | Statistic | Df | Sig. |
| Score | Experimental 1 | ,138 | 35 | ,088 | ,965 | 35 | ,324 |
| Experimental 2 | ,138 | 35 | ,090 | ,965 | 35 | ,330 |
| a. Lilliefors Significance Correction |

#### The data could be stated in normal distribution if p-value (Sig.) was higher than 0.05. From the calculation of Kolmogorov-Smirnov, the p-value of experimental group 1 (0.088) was higher than 0.05. The p-value of experimental group 2 (0.090) was also higher than 0.05. It meant that the pre-test data of both groups was normally distributed. Moreover, from the calculation of Shapiro-Wilk the p-value of experimental group 1 (0.324) was higher than 0.05. The p-value of experimental group 2 (0.330) was also higher than 0.05. It could be concluded that the pre-test data of both groups was also distributed normally.

#### After calculating the homogenity and the normality, I calculated the t-test. The result of t-test pre-test could be seen in the table below.

##### Table 3.3.

##### The T-test Pre-test

| Independent Samples Test |
| --- |
|  | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | t-test for Equality of Means |
| F | Sig. | T | Df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
| Lower | Upper |
| score | Equal variances assumed | ,552 | ,460 | ,209 | 68 | ,835 | ,171 | ,820 | -1,465 | 1,807 |
| Equal variances not assumed |  |  | ,209 | 68 | ,835 | ,171 | ,820 | -1,465 | 1,808 |

#### Based on the table, the results showed that Sig. (2-tailed) was 0.835, and t-test was 0.209. In this part, if Sig. (2-tailed) was higher than 0.05 then there was no significant difference between experimental group 1 and experimental group 2.

####  The treatment was held after the pretest. There were five meeting of treatment. In the treatment, experimental group 1 was taught using Roundtable combined with picture as media, meanwhile experimental group 2 was taught using Think Pair Share combined with picture as media.

####  After the treatment, the pre-test was held. The post-test was held to know the students’ writing ability after getting treatment. The table below was the result of post-test.

#### Table 3.4

#### The Post-test Result

| Descriptive Statistics |
| --- |
|  | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation | Variance |
| Experimental 1 | 35 | 77 | 91 | 84,89 | 3,932 | 15,457 |
| Experimental 2 | 35 | 65 | 88 | 75,51 | 5,777 | 33,375 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 35 |  |  |  |  |  |

#### The lowest post-test score in experimental group 1 was 77.00 and in experimental group 2 was 65.00 Furthermore, the highest pre-test score in experimental group 1 was 91 and in experimental group 2 was 88.00. The mean of post-test score in experimental group 1 was 84.89 and the mean of post-test score in experimental group 2 was 75.51.

#### From the result of pre-test, there was a significant different between the result of both groups. The difference could be seen in the following figure.

#### Diagram 3.2 The Post-test Result

#### From the figure above, the difference score between experimental group 1 and experimental group 2 was 9.35. It meant that the achievement of experimental group 1 that was taught using Roundtable was higher than the achievement of experimental group 2 that was taught using Think Pair Share.

#### After calculating the post-test, I calculated the homogenity and the normality of the post-test between experimental group 1 and 2. Homogenity value (Fvalue) was 0.463. Meanwhile, Ftable was 1.494. Since Fvalue (0.463) < Ftable (2.494), it could be concluded that the population between experimental group 1 and 2 were homogenous. Moreover, the normality pre-test could be seen in the table below.

#### Table 3.5.

#### The normality pre-test

| Tests of Normality |
| --- |
|  | Group | Kolmogorov-Smirnova | Shapiro-Wilk |
| Statistic | df | Sig. | Statistic | Df | Sig. |
| Score | Experimental 1 | ,133 | 35 | ,120 | ,939 | 35 | ,051 |
| Experimental 2 | ,126 | 35 | ,174 | ,964 | 35 | ,304 |
| a. Lilliefors Significance Correction |

#### The data could be stated in normal distribution if p-value (Sig.) was higher than 0.05. From the calculation of Kolmogorov-Smirnov, the p-value of experimental group 1 (0.120) was higher than 0.05. The p-value of experimental group 2 (0.174) was also higher than 0.05. Moreover, from the calculation of Shapiro-Wilk the p-value of experimental group 1 (0.051) was also higher than 0.05. The p-value of experimental group 2 (0.304) was also higher than 0.05. From those calculations, it meant that the pre-test data of experimental and 1 and experimental group 2 was distributed normally.

#### After calculating the homogenity and the normality, I calculated the t-test. The result of t-test pos-test could be seen in the table below.

#### Table 3.6.

#### The T-test Post-test

| Independent Samples Test |
| --- |
|  | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | t-test for Equality of Means |
| F | Sig. | T | Df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
| Lower | Upper |
| Score | Equal variances assumed | 5,884 | ,018 | 7,932 | 68 | ,001 | 9,536 | 1,202 | 7,136 | 11,936 |
| Equal variances not assumed |  |  | 7,932 | 68 | ,001 | 9,536 | 1,196 | 7,144 | 11,928 |

#### From the table above Sig. (2-tailed) was 0.001 and t-test was 7.932. If the result of t-test in post-test was positive, and sig. (2-tailed) was lower than 0.05, it indicated that there was significant differences between experimental group 1 and experimental group 2 in achieving the result of post-test. Null hypothesis (Ho) was rejected and alternative hypothesis (Ha) was accepted because t-value was higher than t-table (t value > t table).

### Results of the questionnaire

#### I used questionnaire to know students’ perception about Roundtable and Think Pair Share combined with picture as media. The questionnaire was given for both groups. There were ten questions. Q1 and Q2 was about students’ interest toward writing in English and the technique that is used. Q3 and Q4 was about difficulties of students’ writing and techniques’ applying. Q5 and Q6 was about advantage of applying the Roundtable and Think Pair Share techniques. Q7 and Q8 was about the effectiveness of applying Roundtable and Think Pair Share technique for teaching writing of descriptive text. Q9 and Q10 was about relevancy of Roundtable and Think Pair Share technique to be applied in teaching writing. The following table was the result of the questionnaire in experimental group 1.

#### Table 3.7.

#### The result of Questionnaire in Experimental Group 1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Item Number | Students' Answers |
| Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree  |
| 1 | 31% | 69% | 0% | 0% |
| 2 | 66% | 26% | 6% | 3% |
| 3 | 69% | 17% | 14% | 0% |
| 4 | 29% | 63% | 9% | 0% |
| 5 | 26% | 74% | 0% | 0% |
| 6 | 40% | 60% | 0% | 0% |
| 7 | 40% | 60% | 0% | 0% |
| 8 | 34% | 66% | 0% | 0% |
| 9 | 34% | 66% | 0% | 0% |
| 10 | 29% | 71% | 0% | 0% |

##### The table above showed the percentage of each question. Almost students answered strongly agree and agree in all question. However, there were some students who answered disagree and strongly disagree in Q2, Q3, and Q4. The following table was the result of the questionnaire in experimental group 2.

##### Table 3.8.

##### The result of Questionnaire in experimental group 2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Item Number | Students' Answers |
| Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree  |
| 1 | 31% | 69% | 0% | 0% |
| 2 | 66% | 26% | 6% | 3% |
| 3 | 69% | 17% | 14% | 0% |
| 4 | 29% | 63% | 9% | 0% |
| 5 | 26% | 74% | 0% | 0% |
| 6 | 40% | 60% | 0% | 0% |
| 7 | 40% | 60% | 0% | 0% |
| 8 | 34% | 66% | 0% | 0% |
| 9 | 34% | 66% | 0% | 0% |
| 10 | 29% | 71% | 0% | 0% |

##### The table above showed the percentage of each question. Almost students answered strongly agree and agree in all question. However, there were some students who answered disagree and strongly disagree in Q2, Q3, and Q4.

#### **Disscussion**

#### Based on pre-test statistical calculation, experimental group 1 and experimental group 2 relatively had same writing ability since the pre-test score of both group were relatively same and those groups were homogenous since there was only slight difference in the pre-test score. Statistical calculation of post-test showed that Roundtable and Think Pair Share combined with picture as media are effective to teach writing of descripitve text since the post-test scores of both group were increased. From the statistical calculation of pre-test and post-test, it could be said that both Roundtable and Think Pair Share combined with picture were effective to teach writing of descriptive text. This result is in line with a study conducted by Handayani (2011) that the use of Roundtable technique in teaching writing gives students good way how they explore their writing well. This result was also the same with Sumarsih and Sumanjaya (2013) that the application of Think Pair Share technique have helped students in writing descriptive text and the students’ achievement was improved when they were taught by Think Pair Share Technique. It was also in line with Sari’s (2014) research that stated Think Pair Share technique gave positive influence to the students’ achievement. It means that cooperative learning can improve students’ writing ability as stated by Astarina (2011) that cooperative learning technique showed that the students’ writing skills improved. Keshavarz, Shahrokhi, and Nejad (2014) stated that cooperative learning enhanced students writing performance. It was in line with the result of this study that cooperative learning could enhance students’ writing ability. It could be seen from the result of post-test. The result of the study was also in line with Mahmoed (2014) that by using cooperative learning students’ writing scores was higher. It could be said that cooperative learning could support students in learning as stated by Jolliffe (2007) that cooperative learning requires pupils to work together in small groups to support each other to improve their own learning and that of others.

#### Another statistical calculation was t-test of pre-test and post-test. From the t-test of pre-test result, there was no significant different between experimental group 1and experimental group 2 since the t-value was lower than t-table. It meant that those group were homogenous. However, from t-test of post-test result, there was a significant difference of the students’ writing achievement between two groups since the t-value was higher than t-table. Therefore, the hyphothesis that stated “There is a significant difference between the result of Roundtable and Think-Pair-Share combined with picture as media to teach descriptive text for seventh grade students of SMP N 3 Semarang in the academic year 2016/2017” was accepted. It could be said that Roundtable technique combined with picture as media was more effective than Think Pair Share combined with picture as media to improve the students’ writing ability in writing descriptive text since there was a significant different between the scores of students who were taught using Roundtable and Think Pair Share technique. The post-test score of students who were taught using Roundtable were higher than post-test score of students who were taught using Think Pair Share.

#### Based on the result of questionnaire in experimental group 1, most of students liked writing descriptive text using Roundtable technique combined with picture as media and the technique was interesting in writing descriptive text. It was in line with Hapsari’s (2011) research. She stated that most students were interested in the teaching activities using Roundtable technique. Moreover, Most of students did not got difficulty in writing descriptive text in the learning process. However, there were few students still got difficulty. the learning process using Roundtable technique combined with picture as media was interesting and effective enough and it could help students to overcome the difficulty in writing descriptive text. this technique was more exciting than the usual learning process and it could be used in another meeting.

#### The result of the questionnaire in experimental group 2 was slightly different with the result of the questionnaire in experimental group 1. Based on the questionnaire in experimental group 2, most of students liked writing descriptive text using Think Pair Share technique combined with picture as media and the techniquewas interesting in writing descriptive text. The learning process using Think Pair Share technique combined with picture as media was interesting, effective enough and more exciting than the usual learning process. This result was in line with Sari (2014) that stated Think Pair Share created a good environment in teaching learning writing. Although there was an increase score in the post-test score, mostly students still got difficulty in writing of descriptive text. It could be caused by the participation of the students when they practice writing of the descriptive text. They are less active in sharing their ideas with their partner and their groups so that they still got difficulty in writing descriptive text. this result was contradict with Sari’s (2014) that stated students become active in the process of writing using Think Pair Share.

#### The implementation of Roundtable and Think Pair Share technique combined with picture as media in the treatment of writing of descriptive text involved some stages of writing. It was same with the learning process of writing as usual. It was in line with a theory from Linse (2006) there were five stages in writing: prewriting, writing, revising, editing, and publishing. In Roundtable technique, the students did those five stages with their group so Roundtable is a cooperative learning structure useful for brainstorming, reviewing, predicting, or practicing a skill, use a single sheet of paper and pen for each cooperative learning group (Millis, 2008). While in Think Pair Share, the students did those five techniques with their partner or their group. They discussed about the topic with their partner so that they could wrote their ideas well and they shared their ideas with their group. By sharing with the group they got suggestion and critical from their friends in group so that they could revise and edit their writing well. However, he students’ participation in experimental group 2 who were taught using Think Pair Share were less active so that some students could not improve their writing. However, Think Pair could encourages students’ participation as stated by a website about Cooperative Learning Strategy that Think Pair Share is a [cooperative learning](https://www.teachervision.com/professional-development/cooperative-learning) technique that encourages individual participation and is applicable across all grade levels and class sizes (Teacher vision, 2017).

#### In writing of descriptive text, the students considered about some writing components as stated by Brown (2004) there are five writing components in scoring writing that should be considered by students. they are organization including introduction, body, and conclusion; logical development of ideas: content; grammar; punctuation, spelling and mechanics; style and quality of expression. From the result of pre-test, the students both groups still had low knowledge in grammar. There are a lot of grammar mistaken in writing descriptive text. Many students neither wrote the introduction nor conclusion. They were also low in vocabulary so the style and quality expression was still low and they could not developed their ideas. However, they had good knowledge in punctuation, spelling and mechanics. Both groups got improvement in writing. Their grammar knowledge was improved. They also could developed their ideas well. Their vocabulary was also improved so that their expression in writing was better and they could develop their idea well.

#### The role of picture as media of teaching and learning process indirectly gave a positive influence so that the teaching and learning process was interesting and effective. Students liked writing of descriptive text by the exixtance of picture since they could describe an object easily as stated by from Hill as cited in Joklová (2009) that pictures bring not only images of reality, but can also function as a fun element in the class. Therefore, the students felt interested in the learning process and the their ideas could emerge from the picture. It could be said that picture was a good media in teaching as stated by Ryan (1993) that pictures, paintings, and other visuals constitute the most effective, most plentiful, and least expensive teaching medium.

## CONCLUSIONS

#### Based on the result and discussion, I conclude that the alternative hypothesis of this study is accepted and the null hypothes is rejected. There was a significant difference between the result of Roundtable and Think-Pair-Share combined with picture as media to teach descriptive text for seventh grade students of SMP N 3 Semarang in the academic year 2016/2017.

#### Roundtable and Think Pair Share can improve students’ achievement in writing descriptive text. However, Roundtable was more effective than Think Pair Share since it gave higher significant difference of the experimental group 1’s achievement than the experimental group 2’s achievement in writing descriptive text. Moreover, only few students who taught using Roundtable technique who got difficulty in writing descriptive text and most students were interested in learning process using this technique. Meanwhile, many students who taught using Think Pair Share technique got difficulty in writing descriptive text. It meant that rountable technique can overcome students’ difficulty effectively.
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