



Journal of English Teaching and Learning

JOURNAL TEAM

EDITOR IN CHIEF

ALFU NIKMAH, M.Pd

MANAGING EDITOR

NUSKHAN ABID, M.Pd

EXECUTIVE EDITOR

ANISAH SETYANINGRUM, M.Pd

EDITOR

SRI WAHYUNINGSIH, M.Pd

SECTION EDITOR

MUHAMMAD MISBAHUL MUNIR AP, M.Pd

LAYOUT

PUSPO NUGROHO
DEWI ULYA MAYLASARI

penerbit

**PROGRAM STUDI TADRIS BAHASA INGGRIS (T-INGGRIS) JURUSAN
TARBIYAH**

INSTITUT AGAMA ISLAM NEGERI (IAIN) KUDUS

Alamat redaksi jurnal : Jl Conge Ngembalrejo PO BOX 51, Telp. (0291)
432677, 438818 fax 441613 kodus 59322 Email: jetl@stainkudus.ac.id

Website: <http://journal.stainkudus.ac.id/>

FOREWORD

Our deep gratitude goes to the presence of Allah SWT who has given us strength and ability, so that we can publish JETLI: Journal of English Teaching and Learning Issues at English Studies Program IAIN Kudus.

This edition contains about theoretical and empirical studies in the field of English, especially on education, teaching and linguistics. Observers of English education have contributed in this journal, both from within and outside of IAIN Kudus. Hopefully the scientific treasury in this journal is useful for the implementation of English education that develops and integrates the linguistic, Islamic, scientific, and professional educators, and competitive aspects.

With the publication of the Journal of JETLI, it is expected that the input and constructive criticism from the academic community and the various competent parties, so that the next issue will be better and better quality.

Finally the editorial team expressed gratitude to the lecturers, editors and related parties who participated in the publication of this journal.

Journal team

DAFTAR ISI

Alfu Nikmah-Developing Speaking Material Using Islamic contents in MA Salafiyah Kajen	1-16
Erna Setyawati-Developing "CH-CD Electrolyte Solution Test Tools" Game for Teaching Spoken Procedure Text to Twelfth Graders of Senior High School	17-39
Aprilian Ria Adisti-Digital Game Project for Teaching English for Young Learners (TEYL)	40-66
Avinta Ika Nurrahma-Dyadic Essays Enhancing Students' Paragraph Coherence in Imaginative Writing	67-89
Dewi Ulya Mailasari-The Analysis Of The Students' Difficulty in Memorizing English Vocabulary in Elementary School	90-110
Lailatul Maulida-The Implementation of Tongue Twisters to Improve the Students' Ability to Pronounce Fricative Consonants and Long Vowels	111-130
Mohammad Arief Wahyudi-The Effectiveness of Speed Reading Technique in Improving Students' Reading Comprehension at Fourth Semesters of English Department	131-146
Suciati-The Effectiveness of The Role, Audience, Format and Topic (RAFT) Technique on Students' Skill in Writing Expository Text	145-159

The Effectiveness of The *Role, Audience, Format and Topic* (RAFT) Technique on Students' Skill in Writing Expository Text

Suciati¹

¹ Institut Agama Islam Negeri (IAIN) Kudus, Kudus, Indonesia



suci@stainkudus.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This research identified the effectiveness of RAFT and conventional technique in improving high and low motivated students' skill in writing expository text and explained the motivation interaction to their skill. RAFT is a system to help students understand their role as a writer, audience, varied formats for writing, and expected content. This research used factorial design with 36 students of experimental group and 34 in control group. They were eleventh graders of *MA Tarbiyatul Banin*, Winong-Pati. There were seven results. ANCOVA showed (1,2) RAFT was effective in improving the high and low motivated students' skill in writing expository text on the level of significance 0.05 and df 34, (3,4) conventional technique was effective in improving the high and low motivated students' skill in writing expository text on the level of significance 0.05 and df 32, (5,6) there was interaction of the students' motivation to students' skill in writing expository text using RAFT and conventional technique. By using RAFT, the high motivated students' skill got more improvement and by using conventional technique, the low motivated students' skill got more improvement and (7) the use of RAFT in improving the students' skill in writing expository text was more effective than the use of conventional technique.

Keywords:

Hortatory Exposition, RAFT Technique, Writing Skill.

Introduction

All nation components have a duty in educating nation life. In order to educate the societies, the government holds a National Education System which involves the participation of all nation components including family and society components. In fact, Indonesian development includes education development which has been running since we have got our independence until now still needs more attention. As the example, United Nations Development Program (UNDP) in Muflichah (2012) shows Human Development Index (HDI) on 2nd November 2011. It mentions that Indonesia is in level 124 from 187 countries. HDI of Indonesian education is number 119 from 187 countries in Asia Pacific. From the result of HDI, we can know that Indonesian education is still left behind from other countries, like Malay and Singapore.

From this data, we should pay attention to the quality of our education. We should not be satisfied with what the Indonesian students have got nowadays. We should always try to make it better. Hopefully, by having better education quality, we can adapt to the world development and face this globalization era confidently. From this view, it means that Indonesian people should be skilful to realize those expectations. It is important for people to master English orally and in writing in order to be able to communicate and socialize with the world community (Harmer, 2001: 23). If the students are able to communicate using English, they will be easy to have communication with the other people from whatever countries. For that reason, we should prepare our next generation well. If Indonesian people can do that, we can struggle in international scope.

Writing must be taught in accompaniment with the other three language skills: listening, speaking and reading for the purpose of communication. We know that all of those points are related and support each other. English at school means developing students skills on using English for communication, whether in written form or in spoken form. From this point, it is so clear that communication skills cover listening, speaking, reading and writing. This objective implies that the students must be able to write in English for certain topic they have

learned. In other words, after having classes for a certain period of time, students of senior high school (SMA/MA) are expected to be able to create written texts in the form of short and long functional texts.

Writing Hortatory Exposition text sometimes makes the students confused because they do not know the people whom they want to persuade and send the letter. Based on the result of research conducted by Metzger (2008: 17), he concludes some points. First, as a teacher, it is important to help our students to see writing as a process of hard work. Secondly, writing is a worthwhile task of which our students can take ownership. Lastly, looking beyond the classroom, we need to help students see how writing can be valuable journey on which to embark. Not little students who are reluctant to study English, especially writing English text. They mention some reasons to avoid the assignment or task from the teacher. They say that English is so difficult, they do not have idea, they do not have rich vocabulary, and many other reasons. As teacher, sometimes we are disappointed to them because they say that they cannot write, but they do not have an effort and motivation to study.

That case also happened to the students of MA Tarbiyatul Banin Pati. Based on the observation conducted, the researcher found that many students of eleventh grade were lazy and did not have motivation to study English, especially writing. Some students did not pay attention to the explanation, played by them, pretended to be busy, did not care with the teacher and lesson, and many others. Here, the researcher concluded that motivation as the internal factor has very big role to the students' intention in studying and teacher's technique in teaching has big influence to the students. Therefore, we should not blame the students. As a teacher, we should evaluate the teaching and learning process, especially the teaching technique and then try to find the solution for their problems.

Based on the discussion above, here, the researcher was so curious and tried to find the solution related to students' motivation and skill. According to Santa, Havens, and Valdes (2004: 32) state that RAFT technique can make the students feel free to write because they can establish the role, audience,

format, and the topic of their writing based on what they want. It is the way to bring together students' understanding of main ideas, organization, elaboration, and coherence. RAFT can be used with any grade level and any subject area for helping students focus on a given assignment. Hopefully, the inclusion classes and students who had more difficult with getting started in writing would find this technique very useful.

After synthesizing the need of the students of MA Tarbiyatul Banin to be motivated and skillful in writing, the research about those techniques was very important to be done. The researcher wanted to know the effectiveness of the RAFT technique to the students in writing expository text, especially their skill. For that reason, the researcher did the research with the title "The effectiveness of the Role, Audience, Format and Topic (RAFT) Technique on Students' Skill in Writing Expository Text". By doing this research, the writer got the information whether this technique is proper or not to be applied for teaching writing to the students.

Method

This research used factorial design. Another technique for method optimization is the use of factorial designs. Antony (2003: 67) explained that factorial designs A smarter, more efficient approach. Factorial designs are a powerful, albeit underutilized set of tools for the analytical scientist. Factorial designs consist of a series of experiments in which factors are varied simultaneously, rather than one at a time. In this research, another variable which influenced the dependent variable was motivation. So, there were three variables in this research. They were independent variables, dependent variables and the moderating variable. The independent variable is the use of RAFT technique in teaching expository text writing. The dependent variable is the writing skill of eleventh grade students of MA Tarbiyatul Banin, Winong, Pati in the Academic Year 2012/2013. And the moderating variable is the motivation of the students in writing descriptive text.

In this research, experimental group is the students who were taught using RAFT technique. Meanwhile, the control group is

the students who were taught without RAFT technique, but it used conventional technique. And each group were divided again into two categories. They were high motivated students and low motivated students. For calculating data in experimental study, there are some ways, like ANOVA, ANCOVA and MANOVA. Here, the researcher discussed about ANCOVA with pre-test and post-test data.

An analysis of covariance (ANCOVA), the alternative to gain scores, focuses on differences between the treatment groups at posttest while holding constant pretest differences. "It is critically important to use reliable measures and precisely measure variables consistently across subjects and over time, especially when using ANCOVA models" (Oakes and Feldman, 2001). Dimitrov and Rumrill (2003) explain that the purpose of using the pretest scores as a covariate in analysis of covariance or ANCOVA with a pretest-posttest design is to (a) reduce the error variance and (b) eliminate systematic bias.

Discussion

Summarize the collected data and the analysis performed on those data relevant to the issue that is to follow. The Findings should be clear and concise. It should be written objectively and factually, and without expressing personal opinion. In this research, there were 36 students for experimental group and 34 students for control group. The experimental group was taught using RAFT technique and the control group was taught without using RAFT technique. They were taught using conventional technique which was usually used by their English teacher in teaching and learning process.

For the beginning of the research, the researcher gave all students the questionnaire to know their learning motivation. The questionnaire consisted of 25 questions with multiple choices. From 36 students in experimental group, they were divided into two groups based on the result of questionnaire and teacher's information. They were 18 high motivated students and 18 low motivated students. On the other hand, from 34 students in control group, they were divided too based on the result of

questionnaire. They were high motivated students and low motivated students.

After that, the researcher gave them pretest. It was writing hortatory exposition. This result was used as data to be compared with the score of posttest. In teaching and learning process along 3 meetings, the English teacher taught the experimental group using RAFT technique with the lesson plan made by the researcher and using RAFT paper. Meanwhile, the learning and teaching process for control group did not use RAFT technique, but it was based on the lesson plan from the English teacher. Then, they had posttest.

Based on the data of pretest and posttest, the researcher and the teacher scored using analytic scale for rating composition tasks from Brown (2004: 244-245). They were five aspects. First was organization: introduction, body and conclusion. Second was logical development of ideas: content. Third aspect was grammar. The next was punctuation, spelling, and mechanics. And, style and quality of expression was the last aspect. To know the effectiveness of the technique and the interaction of motivation and gender to the students' skill, the data of pretest and posttest were calculated using analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) in SPSS. Based on the result of univariate analysis of variance, the researcher got the answer of seven problem statements of this research.

First, it was for high motivated students' skill from experimental group. In pretest, the mean was 62.17 and 77.44 in posttest. The 95% confidence interval showed the lower bound was 68.32 and the upper bound was 71.29. In pretest, the mean of aspect 1 was 12.6, aspect 2 was 11.2, aspect 3 was 12.3 and aspect 4 and 5 was same. It was 13. And, in posttest, the mean of aspect 1 was 16.1, aspect 2 was 16.6, aspect 3 was 14.3, aspect 4 was 15.1 and the last aspect was 15.9. From this data, we knew that the biggest improvement was in aspect 2 (5.4). It was logical development of ideas: content. Then, it was followed by the first aspect. It means that RAFT technique helped them in developing the ideas and organization. It was like the purpose of RAFTs; to give students a fresh way to think about approaching their writing and it also can be the way to bring together students'

understanding of main ideas, organization, elaboration, and coherence (Santa and Havens: 12). The effectiveness of RAFT technique to the high motivated students' skill was shown by $.000 < 0.05$. This data means the use of RAFT technique was effective to improve the high motivated students' skill in writing expository text. And, based on t-test calculation, the use of RAFT technique was effective in improving the high motivated students' skill in writing expository text because t-observation is higher than t-table on the level of significance 0.05 and degree of freedom 34.

Second, it was for low motivated students' skill from experimental group. In pretest, the mean was 56.39 and 71.22 in posttest. The 95% confidence interval showed the lower bound was 62.81 and the upper bound was 64.80. In pretest, the mean of aspect 1 was 11.9, aspect 2 was 10.2, aspect 3 was 10.8, aspect 4 was 12.2 and the last was 11.9. Then, in posttest, the mean of aspect 1 was 14.9, aspect 2 was 15.2, aspect 3 was 12.9, aspect 4 was 14 and the last aspect was 14.2. In this group, the biggest improvement was also in aspect 2. The effectiveness of RAFT technique to the high motivated students' skill was shown by $.000 < 0.05$. This data means the use of RAFT technique was effective to improve the low motivated students' skill in writing expository text. Based on the result of t-test calculation, the use of RAFT technique was effective in improving the low motivated students' skill in writing expository text because t-observation is higher than t-table on the level of significance 0.05 and degree of freedom 34.

Third, it was for high motivated students' skill from control group. In pretest, the mean was 63.71 and 68.94 in posttest. The 95% confidence interval showed the lower bound was 64.90 and the upper bound was 64.80. In pretest, the mean of aspect 1 was 11.4, aspect 2 was 13.1, aspect 3 was 12.1, aspect 4 was 13.8 and the last was 13.4. Then, in posttest, the mean of aspect 1 was 15, aspect 2 was 14.1, aspect 3 was 12.3, aspect 4 was 14 and the last aspect was 13.5. The effectiveness of conventional technique to the high motivated students' skill was shown by $.002 < 0.05$. This data means the use of conventional technique was effective to improve the high motivated students' skill in writing expository

text. And, based on the result of t-test, the use of conventional technique was effective in improving the high motivated students' skill in writing expository text because t-observation is higher than t-table on the level of significance 0.05 and degree of freedom 32.

Fourth, it was for low motivated students' skill from control group. In pretest, the mean was 59.88 and 66 in posttest. The 95% confidence interval showed the lower bound was 61.67 and the upper bound was 64.22. In pretest, the mean of aspect 1 was 11.2, aspect 2 was 11.6, aspect 3 was 11.2, aspect 4 was 13.2 and the last was 12.6. Then, in posttest, the mean of aspect 1 was 16, aspect 2 was 13, aspect 3 was 12, aspect 4 was 13.8 and the last aspect was 13.1. The effectiveness of conventional technique to the low motivated students' skill was shown by $.001 < 0.05$. This data means the use of conventional technique was also effective to improve the low motivated students' skill in writing expository text. And, based on the result of t-test calculation, the use of conventional technique was effective in improving the low motivated students' skill in writing expository text because t-observation is higher than t-table on the level of significance 0.05 and degree of freedom 32.

The pretest result represented the students' condition in the beginning. In pretest, the scores of all groups were relative equal so ANCOVA was applied. It was like the explanation from Jamieson (1999). He stated that ANCOVA addresses a conditional hypothesis. Thus, the question that ANCOVA answers may begin with an untenable assumption, that two participants have equivalent scores at baseline.

The fifth was the interaction of students' motivation to the students' skill from experimental group. From this group, the mean for high motivated students was 77.44, mean of low motivated students was 71.22 and the total mean was 74.33. This data was same with the result of ANCOVA for test of between-subjects effects which showed that there was interaction between students' motivation with their score or skill. It was shown by the data of significance $0.002 < 0.05$. Based on the result of t-test calculation, there was interaction between students' motivation and students' skill in writing expository text

using RAFT technique. The high motivated students' skill got more positive influence than the low motivated students.

The ANCOVA Result of Interaction of Students' Motivation and Gender to the Students' Skill (Experiment Group).

Table 1. Univariate Analysis of Variance
Between-Subjects Factors

		Value Label	N
Gender	1,00	Male	21
	2,00	Famale	15
Motivation	1,00	High	18
	2,00	Low	18

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics
Dependent Variable: Post Test

Gender	Motivation	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Male	High	77,1250	3,87068	8
	Low	71,6154	2,29269	13
	Total	73,7143	3,98927	21
Famale	High	77,7000	4,00139	10
	Low	70,2000	1,48324	5
	Total	75,2000	4,93095	15
Total	High	77,4444	3,83823	18
	Low	71,2222	2,15722	18
	Total	74,3333	4,40130	36

Table 3. Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^a
Dependent Variable: Post Test

F	df1	df2	Sig.
,708	3	32	,554

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups.

- a. Design: Intercept + Pre_Test + Gender + Motivation + Gender * Motivation

Table 4. Tests of Between-Subjects Effects
Dependent Variable: Post Test

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	488,305 ^a	4	122,076	19,950	,000
Intercept	326,300	1	326,300	53,324	,000
Pre_Test	131,157	1	131,157	21,434	,000
Gender	6,564	1	6,564	1,073	,308
Motivation	68,936	1	68,936	11,266	,002
Gender * Motivation	,653	1	,653	,107	,746
Error	189,695	31	6,119		
Total	199594,000	36			
Corrected Total	678,000	35			

a. R Squared = ,720 (Adjusted R Squared = ,684)

Table 5. Grand Mean
Dependent Variable: Post Test

Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
		Lower Bound	Upper Bound
74,299 ^a	,439	73,403	75,195

a. Covariates appearing in the model are evaluated at the following values: Pre Test = 59,2778.

The sixth was the interaction of students' motivation to the students' skill from control group. From this group, the mean for high motivated students was 68.94, mean of low motivated students was 66 and the total mean was 67.47. This data was same with the result of ANCOVA for test of between-subjects effects which showed that there was no interaction between students' motivation with their score or skill. It was shown by the data of significance $0.230 > 0.05$. And, based on the result of t-test calculation, there was interaction between students' motivation and students' skill in writing expository text using conventional technique. The low motivated students' skill got

more positive influence than the high motivated students. This is the ANCOVA result of interaction of students' motivation and gender to the students' skill (control group).

Univariate Analysis of Variance

Table 6. Between-Subjects Factors

		Value Label	N
Gender	1,00	Male	20
	2,00	Famale	14
Motivation	1,00	High	17
	2,00	Low	17

Table 7. Descriptive Statistics
Dependent Variable: Post Test

Gender	Motivation	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Male	High	71,0000	2,70801	4
	Low	65,8125	2,31571	16
	Total	66,8500	3,15019	20
Famale	High	68,3077	3,90266	13
	Low	69,0000	.	1
	Total	68,3571	3,75412	14
Total	High	68,9412	3,76614	17
	Low	66,0000	2,37171	17
	Total	67,4706	3,43983	34

Table 8. Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances^a
Dependent Variable: Post Test

F	df1	df2	Sig.
,760	3	30	,525

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups.

b. Design: Intercept + Pre_Test + Gender + Motivation + Gender * Motivation

Table 9. Tests of Between-Subjects Effects
Dependent Variable: Post Test

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	249,810 ^a	4	62,452	12,876	,000
Intercept	204,791	1	204,791	42,222	,000
Pre_Test	144,546	1	144,546	29,801	,000
Gender	2,873	1	2,873	,592	,448
Motivation	7,308	1	7,308	1,507	,230
Gender * Motivation	2,712	1	2,712	,559	,461
Error	140,661	29	4,850		
TTotal	155168,000	34			
Corrected Total	390,471	33			

a. R Squared = ,640 (Adjusted R Squared = ,590)

Estimated Marginal Means

Table 10. Grand Mean
Dependent Variable: Post Test

Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
		Lower Bound	Upper Bound
67,736 ^a	,665	66,376	69,096

a. Covariates appearing in the model are evaluated at the following values: Pre Test = 61,7941.

From the data above, the researcher got the data that the posttest scores were better than pretest. So, it means the use of RAFT technique in improving the students' skill in writing expository text was more effective than the use of conventional technique. Nevertheless, the improvement of experimental group scores was higher than the control group. It means that the use of RAFT technique in teaching hortatory exposition text was more effective for students whether they were high or low motivated. But, the students who got the bigger influence or improvement were low motivated students. And, here, the

motivation had big roles for this skill improvement. And, the influence of RAFT technique was more significant than conventional technique. The data showed that the significance result of RAFT technique for high motivated students was .000 and the low motivated students' significance was .000. Meanwhile, the significance result of conventional technique for high motivated students was .002 and the low motivated students' significance was .001. The conclusion is the use of RAFT technique is more effective than conventional technique.

Conclusion

Conclusions contain answers from the formulation of research problems. Conclusions and suggestions are written individually in the subtitles. Conclusions contain answers to research questions. Written in narrative form, not in numerical form. Suggestions are given on the basis of research results. Based on data analysis which was discussed in the previous chapter, the researcher concluded seven answers of the problem statements. First, RAFT technique was effective to improve the students' skill of high motivated students in writing expository text with the significance result $.000 < 0.05$. They had the mean of pre-test 62.17 and post test 77.44. Second, RAFT technique was effective to improve the students' skill of low motivated students in writing expository text with the significance result $.000 < 0.05$. They had the mean of pre-test 56.39 and post-test 71.22. Third, conventional technique was effective to improve the students' skill of high motivated students in writing expository text with the significance result $.002 < 0.05$. They had the mean of pre-test 63.71 and post-test 68.94. And the fourth, conventional technique was effective to improve the students' skill of low motivated students in writing expository text with the significance result $.002 < 0.05$. They had the mean of pre-test 59.88 and post-test 66. The fifth conclusion was the interaction of motivation to the skill of students taught using RAFT technique was significant ($0.002 < 0.05$). The sixth was the interaction of motivation to the skill of students taught using conventional technique was not significant ($0.230 > 0.05$). And, the last was the use of RAFT technique was more effective than conventional

technique. The significance result of RAFT technique was higher than conventional technique.

References

- Anderson, Judith, Christine. (2007). Review of Integrating Literature and Writing Instruction: First-Year English, Humanities Core Course, Seminars. *Journal of Teaching Writing*. 24 (1)
- Antony. (2003). *Design of Experiments for Engineers and Scientists*. Oxford and Burlington: Heinemann.
- Brown, D. H. (2004). *Language Assessment: Principles and Practice*. San Fransisco: San Fransisco State University Press.
- Brown, K and Hood, S. (1998). *Writing Matter*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dimitrov and Rumrill. (2003). *Pretest-posttest Designs and Measurement of Change*. IOS Press. Work 20 (2003) 159–165 159.
- Finders, M., Crank, V. and Kramer, E. (2013). Negotiating Expectations: Preserving Theoretical Research-Based Writing Pedagogy in the Field. *Teaching/Writing: The Journal of Writing Teacher Education*. Teaching/Writing -- Winter/Spring 2013 (Full Issue).
- Fitzmaurice, Laird and Ware. (2004). *Applied Longitudinal Analysis*. Harvard: Wiley Interscience Press.
- Harmer, J. (1998). *How to Teach English*. Essex: Longman.
- _____. (2001). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. London and New York: Longman.
- _____. (2007). *How To Teach Writing*. New York: Longman.
- Jamieson, J. (1999). Dealing with Baseline Differences: Two Principles and Two Dilemmas. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, 31(2), 155-161.
- Johnson, DM. (1992). *Approaches to Research in Second Language Learning*. New York: Longman Publishing Group.

- Kopelman, J.B. (2011). *The Effect of RAFT Writing Strategy on Students' Responses to Open Response Mathematics Questions*. Thesis of Department of Mathematical Sciences, Central Connecticut State University. New Britain, Connecticut.
- Lunenburg, M.R. 2011. Expectancy Theory of Motivation: Motivating by Altering Expectations. *International Journal of Management, Business, and Administration*. 15 (1).
- Metzger, K. (2008). Grading as a Process Toward Growth: Differing Grades on Writing Assignment. *Journal of Teaching Writing*. 24 (1).
- Muflichah. (2012). *Menata Ulang Pemikiran Sistem Pendidikan Nasional dalam Abad 21*. Available at <http://sanaky.staff.uui.ac.id/2012/07/13/menata-ulang-pemikiran-sistem-pendidikan-nasional-dalam-abad-21/>. Accessed on January 22, 2013.
- Oakes & Feldman, (2001). *Statistical Power for Nonequivalent Pretest-Posttest Designs. The impact of Change-Score Versus ANCOVA Models*. England: New England Research Institutes.
- Santa, C. and Havens, L. (1995). *Creating Independence through Student-owned Strategies: Project CRISS*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt.
- Santa, C., Havens, L., and Valdes, B. (2004). *Project CRISS: Creating Independence through Student-owned Strategies*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt.