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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the research is to find out; 1) overall, is there a difference in the ability of descriptive writing in English between students who learn with the learning community component and those who learn with modeling component of CTL approach? 2) is there affecting interaction from CTL approach and learning motivation toward the ability of descriptive writing in English? 3) In high learning motivation group, is there a difference in ability of descriptive writing in English between students who learn with the learning community component and those who learn with modeling component of CTL approach? 4) In low learning motivation group, is there a difference in ability of descriptive writing in English between students who learn with the learning community component and those who learn with modeling component of CTL approach? The research method is factorial 2x2. The research analysis employed two ways ANOVA in significance level $\alpha = 0, 05$ dan $\alpha = 0, 01$ and Tuckey test. Before the research hypothesis test result data is analyzed, the first carried out test requirement analysis which includes the test of homogeneity using Liliefors test and the test of normality using Bartlett test with confidence level $\alpha = 0, 05$. The data was collected through writing test for students’ writing ability, and questionnaire for motivation. The research finding shows that: 1) The learning community component of CTL approach was better than modelling component of CTL approach in improving the ability of descriptive writing. The data showed that $F_{\text{count}} = 23.52 > F_{\text{table}} 4.20$. 2) There was affecting interaction from CTL approach and learning motivation toward the ability of descriptive writing in English. The data showed $F_{\text{count}} = 76.08 > F_{\text{table}} 7.64$. 3) In high learning motivation group, the students’ ability of descriptive writing in English that learn with the learning community component of CTL approach was better than those who learn with modelling...
component of CTL approach. The data showed $Q_{\text{count}} 12.91 > F_{\text{table}} 3.89$. 4) In low learning motivation group, the students’ ability of descriptive writing in English that learn with the modelling component of CTL approach was better than those who learn with the learning community component of CTL approach. The data showed $Q_{\text{count}} 5.06 > F_{\text{table}} 3.89$. Thus, CTL is appropriate approach of learning and gives good motivation. The teacher will increase students’ ability of descriptive writing in English.

**Keywords:** descriptive writing, contextual teaching and learning, motivation

**INTRODUCTION**  
Writing skills are often the most difficult skills for students of English as a foreign language to acquire. This may be because of the great emphasis on listening, speaking, and reading in the classroom. Writing may be that their teachers have not had special training in this area and feel unsure of their own writing competence. The teachers have to choose a good approach in design of writing learning. Writing is an expression of a person to something thought. A person unable to write a variety of matters related to the field of scientific other. Writing in the learning of languages second only an opportunity to be able to write and revise. Facilities for students to learn to write closely connected with matter who is learned. Not only deals with the design of matter from teachers but the ability of the students have role in enhancing the ability of writing.

As faced by students of ABA BSI in Jakarta, writing learning is still difficult. Based on the result of observation with interview and documentation, the writer finds some problems in writing learning. The data from interview and documentation is be analyzed as qualitative. The result are ; 1) the student cannot write the final paper very good because there are still mistake in structure and meaning to relate one paragraph to the other paragraph. 2) The students still get bad score in final exam. 3) The student has low motivation to learning and has less reference of the source. 4) Many lectures used conventional approach that made the student bored in writing learning. As we know that in this era, student-centered is very important to make them improved their learning. Then, they can learn from their context and experience. 5) There is still student that cannot make thesis statement.
Based on the above data, the problem of writing learning comes from internal and external factors. One of them is learning motivation. “Education-centered approach to motivation that focuses on what teachers can do to motivate learners” (Dörnyei, 1994, p. 273). Along with this perspective, “goal orientation theory is probably the most active area of research on student motivation in classrooms and it has direct implications for students and teachers” (Pintrich and Schunk, 2002, p. 242). Motivation was be assumption that has important role to increase ability. It motivates behavior and influences or changes behavior. In the real condition, each student has motivation that cannot influence the other student to have motivation. Actually, the student can grow their intrinsic or extrinsic motivation. So, it is be problem in learning process.

To make writing learning process is easy. Each lecturer in ABA BSI Jakarta has to push students’ motivation. Learning process is designed with students’ context and experience. One of ways is using the appropriate of learning approach. Like as contextual teaching learning (CTL) is appropriate to writing learning. Dewey’s research about CTL said students will learn very well if the material has relationship with their knowledge or experience. CTL will be learn from the real world. It supports students’ imagination when they have to write descriptive writing. In CTL has seven components in learning practice. But she/he can emphasize one of all components. Like as learning community and modeling.

**METHOD OF RESEARCH**

The research did in Academy of Foreign Language BSI Jakarta, Indonesia on March until December 2012. The method is factorial 2x2. It is the matrix of research planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>A. CTL (X1)</th>
<th>Learning community component (LCC)</th>
<th>Modeling component (MC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Motivation (X2)</td>
<td>High (HM)</td>
<td>CTL of LCC-HM</td>
<td>CTL of MC-HM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cell 1</td>
<td>Cell 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low (LM)</td>
<td>CTL of LCC – LM</td>
<td>CTL of MC-LM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cell 3</td>
<td>Cell 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Information:
CTL of LCC: Students group that were learning using CTL of learning community component.
CTL of MC: Students group that were learning using CTL of modeling component.
HM: Students group have high motivation.
LM: Students group have low motivation.
CTL of LCC-HM: Students group that were learning using CTL of learning community component and have high motivation.
CTL of MC-HM: Students group that were learning using CTL of modeling component and have high motivation.
CTL of LCC-LM: Students group that were learning using CTL of learning community component and have low motivation.
CTL of MC-LM: Students group that were learning using CTL of modeling component and have low motivation.

The writer used multi stage cluster random sampling to take the sample of research. The sample is the fourth semester that divided two groups. Based on the Guilford’s theory, the sample will be ranked 27% for high group and 27% for low group. In this research, there are 16 students that divided as experiment group and control group. In high motivation group, the students will be divided two part, the first 8 students were learning using CTL that emphasize to learning community component and the second, 8 students were learning using CTL that emphasize to modeling component. It is the same for the low motivation group.

Validity of the research used internal and external validity. There are seven criteria from Campbell and Stanley in Art, et.al., 1) history (process of experiment research did appropriate with the schedule from the academy. It is to prevent some events that can happen and influence the experiment). 2) Maturation (time of experiment is not long. It is one semester). 3) Testing (the purpose is to know respondent’s skill. In this research compare the first and the end of research result). 4) Instrumentation. 5) Morality (the writer did controlling to attendance of student during experiment). 6) Statistical regression. 7) Selection. While, external validity are population and ecology. The purposes are to control the validity of research result. The researcher did
not change condition the class and observation did not do clear. So, the research did like as process of learning.

The instrument of research for the descriptive writing ability is essay test. Some aspects in making essay test used Brown’s theory. The following is instrument descriptive writing.

Table 2. Grating of instrument for descriptive writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>organization</td>
<td>1. Introduction,</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. body and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. conclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>logical development of ideas</td>
<td>1. Content</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>1. Construction are simple, complex, but effective, and</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Syntax rules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>punctuation, spelling, and mechanics</td>
<td>1. Punctuation and spelling, and Writing rules</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>styles and quality of expression</td>
<td>1. Diction (word choosing),</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Useful word, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Choosing and expression, and vocabulary construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test validity is based on the theoretic test that has been done by expert. The result of the expert assessment shows the appropriate to use. Reliability of the instrument is used correlation technique that is product moment. The result is reliable. Based on the result $r_{\text{account}}$ is 0.722 and $r_{\text{table}}$ with n= 20 in significance level 5% is 0.444. While $r_{\text{table}}$ with n= 20 in significance level 1% is 0.561. so, the result is $0.722 > 0.561 > 0.444$. The conclusion that instrument of descriptive writing is reliable and it can use for the research.

The instrument of research for the motivation is questionnaire. Some aspects in making questionnaire used Keller’s theory. The questionnaire used Likert in assessment. The following is instrument motivation
The validity of instrument of motivation used product moment technique. The result of analysis used Pearson Product Moment. There are 40 questions to give for 30 students. This analysis gets 22 questions or 55% that is valid. While, for the reliability used Alpha Cronbach formulate. The result of reliability analysis gets reliability coefficient 0.735. It is the high category.

Technique analysis of research used two way ANOVA in significance level $\alpha = 0.05$ dan $\alpha = 0.01$. In analysis process, the writer finds interaction so it will continue with Tukey test. Before the research hypothesis test results data is analyzed, the first it did by requirement test analysis which includes homogeneity and normality test. Normality test that is done using Liliefors test and homogeneity test using Bartlett test with confidence level $\alpha = 0.05$
FINDING AND DISCUSSION

A. Descriptive Data
This part would be described the result of descriptive writing ability. It will know the score:

Table 4. Descriptive Statistic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>CTL of Learning Community component (CTL of LCC)</th>
<th>CTL of Modeling component (CTL of MC)</th>
<th>High motivation (HM)</th>
<th>Low motivation (LM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Account</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>73.3125</td>
<td>69.25</td>
<td>72.5625</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>6.896557</td>
<td>4.203173</td>
<td>7.571603</td>
<td>3.63318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>47.5625</td>
<td>17.66667</td>
<td>57.32917</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>1173</td>
<td>1108</td>
<td>1161</td>
<td>1120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>CTL of LCC HM</th>
<th>CTL of LCC LM</th>
<th>CTL of MC HM</th>
<th>CTL of MC LM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Account</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>79.25</td>
<td>67.375</td>
<td>65.875</td>
<td>72.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>65a</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>3.918819</td>
<td>2.445842</td>
<td>2.295181</td>
<td>2.559994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>15.35714</td>
<td>5.982143</td>
<td>5.267857</td>
<td>6.553571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>581</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Overall, score of the ability of descriptive writing that learn with the learning community component of CTL approach

Graph 1. Score of the ability of descriptive writing that learn with the learning community component

From the graph above describes that the ability of descriptive writing as overall has score range between 64-87. The lowest score is 64 and the highest score is 87. The ability of descriptive writing in this group has the average of score is 73.31, mode of score is 77, median of score is 72.5 and standard deviation is 6.89

2. Overall, score of the ability of descriptive writing that learn with modelling component of CTL approach

Graph 2. Score of the ability of descriptive writing that learn with modelling component

From the graph above describes the ability of descriptive writing using modelling component of CTL approach as overall has score range between 62-77. The lowest score is 62 and the highest score is 77. The ability of descriptive
writing in this group has the average of score is 69.25, mode of score is 65, median of score is 69.5 and standard deviation is 4.20.

3. Score of ability of descriptive writing in English that learn with the learning community component of CTL Approach is in high learning motivation group

Graph 3. Score of ability of descriptive writing in English that learn with the learning community component of CTL Approach is in high learning motivation group

From the graph above describes the ability of descriptive writing using learning community component of CTL approach in high learning motivation group that has score range between 75-87. The lowest score is 75 and the highest score is 87. The ability of descriptive writing in this group has the average of score is 79.25, mode of score is 77, median of score is 78 and standard deviation is 3.92

4. Score of ability of descriptive writing in English that learn with the learning community component of CTL Approach is in low learning motivation group
Graph 4. Score of ability of descriptive writing in English that learn with the learning community component of CTL Approach is in low learning motivation group

From the graph above describes the ability of descriptive writing using learning community component of CTL approach in low learning motivation group that has score range between 64-70. The lowest score is 64 and the highest score is 70. The ability of descriptive writing in this group has the average of score is 67.37, mode of score is 65, median of score is 68 and standard deviation is 2.45

5. Score of ability of descriptive writing in English that learn with the modelling component of CTL Approach is in high learning motivation group

Graph 5. Score of ability of descriptive writing in English that learn with the modelling component of CTL Approach is in high learning motivation group
From the graph above describes the ability of descriptive writing using modelling component of CTL approach in high learning motivation group that has score range between 62-69. The lowest score is 62 and the highest score is 69. The ability of descriptive writing in this group has the average of score is 65.87, mode of score is 65, median of score is 65 and standard deviation is 2.29.

6. Score of ability of descriptive writing in English that learn with the modelling component of CTL Approach is in low learning motivation group

From the graph below describes the ability of descriptive writing using modelling component of CTL approach in low learning motivation group that has score range between 70-77. The lowest score is 70 and the highest score is 77. The ability of descriptive writing in this group has the average of score is 72.62, mode of score is 70, median of score is 73 and standard deviation is 2.56.

Graph 6. Score of ability of descriptive writing in English that learn with the modelling component of CTL Approach is in low learning motivation group

B. Analysis of Requirement Testing

Analysis of requirement testing in this research used inferential analysis that is two ways ANOVA. After that, it was done different test of score range of groups. The purpose is to know the validity of data. Of course, there is
requirements that are homogeneous and normal data. The requirements used random sample from population that have normal distribution and homogeneous. The following are normality distribution of testing result of population and variance of homogeneity population data from the research:

**Normality Test Data**

This test did to know normality of distribution data. It is important to know relationship between accuracy of statistic test. Normality testing did toward eight groups, these are; 1) learning community of CTL approach, 2) modelling component of CTL approach, 3) high learning motivation, 4) low learning motivation, 5) the ability of descriptive writing in English that learn with the learning community component of CTL Approach is in high learning motivation group, 6) the ability of descriptive writing in English that learn with the learning community component of CTL Approach is in low learning motivation group, 7) the ability of descriptive writing in English that learn with the modelling component of CTL Approach is in high learning motivation group, and 8) the ability of descriptive writing in English that learn with the modelling component of CTL Approach is in low learning motivation group. The testing used $\sigma = 0, 05$ with free degree. This is the describing of group:

Table 5. The result of data distribution of normality test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Descriptive Writing Ability</th>
<th>$L_0$</th>
<th>$L_{0.05}$</th>
<th>$L_{0.01}$</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>CTL of LCC</td>
<td>0.02385</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>CTL of MC</td>
<td>0.03288</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>HM</td>
<td>0.02872</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>0.02743</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>CTL of LCC + HM</td>
<td>0.02442</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>0.331</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>CTL of LCC + LM</td>
<td>0.14231</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>0.331</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>CTL of MC + HM</td>
<td>0.08691</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>0.331</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>CTL of MC + LM</td>
<td>0.04457</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>0.331</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the above table, all of data groups that was be test using lilliefors testing is about normality. The result of $L_o$ is less than $L_t$. The conclusion that all of treatment groups have data are from the population with normal distribution.

**Homogeneity Test**

Data homogeneity of testing with Bartlett is to know about variances that shows each data group different and takes as random. Test criteria used $L_o > L_t$, thus $H_o$ is as homogeneous variance that is refused and the other is received. The conclusion of this testing shows the population of the research homogeneous.

It is table of homogeneity of testing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>$s^2_{1, gab}$</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>$X^2_o$</th>
<th>$X^2_t$</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CTL of LCC- CTL of MC</td>
<td>32,6142</td>
<td>21,1876</td>
<td>1,6489</td>
<td>3,481</td>
<td>Homogeneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM, LM</td>
<td>35.2646</td>
<td>21,6622</td>
<td>3,4751</td>
<td>3,481</td>
<td>Homogeneous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the table above, $H_o$ is received and $H_1$ is refused. Thus, each treatment group has homogeneous data. Then, the data could be continue to hypothesis testing.
C. Hypothesis Research Testing

Hypothesis testing used two ways ANOVA that continued using Tukey test when there was interaction. Variance analysis two ways is technique that has the purpose is to know two influences. They are main effect and interaction effect. The main effect is the influence of different CTL of LCC and CTL of MC, then the influence of high and low motivation toward descriptive writing ability. While interaction in this part is the influence between CTL and motivation toward descriptive writing ability. The following is description of data.

Table 7. Description of data for hypothesis testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>CTL of LCC</th>
<th>CTL of MC</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>1161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>79.25</td>
<td>65.875</td>
<td>145,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>15.3571</td>
<td>5.2679</td>
<td>20,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>1120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>67.375</td>
<td>72.625</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>5.9821</td>
<td>6.5536</td>
<td>12,5357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total | 16 | 16 |
| Sum | 1173 | 1108 |
| Average | 146,625 | 138,5 |
| Variance | 21,3392 | 11,8215 |

Then, it will do calculation of ANOVA two ways based on the data in the above table. The following is the result of calculation.
Table 8. The result of two ways ANOVA testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variances</th>
<th>db</th>
<th>JK</th>
<th>RK = JK/db</th>
<th>Fh = RK/RDK</th>
<th>Ft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Among row (b)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>115,53</td>
<td>115,53</td>
<td>13,9361</td>
<td>4,20/ 7,64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among column (k)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>195,0325</td>
<td>195,0325</td>
<td>23,5262</td>
<td>4,20/ 7,64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (bxk)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>630,7825</td>
<td>630,7825</td>
<td>76,0896</td>
<td>4,20/ 7,64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Into</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>232,125</td>
<td>8,29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total correction</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1173,47</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the table above, the following is describing the result of hypothesis.

1. The first hypothesis, from the table above there is $F_{\text{account}} = 23,5262 > F_{\text{table}} \ 7, 64 ($α = 0, 01$) and $4, 20 ($α = 0, 05$). It shows that the ability of descriptive writing’s students have studied using learning community component of CTL approach was better than modeling component of CTL approach.

2. The second hypothesis, from the table there is $F_{\text{account}} = 76,0896 > F_{\text{table}} \ 7, 64 ($α = 0, 01$) and $4, 20 ($α = 0, 05$). There was interaction between CTL and motivation toward the ability of descriptive writing.

3. The third hypothesis shows the ability of descriptive writing’s students have studied using learning community component of CTL approach was better than modeling component of CTL approach in high motivation. It shows by $Q_{\text{account}} = 12.91 > F_{\text{table}} \ 3.89$.

4. The fourth hypothesis shows the ability of descriptive writing’s students have studied using modeling component of CTL approach was better than learning community of CTL approach in low motivation group. It shows by $Q_{\text{account}} = 5.06 > F_{\text{table}} \ 3.89$.

Based on the descriptive analysis, it gets the average of score of the ability of descriptive writing that learn using learning community component of CTL approach is 73.31. The score is different with the score that was gotten by the students who learn using modelling component of CTL approach is 69.25. it can see from the result of inferential analysis that shows with differences of score. Moreover, the score of the ability of descriptive writing in English using learning community component of CTL approach was better than using
modelling component of CTL approach. Thus, it can concluded that as overall learning community of CTL approach was effective than modelling component of CTL approach. Deviation standard both of learning community component and modelling component of CTL approach shows 6.89 and 4.20. It means that learning community component was efficient than modelling component of CTL approach.

The result of descriptive statistic shows that the average of score of learning community component is more than modelling component of CTL approach. These are 79.25 and 65.87. Thus, it can concluded that there is a differences of the average score. In addition, it approved from hypothesis testing that is significance of differences the ability of descriptive writing between learning community component and modelling component of CTL approach. Thus, learning community component was better than modelling component of CTL approach to increase the ability of descriptive writing in English of high learning motivation group. Even though, in low learning motivation group shows the different score. The score of the ability of descriptive writing for students that learn modelling component is higher than learning community component. These are 73 and 68. So, it shows effectiveness of modelling component of CTL approach.

The result of interaction between CTL approach and learning motivation can increase the ability of descriptive writing in English. It shows from the hypothesis testing that is \( F_h(k) > F_t \) (\( H_o \) is refused and \( H_1 \) is received). Therefore, there is interaction influence between CTL approach and learning motivation towards the ability of descriptive writing. Based on this testing, it can concluded that grouping of students in learning motivation aspect give the significance influence towards effectiveness of learning community component and modelling component of CTL approach to increase the ability of descriptive writing.

Thus, CTL is appropriate approach of learning and giving good motivation and the teacher will increase students’ descriptive writing ability. It can be proven by improving the score of students. In the process of learning, CTL applied seven components. But in the research, learning community component of CTL approach was emphasized because they expected to share knowledge. Students who have more knowledge can be source of learning for other students.
Besides that, students who have high motivation are not difficult to receive new knowledge using learning community component of CTL approach. The advantage of this component that the student is be as source of learning for low motivation. They can discussion using model. It was describing in modeling component.

In CTL, the teacher used students’ experience to increase their writing ability. As a whole based on the result of descriptive and inferential statistic is satisfying, CTL has effective role toward improving the ability of descriptive writing. However, CTL can be done with choosing characteristic of motivation’s student. Because, all of the CTL characteristic is not effective for the students. From the research, CTL of learning community component is appropriate to emphasize for high motivation. Then, CTL of modeling component is appropriate to emphasize for low motivation. CTL has advantage and disadvantage. Thus, the teacher has to design CTL is more interest and a good media of learning can support the learning better. Some disadvantages from the research are:

1. In choosing information or material in the class is based on the students’ need while each class has different level. The teacher found some difficulties to take current material.
2. It is not efficient because the process of learning needs more time.
3. In CTL learning, there shows different students’ ability. But for the students that have low motivation can have low confidence.
4. For the students that cannot follow the learning will have trouble to pursue learning. Because in CTL learning need activeness.
5. The students cannot be easy to adapt and to develop ability.
6. The students will get knowledge different and it is not spread.
7. Role of teacher is not to appear, because the teacher is just facilitator in CTL learning.

So it can be concluded that the approach is not necessarily more weakness not well applied in process of teaching. The success of method are affected all elements that exist in the environment of education, not just the teacher but also students, learning design, stakeholder, the environment, parents, and so on. All of element in process of learning is whole unity.
CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Based on the result hypothesis testing, the following is conclusion: 1) the first shows that the ability of descriptive writing’s students have studied using learning community of CTL approach was better than learning modeling component of CTL approach. The second, there was interaction between CTL and motivation towards increasing of ability of descriptive writing. The third shows ability descriptive writing’s students have studied using learning community of CTL approach was better than learning modeling component of CTL approach in high learning motivation. Then, the fourth shows ability descriptive writing’s students have studied using modeling component of CTL approach was better than learning community of CTL approach in low learning motivation group.

Some inadequacy of research are 1) the researcher used CTL but it emphasizes to learning community component and modeling component, 2) to make category of motivation used questionnaire, 3) there are two group students, that are high motivation and low motivation, 4) sample of research just took from 1 university, 5) the research just is focus to one of skill in language that is writing

The result of research has implication. There are: 1) improving the ability of descriptive writing through CTL. 2) Improving ability of descriptive writing through motivation. Therefore motivation is awareness that comes from students’ self. So, the teacher has to know the students’ condition. The teacher has to design material that is attractive. [ ]
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