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Abstract
This research is aimed to find whether: (1) Self-Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD) is more effective than Direct Method (DM) to teach writing to the eighth grade students; (2) the students who having high creativity have better writing skill than those having low creativity; and (3) there is an interaction between teaching methods and students’ creativity to teach writing.

This research was an experimental research conducted at SMP N 1 Prambanan Klaten in the Academic Year of 2015/2016. The population of the research was consisting 48 students were taken by using cluster random sampling. Each class consisted of 24 students for experimental class taught using SRSD and 24 students of control class taught using DM. The data collection was done by giving creativity and writing test. The data analysis was done by applying descriptive and inferential statistics (ANOVA and Tukey HSD test) to test the research hypothesis.

The research findings are: (1) SRSD is more effective than DM to teach writing to the eighth grade students; (2) the students having high creativity have better writing skill than those having low creativity; and (3) there is an interaction between teaching methods and students’ creativity in teaching writing.

The findings imply that to teach students having high creativity, SRSD is more effective than DM. For the students having low creativity, both SRSD and DM have the same effect on the students’ writing skill. In addition, creativity is one of the factors influencing students’ writing skill. The students having high creativity have better writing skill than those having low creativity.
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INTRODUCTION

English as a compulsory subject in Junior High School has integrated four skills namely listening, speaking, reading, and writing. From those four skills, writing is believed as one of the macro skills, which plays an important role. Today, the ability to write has become an indispensable skill in the global literate community (Brown, 2001: 218). Writing is necessary in most contexts of life at least in the basic level such as recruiting employment in workplace and it is taken for granted in literate cultures. Along with reading comprehension, writing skill is a predictor of academic success and a basic requirement for participation in civic life and in the global economy (Graham and Perin, 2007: 9). Writing skill is described as a measurement of someone’s achievement and requisite to contribute in international scope. In the school setting, writing plays two distinct but complementary roles as a skill that draws on the use of strategies and a means of extending and deepening students’ knowledge (Keys, 2000; Shanahan, 2004; Sperling & Freedman, 2001 in Graham and Perin, 2007: 9-10). First, writing is a skill that draws on the use of strategies such as planning, evaluating, and revising text to accomplish a variety of goals, such as
writing a report or expressing an opinion with the support of evidence. Second, writing is a tool to explore and broaden students’ knowledge and as a means for learning subject matter. To master writing skill, the students should focus on some indicators such as grammar, organization, mechanics, vocabulary, and content.

Actually, there are only several students who are able to produce written texts correctly. It is because of their lack of grammar, organization, mechanics, vocabulary, and content. Creativity, self-confidence, participation, class condition are the other factors that influence the students writing skill. The common problem is that students are less in writing practice. They do not know the procedure and strategy in writing. In addition, they do not explore their ideas widely. They are less in the choice of words and seldom use incorrect punctuation, structure, capitalization, etc. To make the students able to write, teacher should select method and explore the influencing factors.

One of the methods is Self-Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD). The SRSD model uses specific stages of instruction to teach students to accomplish writing tasks and procedures for regulating work and undesirable behaviors that impede performance involving brainstorming, semantic mapping, generating writing content, setting goals, and revision (Chalk, Shanna, and Burke, 2005: 76). SRSD is a method in teaching writing by implementing strategy as well as accomplishing writing task by exploring ideas, collecting and grouping detail information, producing the tasks, evaluating, etc. In addition, SRSD is intended to increase students’ knowledge about the writing process and form positive attitudes about writing and their writing capabilities. Harris (1982) in Eissa (2009: 9) stated the major goal of SRSD as it relates to writing skills are: (1) helping the writer master high level cognitive processes of writing; (2) developing autonomous, reflective, and self-regulated use of effective writing skill; and (3) forming positive attitude toward writing and themselves as writers. SRSD is organized into six instructional stages. They are: (1) Developing background knowledge. In this stage, the teacher identifies previously learning strategies and how they have impacted the students; (2) Making initial conference (strategy goals and significance). The teacher introduces the components of the strategy, its benefits and expectations; (3) Modeling of the strategy. In this stage, the teacher shows the students how to use the strategies as he plans and writes the text; (4) Memorizing the strategy. Students memorize the writing strategy and the self-statements by using mnemonics or other techniques; (5) Applying collaborative practice. The students compose their own narrative text individually, in pair or group monitoring by the teacher. (6) Implementing independent practice. The students implement the writing strategy independently and start to express the self-statements in their heads.

Another method that is used in the research is Direct Method (DM). It is also well-known as Natural Method. It is a method in which the goal of instruction becomes the way of learning how to use a foreign language to communicate. Freeman (1983: 18) stated that DM does not allow translation. This method
provides learners with a practically useful knowledge of language. In DM, students learn how to communicate in target language and are asked to use both oral and written skills (Freeman, 1983: 18). DM is best for learning specific concept and skills authentically. There are two stages in DM: Planning Task and Interactive Task (Arends, 1997: 75). The activities in Planning Tasks are including preparing objective, choosing content, performing task analysis and planning for time and space. Meanwhile, the activities in Interactive Tasks are providing objectives, presenting and demonstrating, providing guide practice, checking understanding and providing feedback, and providing independent practice.

Another significant factor that supports students in mastering English writing skill is creativity. A number of experts suggest that creativity is the generation of imaginative new ideas involving a radical newness innovation or solution to a problem, and a radical reformulation of problems (Newell and Shaw, 1972: 42; Sefertzi, 2000: 2). Creativity involves the production of new ideas or the recombination of identified elements into something new and providing valuable problem solving. Developing the capacity to be creative is believed to have the potential to enrich lives and help contribute to a better society (Richards, 2013: 1). Students develop their creativity to perform well not only in exams and extra-curricular activities, but also in the workplace and wider society. Creativity is essential in all aspects including writing skills. Creativity helps students increase their capacities or original ideas and for creative thinking. It also improves the quality of the students’ experiences, motivation, and self-esteem. However, it is not easy to create a good text. Students should be creative in developing the ideas, producing new impression, using correct grammar, vocabulary, punctuation, etc. Students’ creativity can be seen from the process and the result of composing a text.

Based on the ideas above, the writer is interested to know the reality, then she is interested in conducting a research entitled: “The Effectiveness of Self-Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD) to Teach Writing Viewed from Students’ Creativity (An Experimental Study in the Eight Grade Students of SMP N 1 Prambanan Klaten in the Academic Year of 2015/2016).”

This research is aimed to find whether: (1) Self-Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD) is more effective than Direct Method to teach writing to the eighth grade students of SMP N 1 Prambanan Klaten in the Academic Year of 2015/2016; (2) the eighth grade students of SMP N 1 Prambanan Klaten who having high creativity have better writing skill than those having low creativity; and (3) there is interaction between teaching methods and students’ creativity to teach writing.

METHODS

An experimental design will be used in this research. Experimental research is the most conclusive scientific method because the researcher actually establishes different treatments (Fraenkel and Wallen, 2000: 8). The purpose of an experimental study is to investigate the correlation between
cause and effect and how far its correlation is between variables by giving certain treatment to experimental class and to control class as the comparison.

There are three variables in this research: dependent, independent, and moderator variables. Dependent variable is the major variable that will be measured in the research. Acting as the dependent variable in this research is writing skill of the students. Meanwhile, Independent variable is variable that the researcher suspects may relate to or influence the dependent variable (Hatch and Lazaraton, 1991: 63-64). There are two independent variables in this research: the first being SRSD in experimental class and the second is Direct Method in control class. The third variable is the creativity of the students which acts as moderator variable. This variable functions similarly to independent variable in producing variability in dependent variable.

This research will be conducted in SMP N 1 Prambanan Klaten. It is located at Jl. Jogja- Solo KM 17 Sanggrahan, Prambanan, Klaten since April to September 2015. The population of the research was consisting 48 students were taken by using cluster random sampling. Each class consisted of 24 students for experimental class taught using SRSD and 24 students of control class taught using DM. The researcher uses a certain technique called cluster sampling, the unit of sampling is a naturally occurring group of individuals (Gall, Gall, and Borg, 2003: 174). Furthermore, each of the sample class is divided based on their creativity. It will be classified into two groups: high creativity students and low creativity students.

In collecting the data, the researcher will use two instruments, one is for writing skill and the other is for creativity. The instrument for measuring creativity can be given prior or after the treatment, while measuring writing can only be done after the treatment. Before the tests will be given to the students, there will be try out test for both creativity and writing test in order to measure the readability of test instructions. In writing test, the scoring criteria include five aspects. They include content, vocabulary, grammar, mechanics, and organization. Meanwhile, in creativity test, there are six sub-tests that measure four different aspects of creativity. The six sub-tests include word initial, word creation, sentence formation, similar characteristic, extraordinary use of word, and consequence or effect.

The techniques which will be used to analyze the data of this study are descriptive and inferential statistics. The descriptive statistics will be used to know the mean, median, mode, standard deviation, histogram, and polygon of students’ scores in writing. Inferential statistics will be used to test the research hypothesis. The researcher will use ANOVA to know the variances which appear due to the different treatments as a basis for the conclusion that are drawn. This procedure will be also used to examine the effect of two independent variables to dependent variable (Setiyadi, 2006: 175). Before applying the ANOVA, the researcher will conduct perquisite tests which consist of normality and homogeneity test. The normality test is used to determine whether the sample in this research is in normal
distribution or not. To test population’s normality, Lilliefors test is used. The sample of population can be said normal if $L_0 < L_t$ at significance degree $\alpha = 0.05$. In addition, the homogeneity test is used in order to find out whether the data are homogenous or not. The homogeneity of population is tested by Barlett test at significance degree $\alpha = 0.05$, the groups are considered as homogenous if the values of $\chi^2_t$ are smaller than $\chi^2$. Besides ANOVA test, Tukey’s test was used to find level of mean difference. The finding of q is found by dividing the different between the means the square root of the ratio of the within group variation and the sample size.

**RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

The data used for the research are in the form of scores obtained from the result of the students’ creativity test and writing test. The data are divided into 8 categories as follows: (1) the data of the students taught using self-regulated strategy development ($A_1$) shows that the score is 50 up to 90. The range is 40. The number class used is 6, and the class width (interval) used is 7, the mean is 75.04, the mode is 81.61, the median of scores is 78.5, and the standard deviation is 10.20; (2) the data of the students taught using direct method ($A_2$) shows that the scores is 62 up to 79. The range is 17, the number class used is 6, and the class width (interval) is 3. Moreover, the mean is 70.88, the mode is 74.90, the median is 70.50 and the standard deviation is 5.612; (3) the data of the students having high creativity ($B_1$) shows that the score is 64 up to 90. The range is 26, the number class used is 6, and the class width (interval) used is 4. Moreover, the mean is 76.38, the mode is 76.42, the median is 76.50 and the standard deviation is 6.70; (4) the data of the students having low creativity ($B_2$) shows that the score is 50 up to 80. The range is 30, the number class used is 6, and the class width (interval) used is 6. Moreover, the mean is 69.46, the mode is 70.50, the median is 70.50 and the standard deviation is 7.18; (5) the data of the students having high creativity who are taught using self-regulated strategy development ($A_1B_1$) shows that the score is 73 up to 90. The range is 17, the number class used is 5, and the class width (interval) used is 4. Moreover, the mean is 81.00, the mode is 77.83, the median is 79.50, and the standard deviation is 5.77; (6) the data of the students having low creativity who are taught by using self-regulated strategy development ($A_1B_2$) shows that the score is 50 up to 80. The range is 30, the number class used is 5, and the class width (interval) used is 7. Moreover, the mean is 69.08, the mode is 84.5, the median is 60, and the standard deviation is 10.5; (7) the data of the students having high creativity who are taught using Direct Method ($A_2B_1$) shows that the scores is 64 up to 76. The range is 12, the number class used is 5, and the class width (interval) used is 3. Moreover, the mean is 71.92, the mode is 73.83, the median is 73, and the standard deviation of the scores is 3.86; (8) the data of the students having low creativity who are taught using Direct Method ($A_2B_2$) shows that the score is 62 up to 79. The range is 17, the number class used is 5, and the class width (interval) used is 4. Moreover, the mean is 69.8, the mode is 72.5, the median is 71.5, and the standard deviation of the scores is 5.2.
Then, based on the result of normality test it was found that the sample was on normal distribution because normal if $L_o < L_t$ at significance degree $\alpha = 0.05$. The summary of the sample can be seen below.

### Table 1 Summary of Normality Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Number of Sample</th>
<th>$(L_o)$</th>
<th>$(L_t)$</th>
<th>$(\alpha)$</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A₁</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.1170</td>
<td>0.1809</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A₂</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.1034</td>
<td>0.1809</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>B₁</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.1665</td>
<td>0.1809</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>B₂</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.1020</td>
<td>0.1809</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A₁B₁</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.1707</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A₁B₂</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.2050</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A₂B₁</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.1611</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A₂B₂</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.1547</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Homogeneity test is conducted to know whether data are homogeneous or not. The result of the analysis is presented below.

### Table 2 Summary of Homogeneity Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\text{df}$</th>
<th>$s^2$</th>
<th>log $s^2$</th>
<th>(df) log $s^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.009090</td>
<td>32.51</td>
<td>1.512086</td>
<td>0.137462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.009090</td>
<td>17.17</td>
<td>1.234878</td>
<td>0.112262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.009090</td>
<td>117.63</td>
<td>2.070542</td>
<td>0.188231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.009090</td>
<td>25.24</td>
<td>1.402131</td>
<td>0.127466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>0.565421</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the result of homogeneity test above, it can be seen that the score of $\chi^2_o$ is 3.388. From the table of Chi- Square distribution with the significance level $\alpha= 0.05$, the score of $\chi^2_t = 7.815$, it can be concluded that the data are homogeneous.

ANOVA test is used to know the effects of the independent variables and attributive variable toward the dependent variable. In addition, it functions to check if there is an interaction among those variables. The hypothesis is rejected if $F_o$ is higher than $F_t$ ($F_o > F_t$). The summary of the data is presented as follows.

### Table 3 Summary of Total and Mean Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$s^2$</th>
<th>Mean $\text{log } s^2$</th>
<th>Standard Deviation $\text{log } s^2$</th>
<th>Log $s^2$</th>
<th>$\text{B}$</th>
<th>$\chi^2_o$</th>
<th>$\chi^2_t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42.807</td>
<td>1.632</td>
<td>71.787</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>7.815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2_o < \chi^2_t$
From the table above, the conclusion are: (1) $F_O (4.333) > F_t (4.04)$, $H_0$ is rejected and the difference between columns is significant. It can be concluded that Self-Regulated Strategy Development is more effective than Direct Method to teach writing; (2) $F_O (12.230) > F_t (4.04)$, It can be concluded that the writing skill of the students having high and those having low creativity are significantly different. In addition, the mean of $B_1 (76.46)$ is higher than that of $B_2 (69.46)$. It can be concluded that students having high creativity have better writing skill than those having low creativity; (3) $F_O (6.033) > F_t (4.04)$, $H_0$ is rejected and there is an interaction between teaching methods and students’ creativity. Therefore, it can be concluded that the effectiveness of learning method is influenced by the level of students’ creativity.

Tukey HSD Test is used to identify which means are significantly different from the other. The summary can be seen in the table below.

### Table 5 Summary of Tukey Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>$q_o$</th>
<th>$q_t$</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>$A_1$ and $A_2$</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>$B_1$ and $B_2$</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>$A_1B_1$ and $A_2B_1$</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>$A_1B_2$ and $A_2B_2$</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the result of Tukey Test above, it can be concluded that: (1) Self-Regulated Strategy Development is more effective than Direct Method to teach writing; (2) Students having high creativity have better writing skill than those having low creativity; (3) Self-Regulated Strategy Development is more effective than Direct Method to teach writing for students who having high creativity; (4) Self-
Regulated Strategy Development is as effective as Direct Method to teach writing for students having low creativity.

Based on the results above, it can be stated that (1) **Self-Regulated Strategy Development is more effective than Direct Method to teach writing**. It allows the students to generate their affective, cognitive, and behavioral aspects for planning, drafting, and revising text through the six stages. The stage of SRSD includes many interesting strategies to explore their ideas deeply and manage their behavior during the writing process. Moreover, SRSD provides self-correction independently in the form of story rocket to see whether the students fulfill the indicators or not. It is also useful to see the student writing progress. SRSD promotes students’ development of positive attitudes about writing and themselves as writers. Those strategies are beneficial for students in arranging the text to become broader and qualified. De La Paz (1999) in Mills (2008: 6-7) stated through SRSD, students in all groups showed an increase in essay length and number of text structure elements. Furthermore, all groups retained their gains over baseline measures at maintenance testing. In addition, Adkins (2005: 132) added it should also be noted that while the participants in the current study demonstrated success with using SRSD to write stories that were longer, contained more essential elements, and were of overall better quality. On the other hand, Direct Method is a teacher-centered and teacher-dominated classroom. The teacher becomes the main decision maker in the teaching and learning process. However, Teachers faced problems such as lack of methods, mispronunciation, lack of vocabulary, etc. that will influence the accomplishment of the method. In addition, it focuses on vocabulary. As the result, the students lack to communicate based on the contexts and upcoming issues. Their language is strict and stiff because they only focus on vocabulary. Richards and Rodgers (1986: 10) stated teaching through Direct Method required teachers who were native speakers or who had native like fluency in the foreign language. It was largely dependent on the teacher's skill, rather than on a textbook, and not all teachers were proficient enough in the foreign language to adhere to the principles of the method. In addition, Brown (1973: 5) Richards and Rodgers (1986: 11) documented similar problems with strict Direct Method techniques. He described his frustration in observing a teacher performing verbal gymnastics in an attempt to convey the meaning of Japanese words, when translation would have been a much more efficient technique to use. In this process, vocabulary is emphasized, and interaction among students and with the teacher is fostered, although it is limited to mostly asking and responding to questions. (Zainuddin, 2011:65). From the explanation above, it can be concluded that Self-Regulated Strategy Development is more effective than Direct Method to teach writing; (2) **Students having high creativity have better writing skill than those having low creativity**. Students having high creativity tend to be more innovative, curious, aware, exclusive, confident, and active in the teaching and learning process, daily life, and society. They like to explore the new idea and imagine it freely. They will be more critical in asking and responding questions
and sharing the ideas to others. Burgess (2015) stated that students with high creativity dealt with: (a) Creative Growth. Creative writing is not only fun for students to do, but it also allows students to practice how to think ‘outside of the box’; (b) Social Development. Creative writing develops self-confidence and identity; (c) Emotional Development. Students can develop emotionally from creative writing.

On the contrary, the students with low creativity lack of ideas, motivation, and creative thinking in writing. Students with low creativity are able to imitate, reason, and practice the skills to create the product but it is beyond the creativity itself. They have difficulties in identifying, recognizing, generating the ideas, and using their insight in verification process due to solving the problem. They tend to follow other people’s ideas rather than synthesize one’s own. They also have ordinary ideas and monotonous actions. Stenberg (2006:90) stated that to be creative one must first decide to generate new ideas, analyze these ideas, and sell the ideas to others. In other words, a person may have synthetic, analytical, or practical skills but not apply them to problems that potentially involve creativity. From the explanation above, it can be stated that the students having high creativity have better writing skill than those having low creativity;

(3) There is an interaction between teaching methods and students, creativity for teaching writing. One of the influencing factors in the success of teaching writing is method. Teacher should select appropriate method to maximize the students’ writing skills. Suitable method will reinforce the students’ internal factors such as motivation, creativity, self-confidence, etc. Thus, writing skill, the methods, and internal factors should have close relation to support each other in achieving the goal of teaching and learning process. Self-Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD) is a method for helping students learning specific strategies for planning, drafting, and revising text. It not only includes cognitive but also affective and behavioral aspects. It also brings awareness about them selves in the process of writing. They ask themselves, add or reduce the information, and revise the text. They should be careful, systematic, patient in finishing writing products. However, it is a fun way for students because there are many kinds of strategies. Through the strategy of SRSD the students can create text imaginatively, widely, and freely. The strategies encourage the students to be more interactive with others and effective to achieve the goal of writing. Based on the students’ statements, SRSD is a valuable tool for students not only to improve their writing but to also change their attitudes and beliefs about writing (Flanders, 2005: 33).

The students having high creativity explore their cognitive, affective, and behavior better than students having low creativity. They tend to be more active, flexible, excellence, curious, detail, fluent, confidence, etc. They have ability to go beyond tradition, habits, and the obvious in working out the details of an idea or solution. They turn ideas and materials to new, different, and unusual uses or unique. high creativity persons reveal the following traits as among those shared by many unusually creative people such as fluency, elaboration, tolerance of ambiguity, originality, breadth of interest, sensitivity,
curiosity, independence, action, concentration and persistence, commitment, expression of total personality ,and sense of humor (Guilford, 1973: 4).

SRSD is more effective for students having high creativity because SRSD combines some aspects such as cognitive, affective, and behavior. In line with high creativity, SRSD supports the students to discover critical thinking, brilliant thought, and different point of view. In addition, SRSD encourages the students to be confident, brave, imaginative, and independent in expressing ideas in the writing process. Moreover, it shapes the students awareness about themselves in the process of writing to add, reduce, and revise the detail information of the text. Haris (1992) in Eissa (8: 2009) stated the major goals of SRSD as it is related to the writing include helping writers (a) master the higher- level cognitive processes involved in writing; (b) develop autonomous, reflective, self-regulated use of effective writing strategies; and (c) form positive attitudes about writing and about them selves as writers.

Meanwhile, the students having low level creativity found many obstacles in taking care the mental and physical aspects. In addition, they lack psychological aspects such as confidence, inflexible, and strict. Students having low creativity cannot accept ideas or ways of behaving that are different from others. In addition, they are monotonous and stiff in grasping the information from outside. Fostering creativity in such people would promote self-realization. Krystal (1998) in Cropley (1994: 84) showed that uncreative people had difficulty in “self-caring” and lacked self-coherence. Hudson (1963) added the point that noncreative people tend to be narrow and rigid in dealing with information from external environment.

Due to their characteristics, for students having low creativity, Self-Regulated Strategy Development and Direct Method can be used to teach writing. It means that neither of the teaching methods is more effective than the other for the students having low creativity. ISU (2015: 1) stated that no one technique will fit all needs. Thus, for the students having low creativity whether they are taught using Self-Regulated Strategy Development or Direct Method, they reach same result in their writing.

CONCLUSION, IMPLICATION, AND SUGGESTION

Based on the result of the data analysis, the research findings are: (1)Self-Regulated Strategy Development is more effective than Direct Method to teach writing for the eighth grade students of SMP N 1 Prambanan Klaten in the academic year of 2015/2016; (2) The eighth grade students of SMP N 1 Prambanan Klaten in the academic year of 2015/2016 who have high creativity have the better writing skill than those have low creativity: (3)There is an interaction between teaching methods and students’ creativity in teaching writing at the eighth grade students of SMP N 1 Prambanan Klaten in the academic year of 2015/2016. Based on the findings, it can be concluded that Self-Regulated Strategy Development is an effective strategy to teach writing.
The result of this study implies that Self-Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD) is an effective teaching method for teaching writing. SRSD allow teachers and students to explore language in a creative way through the fun activity. However, in deciding to use these strategies of SRSD, the teachers have to select the strategies that match with the topics and media. The more the teacher exploits the strategies, the greater chance for students to increase their writing skill. Having examined the research findings, there are some suggestions which are addressed to the English teacher, the students, and other researchers. In order to improve the students’ writing skill, it is better for teachers to implement Self-Regulated Strategy Development. Students are suggested to use SRSD because the methods contain the strategies which help students in transferring thought by concerning to the discovery of idea/content, grammatical rules, organization, choice of words/vocabulary, and mechanics. Other researchers may conduct other research related to the SRSD viewed from students’ risk-taking, intelligence, critical thinking, self esteem, etc.
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