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Abstract
This article presents the result of the research study aimed at finding out: (1) whether there is a significant difference in writing skill between students taught using Interactive Writing and students taught using Guided Writing; and (2) whether Interactive Writing is more effective than Guided Writing to teach writing. The research method used in this study is a quasi-experimental research design. This research was conducted at SMP N 1 Nguter in the academic year of 2015/2016. The population of the research is the eighth grade of SMP N 1 Nguter. The samples are class VIII D as the experimental class which consists of 26 students and class VIII E as the control class which consists of 26 students. The research instrument used to collect the data in this study is test. The data were analysed by using t-test formula. The computation of the t-test shows that \( t_{o} = 3.766 \) is higher than \( t_{table} (50, 0.05) = 1.671 \). Therefore, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference in writing skill between the students taught using Interactive Writing and the students taught using Guided Writing. The mean score of experimental group is 71.88, while the mean score of control group is 66.46. Therefore, it can be concluded that Interactive Writing is more effective than Guided Writing to teach writing.
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Abstrak
Artikel ini memaparkan hasil penelitian yang bertujuan untuk mengetahui: (1) apakah ada perbedaan yang signifikan pada kemampuan menulis antara siswa yang diajar menggunakan Interactive Writing dan siswa yang diajar menggunakan Guided Writing; dan (2) apakah Interactive Writing lebih efektif dibandingkan dengan Guided Writing untuk mengajar writing. Metode penelitian yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah metode kuasi-eksperimental. Penelitian ini dilangsungkan di SMP N 1 Nguter tahun ajaran 2015/2016. Populasi dari penelitian ini adalah kelas VIII SMP N 1 Nguter. Sampel dari penelitian ini adalah kelas VIII D sebagai kelas eksperimen yang terdiri dari 26 siswa dan kelas VIII E sebagai kelas kontrol yang terdiri dari 26 siswa. Instrumen penelitian yang digunakan untuk mengumpulkan data dalam penelitian ini adalah tes. Data yang diperoleh di analisis menggunakan rumus t-tes. Penghitungan data menunjukkan bahwa \( t_{o} = 3.766 \) yang mana lebih tinggi dibandingkan \( t_{table} (50, 0.05) = 1.671 \). Oleh karena itu, dapat disimpulkan bahwa terdapat perbedaan yang signifikan pada kemampuan menulis siswa yang diajar menggunakan Interactive Writing dan siswa yang diajar menggunakan Guided Writing. Nilai rata-rata siswa yang diajar menggunakan Interactive Writing adalah 71.88, sedangkan nilai rata-rata siswa yang diajar menggunakan Guided Writing adalah 66.46. Oleh karena itu, dapat disimpulkan bahwa Interactive Writing lebih efektif dibandingkan dengan Guided Writing untuk mengajar writing.
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INTRODUCTION

Writing skill is an important skill that must be mastered by English learners as they master other skills. However, the fact shows that the ability of students to write is far from the expectation. The students feel that writing is a difficult skill to master. Moreover, it is stated by Heaton (1989: 5) that writing skills are complex and sometimes difficult to teach. It requires mastery not only of grammatical and rhetorical devices but also of conceptual and judgmental elements. It means that there are many aspects that should be mastered by students to produce a good piece of writing. They have to be able to develop and organize the idea, correctly choose the vocabulary, and use appropriate grammar to build correct sentences.

Manchon (2009: 86) says that writing involves both conceptual and linguistic processing. Writing also involves a linguistic processing. Thus, writing is also perceived as a tool for learning language. It means that when students write, they will activate their previous knowledge of what they have learned in reading or listening activity related to the linguistics concerning with grammar, vocabulary, and spelling. It will increase students’ linguistics knowledge so they can reinforce their language acquisition. Brown (2007: 81) defines writing as a complex activity including deciding what ones wants to write, how to say it and how to express those ideas onto paper in a way that is intelligible to other.

Brown (2001: 356-358) classifies the aspects of writing into six aspects: content, organization, discourse, syntax, vocabulary, and mechanics. Content consists of thesis statements, related ideas and development of ideas through personal experience, illustration, facts, and opinion. Next, organization includes the effectiveness of introduction, logical sequence of ideas, conclusion, and appropriate length. Topic sentences, paragraph unity, transition, discourse makers, cohesion, rhetorical conventions, reference, fluency, economy, and variation are included in discourse. While spelling, punctuation, citation of references, and neatness and appearance consist in mechanics.
Nowadays, there are many interesting teaching techniques which can be applied. Teacher must be selective in choosing the most effective and appropriate teaching techniques which suit with the condition and the needs of the students. In this research, the researcher tried to compare two techniques for teaching writing. The purpose of this research is to find out which technique is more effective to teach writing.

Interactive Writing is the first technique that is used in this research. Interactive Writing is a writing strategy that enables teacher and students to collaborate ideas, hear sounds in words, and implement conventions of writing in order to compose a written piece by sharing the pen throughout the process (McCarrier Pinnel, & Fountas, 2000). Interactive Writing, an instructional writing method used for young children, derived from the language experience approach (LEA). The concept of an LEA lesson is centered on oral language development and personal experiences (Ashton-Warner, 1963; Smith, 2002). Elements from LEA were utilized to develop the writing method known as shared writing (McKenzie, 1985). Interactive Writing was developed in 1991 by a group of researcher at Ohio State University and teacher from Columbus, Ohio. They adapted from McKenzie’s research on share writing to include students’ participation through a “share pen” approach. McCarrier, Pinnel, & Fountas in Wall (2008: 149) make the process collaborative and interactive for students. Shared writing lessons are grounded in an event or a shared experience. A shared writing lesson enables the teacher to write the text while the children orally negotiate the written piece and are engaged in the structure of the writing process (Button, Johnson, & Furgerson, 1996).

As stated by Russo (1996: 83), in Interactive Writing students share to produce a written text on the board, created by all, corrected by all and savored by all. Each member is asked to write on the board and other students continue it. Another student can take part to help their friend to do so correctly. After finishing the text, the teacher can underline all errors of the morphology and syntax, spelling, mechanics and others, and then the teacher chooses another student to correct them.
The main point of Interactive Writing is to make the students active in learning writing. In Interactive Writing, students are required to give ideas, evaluating or correcting, and editing. The purpose of Interactive Writing is to provide opportunity for students to work on new and unknown words within familiar contexts and with the support of the teacher. The role of teacher is to encourage the students with some activities which promote interaction among students with the other students. The teacher plays role in monitoring and guiding the process, talking to students through various writing conventions that the group encounters while they write. On the other side, some students have difficulty continuing their friend’s work. The weaknesses appear when students take turn in composing the text together. They find difficulties in continuing their friend’s sentences. They have to brainstorm again to adapt the previous sentences produced by their friends.

The second technique that is used for comparison is Guided Writing. Guided Writing is another common teaching method which is usually used to teach writing. Guided Writing is free writing limited to structuring sentences, often in direct answer to question, the result of which looked like a short piece of discourse, usually a paragraph (Reid, 1993: 25).

Brown (2001: 334) states Guided Writing loosens the teacher’s control but still offers a series of stimulation. Teacher provides the first sentence, a last sentence, an outline and leads the students to analyze the content of the text. Students are helped to arrange their ideas into a structurally good text. In case, the students have little opportunity to create what they want to write. Guided Writing is only effective after the students have been exposed to many models and demonstration of the writing process. By using Guided Writing, the students get enough scaffolding in writing. It works well for students with less skill in writing, but not for the higher-skilled students. It may obstruct their interest in writing instead of encouraging them to make a good text. Students will get big portions of teacher’s scaffolding. It brings good impact in the process of writing for students.
Based on the explanation above, it can be assumed that Interactive Writing is more appropriate to be applied in teaching writing than Guided Writing because it leads students to be active during the lesson from the beginning until the end. By being active in the writing process, students will be able to arrange and share ideas with the scaffolding from the teacher. The students are not only mentally active but also physically active because the students are asked to work by group and they are invited to share their ideas on front of the class. The teacher’s role during Interactive Writing is as the facilitator to guide the student to express their ideas. It helps the students because the teacher provides scaffolds to the students who have a problem in writing a story. On the contrary, by using Guided Writing, the students are less active in doing the writing because they tend to follow the material provided by the teacher. Students will find difficulties in writing tests they take. They have difficulty to choose the idea because before doing the writing test they tend to imitate the text that the teacher has given. Therefore, the hypotheses of this research are as follows: (1) there is a significant difference in writing skill between students taught using Interactive Writing and students taught using Guided Writing in teaching writing to the eight grade of SMP N 1 Nguter in the academic year of 2015/2016 and (2) Interactive Writing is more effective than Guided Writing to teach writing to the eight grade of SMP N 1 Nguter in the academic year of 2015/2016.

**RESEARCH METHOD**

The researcher decided to use quasi-experimental research because it enables a researcher to identify causal relationships because it allows the researcher to observe, under controlled conditions, the effects of systematically changing one or more variables (Johnson and Christensen, 2000: 23). This research was conducted at the eighth grade of SMP N 1 Nguter from 22 April to 4 May 2016, in the academic year of 2015/2016. The two classes used as the sample were chosen randomly by the researcher from nine classes of grade eight in SMP N 1 Nguter. The two classes
were class VIII D which consists of 26 students as experimental group who were taught using Interactive Writing and VIII E which consist of 26 students as control group who were taught using Guided Writing.

In this research, the researcher conducted the try-out test in which the result was analyzed in terms of readability for the writing test instruction. It is tried out in one class that is not included in the research sample but at the same grade in the school. The researcher chose class VIII B which consists of 27 students to do the try-out test. It is necessary since there have been some cases in which students failed to do the test because they do not understand the given instruction.

Experimental and control groups were given pre-test on writing of recount text. After that, experimental group was taught by using Interactive Writing and control group was taught by using Guided Writing. The last, the experimental and control groups were given post-test again on writing of recount text. Post-test was conducted to compare the result of the two groups after they got different treatments.

Writing tests, as the research instrument, were used by the researcher to measure the students’ writing skill in order to collect the data. The data which were analyzed are pre-test and post-test scores of experimental group and control group. The data were compared using t-test formula to prove whether there is any significant difference between the two groups in writing skill, and to find which technique is more effective to teach writing.

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The aim of the research is to find out: (1) whether there is a significant difference in writing skill between students taught using Interactive Writing and students taught using Guided Writing; and (2) whether Interactive Writing is more effective than Guided Writing to teach writing. The data description of each group is presented as follows:
Table 1: The frequency distribution of experimental group pre-test scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Limits</th>
<th>Class Boundaries</th>
<th>Midpoint</th>
<th>Tally</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52 – 56</td>
<td>51.5 – 56.5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 – 61</td>
<td>56.5 – 61.5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>III I</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 – 66</td>
<td>61.5 – 66.5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>III I</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 – 71</td>
<td>66.5 – 71.5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 – 76</td>
<td>71.5 – 76.5</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest score of pre-test of experimental group is 73 while the highest score of post-test of experimental group is 79, so the difference of pre-test and post-test highest scores of experimental group is 6. The lowest score of pre-test of experimental group is 52 while the lowest score of post-test of experimental group is 58, so the difference of pre-test and post-test lowest score of experimental group is 6. The mean score of pre-test of experimental group is 63.15 while the mean score of post-test of experimental group is 71.88, so the difference of pre-test and post-test mean scores of experimental group is 8.73.
Figure 1: The difference between pre-test and post-test scores of experimental group.

Score of Control Group

Table 3: The frequency distribution of control group pre-test scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Limits</th>
<th>Class Boundaries</th>
<th>Midpoint</th>
<th>Tally</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52 – 56</td>
<td>51.5 – 56.5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 – 61</td>
<td>56.5 – 61.5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 – 66</td>
<td>61.5 – 66.5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 – 71</td>
<td>66.5 – 71.5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 – 76</td>
<td>71.5 – 76.5</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 26 100

Table 4: The frequency distribution of control group post-test scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Limits</th>
<th>Class Boundaries</th>
<th>Midpoint</th>
<th>Tally</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55 – 59</td>
<td>54.5 – 59.5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>HIII</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 – 64</td>
<td>59.5 – 64.5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>HII</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 – 69</td>
<td>64.5 – 69.5</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 – 74</td>
<td>69.5 – 74.5</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 – 81</td>
<td>74.5 – 80.5</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 26 100
The highest score of pre-test of control group is 76 while the highest score of post-test of control group is 81, so the difference of pre-test and post-test highest score of control group is 5. The lowest score of pre-test of control group is 52 while the lowest score of post-test of control group is 55, so difference of pre-test and post-test lowest score of control group is 3. The mean score of pre-test of control group is 62.26 while the mean score of post-test of control group is 66.46, so the difference of pre-test and post-test mean scores of control group is 4.20.

![Figure 2: The difference between pre-test and post-test scores of control group](image)

**Normality and Homogeneity of Pre-test Experimental and Control Groups**

The normality test used in this research is Liliefors testing at the level of significance of 0.05 ($\alpha = 0.05$), while the homogeneity testing used Bartlet formula at the level of significance of 0.05 ($\alpha = 0.05$). The computation results of the normality test of pre-test for experimental and control groups are both experimental group and control group are in normal distribution. In the data of experimental group, it can be seen that Lo is 0.1148. It is then consulted with L table for $n = 26$ at the level of significance of $0.05 = 0.1699$. It can be concluded that the data of experimental group are in normal distribution because the value of Lo is lower than Lt ($Lo < Lt$).
Meanwhile, the data of control group shows that Lo is 0.1561. It is then consulted with L table for n = 26 at the level of significance of 0.05 = 0.1699. It can be concluded that the data of control group are in normal distribution because the value of Lo is lower than Lt (Lo < Lt).

From the computation of homogeneity test of pre-test, it can be seen that \( \chi^2_o = 2.6836 \) is lower than \( \chi^2_t = 3.841 \) or \( \chi^2_o < \chi^2_t \). It can be concluded that the data are homogeneous because \( \chi^2_o \) is lower than \( \chi^2_t \).

**Normality and Homogeneity of Post-test Experimental and Control Groups**

From the computation of the normality test of post-test for experimental and control groups, it can be seen that the data of both experimental group and control group are in normal distribution. In the data of experimental group, it can be seen that Lo is 0.0944. It is then consulted with L table for n = 26 at the level of significance of 0.05 = 0.1699. It can be concluded that the data of experimental group are in normal distribution because the value of Lo is lower than Lt (Lo < Lt). Meanwhile, the data of control group show that Lo is 0.1172. It is then consulted with L table for n = 30 at the level of significance of 0.05 = 0.1699. It can be concluded that the data of control group are in normal distribution because the value of Lo is lower than Lt (Lo < Lt).

From the computation of homogeneity test of post-test, it can be seen that \( \chi^2_o = 2.862 \) is lower than \( \chi^2_t = 3.841 \) or \( \chi^2_o < \chi^2_t \). It can be concluded that the data are homogeneous because \( \chi^2_o \) is lower than \( \chi^2_t \).

**Hypothesis Testing**

The data which are analyzed in this research are pre-test and post-test scores of the two groups, experimental and control groups. The null hypothesis (Ho) of this research states that there is no significant difference in writing skill between students taught using Interactive Writing and students taught using Guided Writing. Statistically, the hypothesis can be \( H_o: \mu_1 = \mu_2 \). The alternative hypothesis (Ha) of this
research is that there is a significant difference in writing skill between students taught using Interactive Writing and students taught using Guided Writing. Statistically, the hypothesis can be formulated as \( H_a = \mu_1 \neq \mu_2 \). If \( t_o \) (t observation) is lower than \( t_t \) (t table) \( t_o < t_t \), \( H_0 \) is accepted. On the contrary, if \( t_o \) (t observation) is higher than \( t_t \) (t table) or \( t_o > t_t \), \( H_0 \) is rejected.

In pre-test, the sample should come from the same level of population and have no significant difference in the writing skill. To prove that the two groups have no significant difference, the researcher used the t-test. The result of t computation (t-test) of the pre-test shows that t observation \( (t_o) \) is 0.571 while t table \( (t_t) \) for degree of freedom 50 and the level of significance of 0.05 is 1.671. It is known that if \( t_o \) (t observation) is lower than \( t_t \) (t table) or \( t_o < t_t \), \( H_0 \) is accepted. It can be concluded that there is no significant difference in the students’ writing skill in the two classes in the pre-test.

The researcher also used the t-test to test the first hypotheses. The data which are analyzed in this research are post-test scores of the groups, experimental and control groups. The result of t computation shows that t observation \( (t_o) \) is 3.766, while t table \( (t_t) \) for the degree of freedom 50 and the level of significance of 0.05 is 1.671. It is known that if \( t_o \) (t observation) is higher than \( t_t \) (t table) or \( t_o > t_t \), \( H_0 \) is rejected. Then, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference in writing skill between students taught using Interactive Writing and students taught using Guided Writing.

The second hypothesis of this research is that Interactive Writing is more effective than Guided Writing to teach writing. To test the second hypothesis, the researcher compares the post-test mean scores of the two groups. The mean of the scores of experimental group is 71.88, while the mean of the score of control group is 66.46. The mean score of experimental group is higher than the mean score of control group. It can be concluded that Interactive Writing is more effective than Guided Writing to teach writing.
The result of the research shows that there is a significant difference in the writing skill between the students taught using Interactive Writing and students taught using Guided Writing and Interactive Writing is more effective than Guided Writing to teach writing ($\bar{X}_1 > \bar{X}_2$).

Discussion

The result of the research shows that there is a significant difference in the writing skill between the students taught using Interactive Writing technique and those taught by using Guided Writing technique. It can be concluded that Interactive Writing is more effective than Guided Writing technique to teach writing ($\bar{X}_1 > \bar{X}_2$).

In the implementation of Interactive Writing technique, the students share and develop their ideas in group discussion. The use of Interactive Writing gives students opportunities to be active and work cooperatively because Interactive Writing lead the students to be active during the lesson from the beginning until the end. For example, in the drafting session, the students should negotiate by sharing their ideas and opinion about what they are going to write. Every student should arrange and share their ideas in their mind. It means that they are mentally active during Interactive Writing. The students are not only mentally active but also physically active by coming forward in front of the class to write their own sentences one by one. Interactive Writing gives students a chance to share their language experience through writing activity to compose a story and encourage the students to be active to participate in sharing their ideas. Gunning (2010: 196) mentions that in Interactive Writing, students do some of the physical writing of the story. It can be given a figure that the students write about experiences they have had or books that have been read to them and it is to be the basic for the writing class. In Interactive Writing, the students’ participation is as a must because in Interactive
Writing, all students are hoped to involve in giving ideas, evaluating or correcting and editing.

In Interactive Writing, the students think what they know about the topic. They share the ideas and negotiate with their group what they want to write. It encourages the students to be active in thinking, sharing, developing, organizing, and correcting their ideas in group discussion before writing. It is mentioned by Callella and Jordano (2002: 3-4) that in the process of Interactive Writing, every student is given opportunity to apply what he or she knows about language and build on their prior knowledge. Students have an active role in the writing process as the teacher scaffolds the learning. The teacher’s role during Interactive Writing is as the facilitator to guide the student to express their ideas. It helps the students because the teacher provides scaffolds to the student who have a problem in write a story. Therefore, in the Interactive Writing class, students are active in the pre-writing activity, during writing activity, and post-writing activity. Students are not only mentally active but also physically active during Interactive Writing. As states by McCarier Pinnel & Fountas, 2000) that Interactive Writing is a writing strategy that enables teacher and students to collaborate ideas, hear sounds in words, and implement conventions of writing in order to compose a written piece by sharing the pen throughout the process.

On the contrary, in Guided Writing technique, the students are less active in doing the writing because they tend to follow the material provided by the teacher. It makes their works have similarities with the provided text. They have a little opportunity to cooperate with other students because they only focus on following material given by the teacher. Ontario (2005: 54) mentions that Guided Writing makes students less active in doing the writing because they only follow the outline that already provided. Some of the students find difficulty when they are asked to write different topic from the model text. It shows that the students write by imitating and follow the outline that given by the teacher. As stated by Hyland (2003: 4), Guided Writing is a technique in which the learners imitate the model text
given by the teacher. When the teacher does not give a model text, the students get difficulties in writing.

In summary, the result of the research shows that there is a significant difference in writing skill between the students taught using Interactive Writing Technique and the students taught using Guided Writing Technique and that teaching writing using Interactive Writing Technique is more effective than teaching writing using Guided Writing Technique.

CONCLUSION

Based on the result of the research, the findings are as: (1) there is a significant difference in writing skill between the students taught using Interactive Writing techniques and those taught using Guided Writing technique of the 8th grade students of SMP N 1 Nguter in academic year 2015/2016; and (2) Interactive Writing is more effective than Guided Writing to teach writing for the 8th grade students of SMP N 1 Nguter in academic year 2015/2016. The result of the research shows that Interactive Writing gives better result in writing skill than Guided Writing. It means that Interactive writing is effective to be implemented as the technique in teaching writing.
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