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ABSTRACT

NING SETIO WATI. NIM: S891108071. 2013. The Effectiveness of Collaborative Writing method to Teach Writing Skill Viewed from Students’ Creativity (An Experimental Study at the Third Semester Students of English Department at State Islamic College (STAIN) of Jurai Siwo Metro in the Academic Year of 2012/2013). THESIS. Consultant I: Prof. Dr. Joko Nurkanoto, M.Pd, II: Dra. Dewi Rochsantiningsih, M.Ed., Ph.D. English Education Department, Graduate School, Sebelas Maret University.

This research aims at establishing whether: (1) Collaborative Writing method is more effective than Direct Instruction method to teach writing skill; (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 skill to the third semester students of English Department, State Islamic College (STAIN) of Jurai Siwo Metro in the academic year of 2012/2013.

The method which was applied in this research was experimental study. The population of this research was the third semester students of English Department which consists of 218 students. The sample of the research was two classes; the class C was used as the experimental class and class B as the control class. The sampling technique used was cluster random sampling. Each class was divided into two groups (the students having high and low creativity). The techniques of collecting data were creativity test for collecting data of students’ creativity and writing test for collecting the data of students’ writing skill. The data were analyzed by using Multifactor Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test of 2x2 and Tukey test.

The result of data analysis shows that: (1) Collaborative Writing method differs significantly from Direct Instruction method to teach writing because $F_0 > F_t$ and $q_o > q_t$ (between $A_1$ and $A_2$) > $q_t$; (2) students having high creativity differ significantly from those having low creativity because $F_0 > F_t$ and $q_o$ (between $B_1$ and $B_2$) > $q_t$; and (3) there is an interaction between teaching methods and students’ creativity in teaching writing because $F_0 > F_t$, and the result of Tukey test shows that: (a) for the students having high creativity, Collaborative Writing method differs significantly from Direct Instruction method to teach writing because $q_o$ (between $A_1B_1$ and $A_2B_1$) > $q_t$; and (b) for the students having low creativity, Direct Instruction method differs significantly from Collaborative Writing method to teach writing because $q_o$ (between $A_1B_2$ and $A_2B_2$) > $q_t$.

Based on the result of the research, it can be concluded that Collaborative Writing method is an effective method to teach writing. The research also shows that the effect of teaching method depends on the students’ creativity. Therefore, English teachers are expected to be able to select the appropriate teaching method to teach writing for the students having high and low creativity.

Keywords: Collaborative Writing method; Writing Skill; Creativity.
MOTTO

Knowledge is like a wild animal, and writing is a precise rope to tight it up. Thus, tight your wild animal up to its tightening rope.

(Imam Syafi’i)
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

A. Background of the Study

Writing is one of language skills. Besides writing skill, there are some other language skills, such as: listening, speaking, and reading. Each skill is interconnected with each other and closely related. Those skills are acquired by some relationship of a regular sequence. In fact, the first skill is listening where the skill is obtained when the fetus is in the womb. When the baby is born, he has reaction to cry or to smile in responding a variety of sounds that are heard. After the listening skill, the child will be able to start speaking. The child will grow up adult and he begins “to learn” and “to read” when he looks something. After the reading skill, he will be able to write down what he hears, what he speaks about, and what he reads.

As stated by Grundy (1991:1), writing is putting the spoken language into written form is only true for activities like taking down dictation or transcribing a tape. It means that writing is one of activities that are productive and expressive. In writing, the writer must master content, organization, grammar, mechanic, and vocabulary. Writing skill does not come automatically, but it must go through training and practice numerously and regularly. Practicing to write starts from elementary school until University. Unconsciously, the ability to write will be acquired by the students when they keep practicing to write intensively.

For students of English Education Department, having a good writing skill is very important and it cannot be denied. One of the reasons is that in learning
activities students are always engaged in a variety of writing activities especially for writing course and other courses. It is one of the English skills that are taught in English Department of State Islamic College (STAIN) of Jurai Siwo Metro. The course is given for four semesters which has the ultimate goal that the students should be able to write scientific papers in English well.

Furthermore, good writing is necessary for success in college as well as in many professions. Writing is the vital means of communication within an organization. Therefore, the ideal condition of English writing class involves the students’ participation actively in writing class. Writing is one of the important ways of expressing the thoughts, and communicating the ideas. They are able to use all aspects of writing, which consist of content, organization, vocabulary, grammatical accuracy, and mechanic, in their written communication. Those aspects of writing are important to be mastered by the students.

Meanwhile, based on the observation of the researcher in the field, learning to write still does not fulfill the requirement. For example, when a lecturer teaches writing course, the students get silent and feel confused to start writing. These factors will influence it, whether the lecturer who uses methods or techniques is not attractive or the students who is not creative in writing. Both of them are the things that do not trigger the students to write so that some students always think of resistances in writing, such as: (1) They are still confused to organize their ideas when they begin to write. (2) They must use good grammar to make a good sentence. (3) The choice of vocabulary is sometimes not appropriate
in writing the paragraph. (4) They are still confused to write relevant topic with the content of the paragraph.

Referring to the cases above, the low students' writing skill is reflected by the method is used by lecturer inappropriate for students and the students have not creative thinking in writing. Therefore, to create excitement among the students, they need the appropriate method in learning writing skill. The lecturers are required to be creative in choosing a method of learning, because it is capable of realizing stimulation in developing students' creativity to write.

In the context of teaching language, the teaching writing skill is the significant part of the language skills. Sometimes the activity of writing is not designed in such an interesting way which can create students’ creativity. Learning to write in English is a complex process because of a piece of writing, as a written communication requires the writers’ skill to use not only their linguistic competence but also their communicative competence. This idea is also supported by Raimes (1983:3). He states that:

“First, writing reinforces the grammatical structures, idiom, and vocabulary that we have been teaching our students. Second, when our students write, they also have a chance to be adventurous with the language, to go beyond what they have just learned to say, to take a risks. Third, when they write, they necessarily become varied that involved with the new language: the effort to express ideas and the constant use of eye, hand, and brain is a unique way to reinforce learning”.

Furthermore, from the explanation above, the lecturers must be more creative in providing and applying interesting method of teaching writing to encourage them to be more creative in a classroom interaction. The lecturers should also apply students-centered, in which the lecturers give chance for
students to write more. The students will realize that they have important roles in this activity and get accustomed to writing English. It is important to give chance for students to write more and to get accustomed in writing English because it will build up their creativity.

Meanwhile, collaborative writing method is able to be an alternative to teach writing course. Mulligan, et al. (2011) defines that collaborative writing assignments and peer editing, as done in pairs or small groups, can have numerous affective benefits for the learner. In practice, the students are required learning in small groups where they will jointly discuss the writing that should discuss. Furthermore, after the discussion is completed, they must make individual responses. Then, in small groups, they required to ask his friend to read each other (proofread) and provide input to the response made. After a few times correction process, only then can the result of writing be submitted to the lecturer to be assessed. This is the substance of collaborative writing.

On the contrary, many teachers who still use individual method, such as Direct Instruction method. Direct Instruction (also called expository or didactic teaching) is a strategy in which the teacher is the major provider of information. In the Direct Instruction model, the teacher’s role is to pass on facts, rules, or action sequences to students in the most direct way possible; this usually takes the form of explanations, examples, and opportunities for practice and feedback (Borich, 1996: 244). In a direct instruction lesson, the teacher usually spends some time lecturing and then the teacher guides the students through a complex problem, with the problem broken down into simple steps; then the students are given one
by one the simple steps to carry out on their own. Finally, the students are given one or many sample problems to accomplish on their own. In each case, the timing of the lesson and the knowledge the student will be very much under the teacher's control. It can cause low skill for students in expressing their ideas in writing activities, because they have not struggled with the problem themselves.

In addition, the researcher assumes that the method is more focused on outcomes rather than processes. Meanwhile, an approach which is considered as a good approach for now is a process approach. In the product approach, students are only emphasized to write and then the lecturer will give assessment. Moreover, by using the process approach, students will be taught the stages of writing that is a cycle in writing, such as: prewriting, drafting, sharing and responding, revising, and editing, publishing. With more emphasis on the process approach, students are expected to be more independent and understand of the steps to produce in a good writing.

Therefore, in learning collaborative writing skills, students will help each other to improve their writing through peer correction process (peer correction). By using this method, they are able to correct about their grammar to one another, especially the development of their writing and organizing their ideas. This method is easily applied in teaching writing skills because it does not demand the existence of a complex learning media. On the contrary, a lecturer is required only to prepare the topics to be discussed and responded, and conditioned the passage of the discussion process. The evaluation of students' writing is done on the final stage of the collaborative process by the students themselves. The lecturer only
gives feedback and evaluates the students’ writing of the final draft through the
process of cross-correction.

Moreover, other factor that also determines the success of teaching writing
is students’ creativity. It plays an important role to produce a good understandable
writing. According to Grainger, *et al.* (2005: 13), the creative process of writing
involves us in making choices about our stance, content, structure and language,
and creating combinations and connections between ideas and images. It means
that creativity is a process involves the creation of new ideas or concepts that are
fit for a particular writing purpose, or new associations of the creative mind
between existing ideas and concepts. An alternative conception of creativeness is
that it is simply the act of making something new. The creativity has a very
influential factor to yield a good writing. It is an ability to think creatively and to
measure one’s fluency, flexibility, and originality of a verbal form, which deals
with words and sentences.

In line to the definition above, Khan (2012) describes the close affinity
between creativity and creative writing in Pakistan. He collects the data from the
questionnaire and focus group interview with a large public sector university’s
Master of Arts in English students. He has discovered in service school teachers
that English teachers in Pakistan do not teach to develop the creative abilities of
pupils. The findings explicitly reveal that these teachers choose topics from the
textbooks and explain them for writing in the classroom. The evidence shows that
English teachers are confused about strategies needed in rousing learners’ interest
in creative writing. Thus, in Pakistan, English teachers must be encouraged and
trained to engage in activities that are essential for enhancing creativity and creative writing.

Considering the explanation above, an experiment will be conducted to see which methods, Collaborative Writing method or Direct Instruction method will be more effective in resulting writing performance viewed from students’ creativity. In other words, the researcher is interested to conduct the research that discusses “The Effectiveness of Collaborative Writing to Teach Writing Skill Viewed from Students’ Creativity (An Experimental Study at the Third Semester Students of English Department, State Islamic College of Jurai Siwo Metro in the Academic Year of 2012/2013)”.

B. Problem Identification

Based on the elaboration of the background, there are some problems that can be identified as follows:

1. Why do the students still have low interest in learning English especially writing?
2. How far do the students get difficulties to organize their ideas in making a good paragraph?
3. Why do the students still have confusion of using appropriate mechanics in writing?
4. How does the Collaborative Writing method influence on learning of writing to students’ creativity?
5. Do the different levels of students’ creativity affect on the students’ learning achievement in writing?

6. Do the students prefer learning using Collaborative Writing method rather than Direct Instruction method?

C. Problem Limitation

This research has some problems, it is necessary to limit the problems, so this research will be more accurate, effective, and understandable. Therefore, the researcher will focus on the teaching method used in this research. They are Collaborative Writing method and Direct Instruction method. Both of the teaching methods will be applied in teaching writing to the third semester students of English Department at State Islamic College (STAIN) of Jurai Siwo Metro in the academic year of 2012/2013.

D. Problem Formulation

Based on the background of study, problem identification, and problem limitation above, the problem can be specified into more detailed questions as follows:

1. Is Collaborative Writing method more effective than Direct Instruction method in teaching writing?

2. Do students who have high creativity have better writing achievement than those who have low creativity?

3. Is there any interaction between teaching method and students’ creativity?
E. Objectives of the Research

In accordance with the problems stated above, the objectives of the research are:

1. To analyze whether Collaborative Writing method is more effective than Direct Instruction method to teach writing.
2. To analyze whether the students having high creativity have better writing skill than those having low creativity.
3. To analyze whether there is an interaction between teaching methods and students’ creativity in teaching writing.

F. Benefit of the Research

This research is expected to be able to give some benefits to lecturers who teach English, especially writing skill of the English Department at STAIN Jurai Siwo Metro and English lecturers in general because they can get a clear description of how to use the method in teaching writing skill effectively to students. Besides, it can lead him or her of how to create learning process by using Collaborative Writing method and Direct Instruction method. Thus, they can teach the students creatively in the classroom so the students will not feel bored to join in the learning activity.

Meanwhile, the benefits for the students, the teaching method used can serve them more comfortable and supporting situations inside the classroom, so that they will be more interested in joining the class. The students can make social interaction that can help foster a sense of accountability, cooperation and
community. Dealing with their English writing competence in learning English, they will be easier to organize their idea by using Collaborative Writing method, so that they will able be to increase their English achievement and writing performance.

Furthermore, the benefits for readers, it will probably be used as the reference for those who want to conduct a research in an English teaching process, especially that has related to Collaborative Writing method and Writing skill. At least, it can be used as an input or only a large knowledge in English teaching. Besides, the readers can understand the difference of high and low students’ creativity. It can be used as inspiration to create creative thinking to teach writing skill.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Theoretical Description

1. Writing

a. The Definition of Writing

Writing activity involves the procedures of thinking process and making decision to produce written texts used for communication in daily activities. As stated by Harris (1993:10) writing is a process that occurs over a period of time, particularly if we take into account the sometimes extended periods of thinking that precede creating an initial draft. Furthermore, Chandra Segaran (2002:1) defines writing as a mental activity of skilful decision-making, appropriate for the situation. It means that the writer is able to make decision as consideration to the purpose of writing, the objectives of the readers in reading the text, situation and condition during the process of writing done.

Moreover, writing, like playing tennis, is an activity made up of several processes, such as thinking what to write and the order to put it in (Grundy, 1991:7). In the process, writing and thinking are so inseparable, if the writer cannot think clearly about an idea, he cannot write well. On the contrary, if he has creative thinking in the writing process, the actual writing process will be easier. Meanwhile, Hyland (2002) states that writing is seen as a process through which writers discover and reformulate their ideas as they attempt to create meaning. It is more of a problem solving activity than an act of communication. How people approach a writing task as the solution to a series of problems.
In addition, Crime and Lea (2008: 5) define that writing consists of words and these words are put together in particular formations to make sentences. Sentences are then grouped together into paragraphs. Moreover, Celce-Murcia (2000: 142) defines that writing is the production of the written word that results in a text but the text must be read and comprehended in order for communication to take place. As a writer must be able to arrange the words into sentences in the form of the written text in which the reader will eventually understand the ideas and their meaning. Thus, the writer is demanded to pay attention to some aspects of the production of the written text which involves the content, organization, vocabulary use, grammatical use, and mechanical considerations such as spelling and punctuation.

Based on the theories above, it can be assumed that writing is a thinking process to produce a written text. It is obtained by process of thinking to arrange the words into the sentences, and then the sentences are grouped together into the paragraphs. The result of the written text is a reflection of the mental activity of the writer in understanding the context situation that faced by the writer.

b. Micro and Macro-Skill for Writing

Writing is the productive skill in the written mode. It is complicated, and often seems to be the hardest of the skills. It is one of language skills which are considered important, because it is one of means for communication with other people in addition to listening, speaking, and reading. Thus, students must be able to write well, they need to acquire micro and macro-skills of writing. According to
Brown (2001: 343) there are two categories of writing skills. They are micro and macro skills. The followings are the list of micro and macro skills for writing:

Micro Skills
(a) Produce grapheme and orthographic patterns of English; (b) Produce writing at an efficient rate of speed to suit the purpose; (c) Produce an acceptable core of words and use appropriate word order patterns; (d) Use acceptable grammatical systems (e.g. tense, agreement, pluralization patterns and rules); (e) Express a particular meaning in different grammatical forms; (f) Use cohesive devices in written discourse.

Macro Skills
(a) Use the rhetorical forms and conventions of written discourse; (b) Appropriately accomplish the communicative function of written texts according to form and purpose; (c) Convey links and connection between events, and communicate such relation as main idea, supporting idea, new information, given information, generalization, and exemplification; (d) Distinguish between literal and implied meanings when writing; (e) Correctly convey culturally specific references in the context of the written text; (f) Develop and use of writing strategies, such accurately assessing the audience’s interpretation, using pre-writing devices, writing the fluency in the first drafts, using paraphrases and synonyms, soliciting peer and instructor feedback, and using feedback for revising and editing.

Skill refers to the ability to perform a task or activity consistently over period time. Thus, it cannot be acquired instantly. It is acquired through training a lot. The earlier micro skills above apply more appropriately to imitative and intensive types of writing task, while macro skills are essential for the successful mastery of responsive and extensive writing. In this case, the researcher focused on micro skill due to the appropriateness of writing task, intensive type, used in this research.

Moreover, Orwig in Armana (2011) gives a definition of writing as a skill saying that: It is a productive skill that is more complicated than it seems at first,
and often seems to be the most difficult of the skills since it has a number of micro skills such as: using orthography correctly, spelling and punctuation conventions, using vocabulary in a correct way and using the appropriate style. Then, Salah in Armana (2011) defines writing as a craft that needs tools. These tools are the sub-skills of writing such as mechanics of writing and text organization. It means that the students have to more pay attention in using the micro skills to produce a good writing. Those are able to be aspects that are going to be evaluated, so the students can easily understand the standardized evaluation in specific criteria.

Furthermore, McCarthy in Albaaly et al (2010) focuses on some micro-skills such as: the ability to use grammar successfully, the ability to use the right word/ words, the ability to compose a sentence/ a paragraph/an essay, the ability to punctuate a passage on one page, the ability to weave sentences into a paragraph to produce a theme. The skills are needed to be mastered by the students. It means that those are the essential of the writing skill to express and produce a good written text.

From the definitions above, it can be concluded that writing is productive skill that is more complecated than listening, reading, and speaking skills. The writing skill is used to express needs and feelings by using a variation of certain micro-skills such as: creating the substance of the text well, organizing the ideas, using the appropriate vocabulary, using grammar correctly, and using the appropriate mechanics. The micro skills are used to evaluate the students in performing of writing.
Referring to syllabus of English Department employed at STAIN Jurai Siwo Metro, the genre text covered in standard competence are narration, description, exposition, and persuasion/argumentation. The standard competence of Writing III is making an outline and expressing meaning in written functional text and simple essay in the form of narration, description, exposition, and persuasion /argumentation in everyday life context. In this case, the researcher focused on the descriptive text only. Therefore, the indicators of writing in this research are: (1) Students are able to create the substance of writing in descriptive text, the experience of the main idea (unity); (2) Students are able to write logical organization of the content (coherence) and the correct generic structure of descriptive text; (3) Students are able to select the words that are suitable with content in descriptive text; (4) Students are able to use the correct grammatical and syntactic pattern in descriptive text; (5) Students are able to the use of the mechanics of language.

c. The Characteristics of Good Writing

Most of students have the capacity to make their writing well and effective. They always think that good writing is the written text that contains no bad mistakes, such as: error of grammar, vocabulary used, and mechanical used. The main purpose of good writing for students is they can present relevant information in written text to the reader in a manner that is easy to understand. Therefore, they have to understand the characteristics of good writing to support them in producing a good writing. Related to the characteristics of good writing,
Altakhaineh (2010) defines the six points of the main characteristics of good academic writing. They are as follows:

1) **Organization**

When students start to write, they must think of how to organize their writing firstly. In this phase, they really need to focus on a clear introduction, body, and the conclusion. It means that the introduction is a key part in which the writer must interpret the title or question and tell the readers the map that they are going to follow through the piece of the writing. The progression of ideas and paragraphing must be clear and supported with examples. They also have to present a reasonable number of alternative points of view and to achieve a sense of argumentation. Thus, they will have the conclusion that should present the results of the investigation and provide a solution to the problem that has been set.

2) **Task achievement or Relevance to Question (title)**

In academic writing, students must be able to produce the writing directly that relevant to the title. They have to approach the task in a direct and efficient way. The development of the argument must be relevant, accurate and appropriate. As stated by Davies (2008), the successful academic writing must address a topic or title clearly. It means that the students must be careful of what the information they include in the essay nothing that “interesting information” may not necessarily be orientated towards the question that is being asked. When doing a final review of their work, it is important to focus on the relationships between the ideas that have been discussed.
3) Accuracy

In accuracy, students have to have high standards of grammar, word choice, vocabulary, spelling and punctuation. Brown and Hood (1998) believe that spelling and punctuation are writing sub-skills. It means that the accuracy of grammar, vocabulary, spelling and punctuation is very important to support their results of good writing. If they are not able to mastery it, they will confuse to understand the meaning of the sentences. Therefore, the students have to know some strategies to avoid having mistakes that generally cause confusion in writing.

4) Range and style

Good writing must also show an effective style. It is important to show a good range of vocabulary and sentence structures and to avoid repetition. However, the teacher will recognize to the students that there is an element of subjectivity in evaluation, as well as a difference in the styles commended by various disciplines. Although, many faculties may have difficulty characterizing the style of a specific piece of writing as appropriate or inappropriate, they will generally agree that an effective style conveys ideas and information precisely, concisely and in a manner appropriate to the context of a particular a good writing. Therefore, good style is very important in an academic text because it is not the written for a specific individual but for the benefit of other people. It should be written in a way which is accessible and understandable to people in various academic circles.
5) Coherence and cohesion

In an academic context, it is necessary to have good use of linking words to join the ideas within and between sentences and paragraphs and there is no unnecessary repetition. This is called cohesion. Then, coherence can be defined as a text is perceived as coherent when it makes consistent sense, with or without the help of devices of cohesion (Carter, 1999). In other words, coherence implies that the text must make sense and cohesion means that it must be appropriately structured and interlinked by suitable signposts and linking words.

6) Appropriateness and referencing

The language must be appropriate to the given topic within an academic context. The students have to make appropriate use of source texts and of direct and indirect quotations too. They also have to provide adequate references or bibliography details. In other words, the written text can be said well, if the written text has appropriate references which are recognized as credible and reliable sources.

Based on the definition above, it can be concluded that written text can be categorized in a good writing if the students can use some points in written language for communication, such as: Organization, Task achievement or Relevance to Question (title), Accuracy, Range and style, Coherence and cohesion, Appropriateness and referencing. The characteristics can be used to measure the criteria of evaluation. Thus, the evaluation is an obligation where the results will inform the students’ capability in writing.
d. The Stages in Writing Process

The ability to write articulately gives one the power and opportunity to share and influence thoughts, ideas, and opinions with others, not only in day-to-day situations, but across time and space. Writing is also one of the most difficult skills to master in both of the first language and the second language. It causes everybody writes a little differently from everybody else. Therefore, in writing process students need some stages to produce a piece of writing well.


1) Pre-writing

Widodo (2008) states this stage is geared to stimulate ideas or thoughts for the students to get started. Pre-writing also assists student writers in deciding what to write about so that they can organize their thoughts. Therefore, in this stage has the purpose to help the student in organizing their ideas and to make a planning of what they are going to writer. They are able to explore certain topics in an unstructured and non-threatening way before working on formal essays. For novice student writers, pre-writing is thought of as a prerequisite for producing good essays.

2) Drafting and Writing

In this phase, the students are encouraged to develop their ideas into rough drafts without considering the grammatical accuracy first. As previously described, in the process based writing, the grammatical accuracy will be
emphasized during the revising stage (Widodo, 2008). It means that students are not supposed to make rough drafts perfect in grammatical accuracy in that this process of writing class is a continuous process of discovery. The important thing is they are able to promote the fluency of ideas so that a certain writing task can smoothly be completed.

3) Sharing and responding

Sharing means just what it says: sharing your work with other people and getting some feedback about how you are doing (Peha, 2002: 10). Meanwhile, Widodo (2008) states that responding or giving feedback is primarily intended to see students first or second drafts. In this phase, teacher will help the students in responding the result of making the drafts. They are required to be active in participating in the classroom, when they give the responds to other students. In other words, in this phase, the students will get the feedback from other students and they will be involved to think creatively in which the goal is to encourage the students to write better.

4) Revising and Editing

According to Widodo (2008) revising does not simply involve looking at language errors but also addresses the global content and organization of ideas so that the writer’s intent is made clearer to the reader. The students will revise their work based on the feedback given in the responding stage from the other students. In the stage, they have discussed and evaluated some mistakes of the drafts. Moreover, in revising stage involves four distinctly different things that students often have to do all at the same time: (a) Adding things; (b) Moving
things; (c) Cutting things; and (d) Leaving things alone. Furthermore, editing means taking care of any problems that students get involved in writing conventions like spelling, punctuation, grammar, and usage. Editing is hard because there are a lot of things that they need to know in order to do it well, such as: to edit for spelling they have to know many words and be able to use a dictionary, and to edit for punctuation they have to understand how to use every type of punctuation your writing needs.

5) Publishing

Publishing is all about preparing a piece of writing so that it can be read, understood, and enjoyed by the public (Peha, 2002: 19). The main idea is that the publishing stage is the chance of the students to prepare their writing in a way that will best reach their audience. Publishing can be a very satisfying part of writing. In this stage, students are able to publish their result of writing in media online or notice boards. It means that it can be a reward for students that they have done their writing well and it can encourage them to write better.

From the definition above, it can be assumed that writing process is one of effective ways to teach the students. Although, there are many stages in writing, the students may use different stages to express their ideas. The stages will help the students to be easier in producing the written text. Referring the stages, the students are required to evaluate their strengths and weaknesses of their writing ability and to think of how they will make further improvements for their writing skill. It is also important to ensure the students become confident and independent in writing process.
e. Writing Assessment

Assessment is integral of learning. Assessment of learning refers to strategies designed to confirm what students know whether they have met curriculum outcomes or the goals of their individualized programs. As stated by Brown (2004: 4) assessment is an ongoing process that encompasses a much wider domain. Whenever a student responds to a question, offers a comment, or tries out a new word or structure, the teacher subconsciously makes an assessment of the student’s performance. It means that assessment is a part of learning that is an ongoing part of everyday. In learning activities, the assessment will cover between the teacher and the students. The teacher will assess of a sample of students’ behavior and drawing inferences about their performance in knowledge and abilities that informs his teaching. In other hand, the students will get the information or feedback about their learning in assessment process.

In line with writing assessment, it can take many forms and should take into account both product and process. Brown (2001:348) defines writing is a composing process and usually requires multiple drafts before an effective product is created; make sure that students are carefully led through appropriate stages in the process of composing. The important of the process is assessed because the product is the end result of a series of activities. Meanwhile, Hyland (2003: 226) states that writing product can be assessed through employing some methods of scoring. There are three types of rating scales generally used in scoring writing. They are holistic, analytic, and trait-based scoring. In both types
of assessment, processes and products are the components that must be integrated in the assessment of writing skills.

1) Types of Scoring Method

The scoring rubric can be used both in product approach and process approach. Commonly, there are three types of rating scales used in scoring writing. They are holistic scoring, primary trait, and analytic scoring. The explanation of each type of scoring method will be described as follows:

a) Holistic Scoring

Holistic scoring uses a variety of criteria to produce a single score. Brown (2004: 242) states each point on a holistic scale is given a systematic set of descriptors and the reader-evaluator matches and overall impression with the descriptors to arrive at a score. Descriptors usually follow a prescribed pattern. Meanwhile, O’Malley (1996: 142) states that rationale for using a holistic scoring system is that the total quality of written text is more than the sum of its components. Writing is viewed as integrated whole. The elements of the holistic scoring involve three dimensions, as follows:

(1) Idea development/organization: focuses on central idea with appropriate elaboration and conclusion;

(2) Fluency/structure: appropriate verb tense used with a variety of grammatical and syntactic structures;
(3) Word choice: uses varied and precise vocabulary appropriate for purpose; and mechanics: absence of errors in spelling, capitalization, and punctuation.

b) Primary Trait

Primary trait focuses on “how well students can write within a narrowly defined range of discourse” (Weighle in Brown, 2004: 242). This type of scoring emphasizes the task at hand and assigns a score based on the effectiveness of the text’s achievement. To rate the primary trait of text, there four points scales ranging from zero (no response or fragmented response) to 4 (the purpose in unequivocally accomplished in a convincing fashion). A primary trait score would assess:

(1) The accuracy of the account of the original (summary);
(2) The clarity of the steps of the procedure and the final result (lab report);
(3) The description of the main features of the graph (graph description);
(4) The expression of the writer’s opinion (response to an article).

c) Analytic Scoring

Analytic scoring focuses on the principle function of the text and offers some feedback potentials, but no wash back any written production that enhances the ultimate accomplishment of the purpose (Brown, 2004: 234). Classroom evaluation of learning is best served through analytic scoring, in which as many as five major elements of writing competence are scored, thus enabling learners to
home in weaknesses and to capitalize on strengths. They are organization, content, grammar, mechanics, and style. The point value for each element of writing is not the same. The differences are based on the emphasis of the goal and student’s need.

Since the goal of writing assessment is to help students become better and more confident writers, scoring rubric plays important role in assessing students’ writing. The analytic scoring covers organization, content, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics that are considered the most appropriate since it is in line with the aspects of writing competence: content treatment, grammar, style, and mechanics. Using analytic scoring rubric is quite substantial because students will receive specific feedback on their performance with respect to each of the individual scoring criteria. Besides, from the data gathered, it is possible to know the students strengths and weaknesses.

In addition, the important writing assessment is scoring the performance of students. Jacob, et al in Reid (1993: 236) develops scoring rubric including aspects: content, organization, vocabulary, language use (grammar), and mechanics. The students can get a maximum of a hundred scores in all of these aspects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD</td>
<td>30-27</td>
<td>knowledgeable, substantive development of thesis, relevant to assign topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOD TO AVERAGE</td>
<td>26-22</td>
<td>Sure knowledge of subject, adequate range, limited development thesis, mostly relevant to topic but lack detail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIR TO POOR</td>
<td>21-17</td>
<td>limited knowledge of subject, little substances, inadequate development of the topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY POOR</td>
<td>16-13</td>
<td>does not show knowledge of subject, non-substantive, not pertinent, or not enough to evaluate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the explanation of the scoring rubric in writing stated by Jacob, et al in Reid above, there are five scales used in assessing writing performance.

The range of scores and the kinds of skills included may not be the same. However, as a whole what evaluated in writing test are content, organization, vocabulary, language uses or grammar, and mechanics. In this research, the
researcher uses the scoring rubric test because it provides clearer description for each aspect of writing.

2. Collaborative Writing Method

a. The Definition of Collaborative Writing Method

According to Andersen (2011:1), collaboration is about people working together to achieve goals. It means that working in a group on a project can be a pleasure. The responsibilities are equitably divided and large problems dissolved under a variety of perspectives. It is supported by Hill & Hill (1990: 7), collaborative classrooms operate on three important principles, such as: (1) Cooperative skills are taught, practiced, and feedback is given on how well the skills were used. (2) The class is encouraged to operate as a cohesive group. (3) Individuals are given responsibility for their own learning and behavior.

Meanwhile, Barkley, et al., (2005: 256) define that in Collaborative Writing, student pairs or triads write a formal paper together. Each student contributes at each stage of the writing process: brainstorming ideas; gathering and organizing information; and drafting, revising, and editing the writing. It means that in pairs or triads, students will produce better work than when they worked alone. Collaborative Writing will improve document quality by pooling the strengths of group members. At the same time, individual weaknesses are caught by the group and revised. Ultimately, collaboration can be a form of motivation for students as they become excited about working with a group as well as the prospect of learning from other students.
Furthermore, Murray in Nunan (1992: 103) states that Collaborative Writing was essentially a social process through which writers looked for areas of shared understanding. To get an understanding, the students have to consider about several social and interactional rules, such as: a common goal, the differential knowledge, the interacted as a group, and distanced themselves from the text. In common goal, the students discuss the goals which they are going to write. They place the goals in rank order from high to low, and then they share a higher order goal.

Moreover, Bosley in Benjamin (2004: 71) defines Collaborative Writing as two or more people working together to produce one written document in a situation in which a group takes responsibility for having produced the document. From the situation, they set a common goal for the group, and specification of the goal is negotiated during the process. In differential knowledge, the students must have different knowledge and there must be gap information between them. Because of this information gap, they (group members) have to negotiate content, style, and even the goal of writing. Then, Higgins, et al in Storch (2005) state that Collaborative Writing is a way to foster reflective thinking, especially if the learners are engaged in the act of explaining and defending their ideas to their peers. In the interacted as a group, they exchange thought, feeling, ideas between them and the result in reciprocal effect on each other. The last, students were distanced themselves from the text.

It is clear that collaborative refers to a writing group but there are as many ways to write in group as there are combinations of individual. Accordingly,
Galegher and Kraut in Benjamin (2004: 71), emphasize the social nature of Collaborative Writing, which involves:

- negotiation about the meaning of facts, a demand for consensus as to an appropriate solution, division of labor based on concerns for fairness and quality of work, coordination of individual contributions, and resolution of questions about authority within the group.

From the theories above, it can be concluded that Collaborative Writing is a social process to work together in pairs or triads to produce written document. In the process, the writers will share about their ideas in making decision in which include composing the complete text, contributing the components, modifying by editing or reviewing, and drafting the document. They will have responsibility for producing the document.

b. Procedures of Collaborative Writing Method

Collaborative writing is a useful method for creating documents, if a specific plan to collaborate with others is not outlined. It is difficult to produce a good quality product. Therefore, it is necessary to introduce a variety of strategies relating to collaborative writing. The first section is a list of guidelines for implementing collaborative writing in lessons. Next, there are strategies and activities for the domains of knowledge acquisition, planning, drafting, and revision. The final section provides evaluation information that can be adapted into a rubric.

When introducing collaborative writing to students, teachers should approach the social aspects of the assignment with them in a cognitive manner.
According to Barkley, et al (2005: 256) states that there are seven guidelines for teacher in collaborative writing process. The following guidelines for teachers to keep in mind:

(1) Students form pairs or triads at your direction or by choosing partners and then generate ideas by brainstorming together or conducting preliminary research. (2) Together, students organize their ideas and create an outline. (3) Students divide up the outline, selecting or assigning sections for each student to write initial drafts individually. (4) Teams read first drafts and discuss and resolve any significant disparities in voice, content, and style. (5) Teams combine individual sections into a single document. (6) Teams revise and edit their work, checking for content and clarity as well as grammar, spelling, and punctuation. (7) After the final edit, teams submit their papers to the professor for assessment and evaluation.

Based on the guidelines above, the researcher will apply the structure guidelines to make collaborative more effective, but the researcher makes different roles of the students. One of them plays a role as a helper and the other as a writer. Specific task need to be done the helper and the writer when they write collaboratively. These steps are described as follows:

In step 1, the students are hoped to understand important components of the genre text, such as: narrative, descriptive, expository, and persuasive. To help the writer stimulate ideas their helper will use the graphic organizer, such as: main mapping, clustering, four-square, semantic mapping, or webbing. As the writers respond verbally to the questions, they write the key words and are encouraged to add any relevant information they might want to write about. Then, the pair reviews the key words in the notes and determines if the order organization should be changed. Alternatively, the ideas may seem to fall into obvious sections, which can be dealt with in turn. Such sections can be color-coded and the ideas
belonging to them are underlined or highlighted with a marker. Pairs may also choose to draw lines linking or around related ideas, so that a semantic map is constructed.

In generating the students’ ideas is intended to motivate and brainstorm the students to get ideas in generating ideas for the topic. The teacher leads the helper to raise ideas about looking for the key words that have relation with the topic using graphic organizer. Then, the writers take some key words and make lists to connect with the topic. As the helper, they have to review the writer’s key words to develop the ideas into paragraph and to organize the ideas.

Step 2 is drafting. In this step, the teacher emphasizes that writers do not have to worry much about spelling as they write their drafts. Rather, the stress should be on allowing ideas to flow. This step aims to give the writer chances to begin writing a rough draft based on the discovered ideas to review from the helper. To write the drafts, the writer is advised not care much more about the language, spelling or punctuation or neatness. During the activity, the teacher goes around the class to provide assistance, guideline, and comments if they are necessary.

Step 3 is reading. In this step, the writer reads the draft. If he or she reads a word incorrectly, the helper provides support and gives some corrections. This steps gives the student chances to read the rough draft. The researcher asks the student (helper) to correct the draft. The helper may comment on the clarity and relevance of the ideas and their coherence. The helper can give written comment
or in orals to the writer. The writer reorganizes what has been written in the first rough draft and to refine ideas based on the feedback from the helper.

Step 4 is editing. In this step, the helper and the writer look at the draft together and consider what improvement might be made. Error of words, phrases, or sentences could be marked. The writer and the helper inspect the draft more than once, checking on different criteria on each occasion. According to Teo (2001), there are five editing criteria:

(1) Meaning. (2) Order (organization of the separate ideas in the text, organization within a phrase or sentence, and organization of order of sentences). (3) Spelling. (4) Punctuation. (5) Style (Word choice and sentence structure). While editing, the writer and helper consider the following question: (1) Does the helper understand what the writer wants to say? (idea and meaning). (2) Does the writing have a clear beginning, middle, and end? (style). (3) Are the words spelled correctly?. (4) Is the punctuation correct and the right place?

To order of question shows its relative important in writing. With the question in mind, the helper marks area the writer has missed, the helper can also suggest other changes. In this step, the teacher asks the pair to look at closely the draft and edits them by using the five editing criteria which refer to aspects of writing such as content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanic. The pair is advised to check they used appropriate and varied linking devices and their work is cohesive and logical. Then, they may add new ideas; delete irrelevant sentences and information and rearrange ideas to improve the organization. After that they look at vocabulary. They think about appropriate or specific vocabulary. Finally, the check content, organization, grammar, spelling and punctuation. The
teacher provides editing guidelines for check list. After editing, they rewrite it for the final writing version.

Step 5 is best copy. The writer then copies out a neat or best version of the corrected draft. The helper provides help when necessary, depending on the skill of the writer. In this case, the teacher asks the student (writer) to write the best version of the product. The best copy is a joint product of the pair and is then turned in to the teacher.

Step 6 is the teacher evaluation. Teacher Evaluates is the final step. In this step, students will have an opportunity to receive comments and instructive feedback directly from the teacher. When the Writer and the Helper turn in their best copy, the teacher will meet with them and provide them with explicit writing and grammatical instruction as well as corrective feedback. The teacher’s comments focus on meaning or idea, order, style, spelling, and punctuation, which are the five editing criteria stated in Step 4. The writers are then expected to review the correction and feedback together as a pair.

In evaluating, the teacher holds a conference by assigning the pair to exchange their composition to be proofread by other pairs. After that, the pair discusses the corrections, feedback or comments from other pairs. If they still have problems with the corrections, feedback or comments from their pairs. At the end of conference the teacher and students discuss remaining problems together. Next, he ask the students (writer) to revise the composition based on the correction, feedback given and comments from their friends or their teacher.
Finally, he asks the students (writer) to write the final composition and submits to the teacher or researcher.

After the students know the steps of writing, the researcher provides them the opportunity to write a short essay. They are required to apply the method in writing task to write a short essay about certain topic of descriptive text. Thus, in this research the researcher asks the students to make pairs, one as a helper and another as a writer. They may have the more or less same writing level and the role of them may be interchangeable.

c. Advantages and Disadvantages of Collaborative Writing Method.

Every method has advantages and disadvantages. There is no method which is perfect and the best one. In order to maximize the teaching learning process of writing, the teacher should be good in choosing appropriate method. Some advantages in Collaborative Writing are as follows:

1) The process of writing collaboratively forces the writer to put implicitly the decisions about his or her writing process into words (Elbow, 2002).

2) Collaboration allows students to learn from each other, as confident students will model successful writing practices for struggling students (Webb, 1998).

3) Co-authorship allows students to work on complex projects, which may otherwise be too large in scope for an individual writer (Howard, 2000).

4) The process of working in a group fosters relationships among a community of writers (Elbow, 2002).

5) Collaboration focuses on the generation of many possible points of view or solutions to a problem (Stewart, 1988).
In spite of the fact that there are some strengths of collaborative writing in the teaching learning process, collaborative writing method has disadvantages as follows:

1) Pair work is likely noisy.
2) Sometimes between the helper and the writer have different opinions or arguments in developing paragraph. Thus, it can make a conflict between them.
3) Not all the students got the chance to consult and performed their writing to the teacher because the limited in the class sessions.

Based on the definition above, it can be assumed that Collaborative Writing method is the process of producing a written work in a group or in pairs which use some procedures. The procedures will help the students to make a good document in written text. This method will make students more active and creative in facing the problem in writing process.

3. Direct Instruction Method

a. The Definition of Direct Instruction Method

Direct Instruction method refers to academically focused on teacher-directed classroom instruction using sequenced and structured materials. Slavin in Kousar (2009) says that Direct Instruction refers to teaching activities where goals are clear to students, time allocated for instruction is sufficient and continuous and feedback to students is immediate and academically oriented. In addition, Stein, at al. in Viel-Ruma (1998) define that Direct Instruction is an explicit instructional
approach that focuses on teacher modeling, task analysis, frequent questioning of the learners with directed feedback, scripted lessons, and choral response. Teacher modeling means that the teacher becomes the decision maker in this method. He presents new material in small steps and checks for students understanding through strategic questioning. In the end of learning activities, he will give feedback for the students directly.

Furthermore, Vukmir (2002: 42) defines that Direct Instruction is best characterized by its teacher directed and skills oriented approach that uses small-group instruction. Teachers and aides use carefully scripted lessons that explicitly introduce the students to key cognitive skills that have been broken into small units. It means that in learning process, the teacher will help the students to perform independently on highly structured tasks, such as writing skill and he has responsible for what students learn. Meanwhile, Valiathan (2009) defines that Direct Instruction (DI) is used to describe learning material in which the teacher or expert transmits information directly to learners structuring learning time to reach a clearly defined set of objectives as efficiently as possible. The teacher explains the material exactly directly by demonstrating a task to be learned step-by-step, and then, the students repeat it until the task is mastered. The students learn to do well only what they practice doing.

In line with the theory, Luke (2006: 7) defines that Direct Instruction, an alternative instructional method that emphasizes fast-paced teacher probes and sequenced drill-repetition-practice routines. It means that direct instruction method also provides the set regular steps in one direction and then back again.
The teacher controls the teaching and learning process in order to drill the low students that provide the drill repetition practice routines learning.

Based on the theories above, it can be concluded that Direct Instruction is an alternative instructional method for the explicit teaching of a skill-set which the teacher or lecture transmits information directly for the students. In teaching activities, the teacher has clear goals for student where he or she will focus on teacher modeling, task analysis, frequent questioning of learners with directed feedback, scripted lessons, and choral response.

b. Procedures of Direct Instruction Method

Direct Instruction methods are indispensable for achieving content mastery and over learning of fundamental facts, rules, and action sequences that may be essential to subsequent learning (Anderson and Block in Borich, 1996: 248). In teaching writing by using Direct Instruction method, the teacher will use some steps for guiding students during initial practice and ensuring that all students will get successful in practice. Furthermore, Borich (1996: 248) says that they are four sequences in conducting Direct Instruction method such as: (1) review, (2) present content, (3) practice, and (4) provide feedback. In line with the theory, the researcher applies the method in the classroom as follows:

The first step in Direct Instruction is the teacher will make sure that students have mastered prerequisite skills and to link information that is already in their minds to the new information. Teachers activate students’ relevant prior knowledge and their experiences and then help them to connect it into the new
knowledge. Sometimes, it is necessary to assess students on prerequisite skills before starting a class. In this case, students had shown poor understanding of prerequisite skills, and the teacher will review those skills before going on to the new lesson. Another reason to review prerequisites is to provide advance organizers. Advance organizers are introductory statements by the teacher that remind students of what they already know and give them a framework for understanding the new material to be presented.

In the second step, teacher begins to present the main body of the lesson or new material in small steps. In this case, teacher divides the lesson or materials into small portions that consistent with the previous knowledge, ability level, and interest of students. It will make the students easily to understand the materials in detail. Completely, teacher presents the topic and identifies the elements of descriptive writing text. In this step, teacher can use the specific strategy for students, e.g. Mind Mapping or Four Square.

Furthermore, in the third step, the teacher presents several ways of accomplishing the material directly. Here, the teacher guides the students by giving the model or example of how to write topic sentences that use graphic organizer (mind mapping) in descriptive text under direct teacher supervision. Directly, Teacher guides the students to write some supporting details of the topic in graphic organizer. From the result of the organizer, teacher asks students to make drafting into paragraph. Teacher guides the students to revise some mistakes in the draft. Teacher gives students increasing responsibility for developing the drafting into a good paragraph.
In the last step, the teacher provides the feedback to know the responds and give correction to the students in learning process. Correct answers to questions should be acknowledged clearly so that students will understand when their work is accurate. When student answers are hesitant, the teacher provides process feedback. Inaccurate responses should be corrected immediately, before errors become habitual. Frequent errors are a sign that students are not ready for independent work, and guided practice should continue.

c. Advantages and Disadvantages of Direct Instruction Method

One of the key elements of Direct Instruction is a teacher-centered approach. While often overused, it is an effective instructional strategy when the teacher's goal is to provide information and teach standard procedures. Using Direct Instruction method for teaching writing has some advantages, such as:

1) The teacher has control of the timing of the lesson.
2) Students are physically easy to monitor.
3) The teacher has control over what will be learned, and who will learn.
4) Direct Instruction enables the teacher to communicate complex knowledge or information at the students’ level.
5) The curriculum can be covered, so the teacher can say that s/he taught the material.

In the other hand, Direct Instruction method has also some disadvantages as follows:
1) It is based on old learning theories that students must learn simple tasks before complex ones, and that only measurable learning is worthwhile.

2) Students do not have a sense of the overall purpose of the simple steps. However, if the teacher tells them the purpose, by using advance organizers, this disadvantage is overcome.

3) Teachers cannot assess what the students’ prior knowledge is, so will be unaware of why particular students cannot learn.

4) Retention of how to solve the problems is low, because the students have not struggled with the problem themselves.

5) Direct Instruction is limited in its ability to help students to fully develop their abilities to think creatively and to work well in a group setting.

Based on the explanations above, the researcher can conclude that Direct Instruction is a method that describes the learning objective-oriented activities and flow of information between teachers and students. It can help the teachers to guide the students through a complex problem, with the problem broken down into simple steps and then the students are given one or many sample problems to accomplish on their own.
4. Teaching Writing Using Collaborative Writing Method and Direct Instruction Method

a. General Differences of Collaborative Writing Method and Direct Instruction Method

There also exist general differences in ways of teaching writing by using Collaborative Writing method and Direct Instruction method. However, Collaborative Writing most often works in a group but Direct Instruction method the students primarily work individually. Therefore, the comparison of Collaborative Writing method and Direct Instruction method are as follows:

Table 2.2 Comparasion of CW and DI in Teaching Writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>Collaborative Writing Method</th>
<th>Direct Instruction Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students’ Role</td>
<td>Students have to practise working in groups and they need to be told the rules governing the assignment. They need to know what they are supposed to do. They are also directors of their own learning. They are taught to plan, discuss, share, and evaluate their own learning.</td>
<td>The students play a reactive role by responding to stimuli. The fact that in the early stages students do not have understanding of the new knowledge of what they purpose of the first step. They listen and understand to the teacher’s explanation, and the teacher will control of the their understanding by giving some questions as a feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s Roles</td>
<td>An important role for teacher is that of facilitator of learning. Facilitators are giving feedback, redirecting the group with questions, encouraging the group to solve its own problems, extending activity, encouraging thinking, managing conflict, observing students, and supplying resources.</td>
<td>The teacher models the teaching method, controls the direction and pace of learning, and monitors and corrects the students’ performance of writing. The teacher must keep the students attentive by varying strategies and tasks and choosing relevant situations to practice structures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the table above, Collaborative Writing method and Direct Instruction method have suggested new perspectives and have contributed to deal with some limitations of teaching method like the needs of raising question, problem solving, producing a written text. However, it is obvious that Collaborative Writing is the main framework of the students or students centered.
On the contrary, Direct Instruction is focused on the teacher activities or teacher centered.

b. The Differences of Collaborative Writing Method and Direct Instruction Method in the Classroom

The brief teaching stages of teaching writing use collaborative writing method, students form pairs or triads to produce written text. Each student contributes at each stage of the writing process, such as brainstorming ideas, organizing information, and editing the text. In working together can help the students to learn and perform the stages of writing more effectively. On the contrary, Direct Instruction method is used to describe a lesson where the teacher has control. The teacher usually spends some time lecturing, then the teacher guides the students through a complex problem, with the problem broken down into simple step, then the students are given, one by one, the simple steps to carry out on their own. Finally, the students are given one or many sample problems to accomplish on their own. The stages can be seen in Table 2.3.

The basic components of Collaborative Writing method and Direct Instruction method are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaborative Writing Method</th>
<th>Direct Instruction Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Students form pairs or triad.</td>
<td>1. Teacher review or Setting clear goals for students and making sure they understand these goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Students organize their ideas to create outline</td>
<td>2. Presenting a sequence of well-organized assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Students divided up the outline for each students.</td>
<td>3. Giving students clear, concise explanations and illustrations of the subject matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Team read, discuss, and resolve the draft.</td>
<td>4. providing the feedback by asking frequent questions to see if the students understand the work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Team combine individual sections into a single document.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Team revise and edit their work, and then submit the paper.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.4 Teaching Writing Stages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaborative Writing</th>
<th>Direct Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Students in groups noted the topic given by the teacher.</td>
<td>1. Teachers activate students’ relevant prior knowledge and their experiences and then help them to connect it into the new knowledge. They will gain it from the lesson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Students begin to create graphic organizers (Four Square) in groups.</td>
<td>2. Teacher gives direction for the students to focus on the lesson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Students discuss with each other to define a few words related to the topic that made the graphic organizer (Four Square).</td>
<td>3. Teacher presents the topic and identifies the elements of descriptive writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. After the students have finished preparing graphic organizer, students continue to make the draft.</td>
<td>4. Teacher uses the specific strategy for students, e.g., mind mapping or four square.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Students began to construct a sentence in pairs.</td>
<td>5. Teacher guides the students through some questions that have correlation with the topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Students engage in a discussion with a friend of the group.</td>
<td>6. Teacher checks frequently for understanding of all students and provide immediate corrective feedback when needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Students share their drafts with other couples and began to write on each piece individually draft.</td>
<td>7. Teacher begins to write topic sentences that use graphic organizer (mind mapping).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Students will exchange the draft to each others.</td>
<td>8. Directly, Teacher guides the students to write some supporting details of the topic in graphic organizer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Students will read and discuss the results of the draft were made and the students correct each other from their work.</td>
<td>9. From the result of the organizer, teacher asks students to make drafting into paragraph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Students will combine their individual task into single document or text.</td>
<td>10. Teacher guides the students to revise some mistakes in the draft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Students improve the content of the text that are less precise.</td>
<td>11. Teacher gives students increasing responsibility for developing the drafting into a good paragraph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Students will reconstruct the lacking parts of the draft right.</td>
<td>12. Teacher gives the instruction for students to apply the strategy in new topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The students will report on their work.</td>
<td>13. Teacher checks the result of their writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Students will feel confident in his writing to shows the result after getting the motivation of teachers.</td>
<td>14. Teacher gives some correction for their mistakes in writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Teacher involves all students and provides immediate feedback to support correct answers and address incorrect ones.</td>
<td>15. Teacher will assess their result in writing performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the description above, Collaborative Writing method differs from Direct Instruction method in the stages of teaching writing. Collaborative Writing process mainly grounded on collaborative learning. This process is more than work together. It also includes sharing of knowledge and process of producing a written text. One important point in Collaborative Writing is that driving questions and explanations are composed by students to test their hypothesis about problems, not by teacher to control the process and explanation the
concepts. On the contrary, Direct Instruction method is highly teacher-directed. The method is providing the information or developing step-by-step skills from the teacher.

5. Creativity

a. The Definition of Creativity

Obviously, creativity means numerous things to different people and can be defined in any number of ways. Creativity can also be defined at many distinct levels, such as: cognitively, intellectually, socially, economically, spiritually, and from the finite perspective of different disciplines, such as: business, science, music, art, dance, theater, etc. As stated by Van Gundy (2005: 4) creativity is the magic word that can turn around an organization, company, division, or department. Furthermore, Cook and Heye in Baldacchino (2009) say that creativity is seen as going beyond new products, new services and improved processes. It means that creativity as a process can be formulated as a form of thought in which an individual tries to find out new rational answers, methods, or new ways in facing the problem.

Great creativity can explore the ideas and create new technologies that have shaped lives today. It is stated by Plucker et al in Kaufman (2008: 1) Creativity is the interaction among aptitude, process, and environment by which an individual or group produces a perceptible product that is both novel and useful as defined within a social context. In addition, According to Newell and Shaw in Sefertzi (2000: 2), creativity is the generation of imaginative new ideas, involving...
a radical newness innovation or solution to a problem, and a radical reformulation of problems. Moreover, Higgins in Sefertzi (2000: 2), states that a creative solution can simply integrate existing knowledge in a different way. A third set of definitions proposes that a creative solution, either new or recombined, must have value. It means that creativity involves the generation of new ideas or the recombination of known elements into something new, providing valuable solutions to a problem. It also involves motivation and emotion. Creativity is a fundamental feature of human intelligence in general.

In addition, there are some the important points in definition of creativity. As stated by Munandar (1992:28):

Creativity is as a process that manifests itself in fluency, in flexibility as well as in originality of thinking. Fluency is to be understood as the ability to come up with ideas rapidly, where the emphasis is on quantity and not on quality. Flexibility is the ability to produce a great variety of ideas, with freedom from perseveration. Originality refers to the ability to produce ideas that are statistically unique or unusual for the population of which the individual is a member.

From the definitions above, the researcher can assume that creativity is the ability to create new product, new service, and improved processes that can be useful and effective response to evolutionary changes in fluency, flexibility, elaboration as well as in originality of thinking. It is grounded in everyday capacities such as the association of ideas, reminding, perception, analogical thinking, searching a structured problem-space, and reflecting self-criticism.
b. Types of Creativity

Basically everyone has a creative talent and ability to express themselves creatively, although each person has different levels. The most important is the talent can be developed and improved of education. Referring to the development of creativity in education, we have to know four aspects in creativity. Munandar (2009: 45) defines that there are four aspects in creativity, such as: (1) person, (2) product, (3) process and (4) press and place.

1) The Creative Person

Creative person is always someone who makes or thinks something creative. As stated by Hulbeck’s in Munandar (1992: 27), Creative action is an imposing of one's own whole personality on the environment in a unique and characteristic way. It means that someone can express his unique talent in doing interaction with the environment. The creative expression is the reflection of the individual originality. Referring to the unique individual, the person is hoped to create new ideas and innovative product. It supported by Csikszentmihalyi (1996), creative individuals are remarkable for their ability to adapt to almost any situation and to make do with whatever is at hand to reach their goals. Creative people tend to be smart to adapt in variety situation and they have a great deal of physical energy, but they're also often quiet and at rest.

Based on the definitions above it can be assumed that creative person is a person that has some characteristics such as: an unique individual who are able to
create new ideas and innovative product and to adapt to almost any situation in reaching his goals.

2) The Creative Process

The creative process is the actual experience of being creative. One popular conception is the idea of flow, or optimal experience, which refers to the sensations and feelings that come when an individual is intensely engaged in an activity (Csikszentmihalyi, in Kaufman, 2008). Meanwhile, Boden (1994) describes the creative process as a person’s exploration and transformation of conceptual spaces. It means that creative process is the essential of the individual exploration and transformation of conceptual spaces to generate ideas. Creative process models describe various phases that occur in the process of being creative including but not limited to idea generation.

Moreover, Wallas in Munandar (1992) mentions that creative process consists of four identifiable stages: preparation, incubation, illumination, and verification. Preparation involves both mastery of the discipline and practice in identifying and hearing the creative voice. This involves relating dreams, creating a habit and a “sacred space” for the work, being open to stimulation from the other arts and people, and time for the process. Incubation involves immersion in the problem, more time, and the invocation of the muse. This is a stage when the issue to be addressed is clearly put front-and-center in the mind and thus a “dream” or insight is requested. Illumination comes when an answer is found in the unconscious and presented and recognized by the conscious (often
instantaneously). Verification is the necessary step to ensure that the solution provided is valid in the real world.

Based on the definitions above, it can be concluded that creative process is a concept to explore and transform the ideas which refers to the sensations and feelings that come when an individual is intensely engaged in an activity. It describes creativity as involving four phases: Preparation; Incubation; Illumination; and Verification.

3) The Creative Product

Creative product is a creative outcome or product that made by man. The product has some level of usefulness, and has been produced and communicated in some way. According to Warr and O’Neill (2005), creative product refers to the product's reflecting some distinguishing signs of creativity, such as aesthetic responses brought about in the observers. It means that the product can be observed by person that it is the something new or has appropriate features. Meanwhile, Welsh in Munandar (1992) defines that creative products are of value and interest in them, the crucial question remains: Can a product tell us anything about the personality of the individual who produced it? Is there a direct relation between what one does and the kind of person he is? It means that the personality of the individual can learn of the product that made by himself, and it will provide the value of the creative person.

Taylor in Taha (2007) demonstrates that there are at least four types of creative products that reflect four levels of creativity. They are expressive,
productive, inventive, and innovative. Expressive relates to the freedom of expression, where originality of the product and the skill of the person are irrelevant (for example, spontaneous drawings by children). Productive relates to having certain skills and being able to use certain techniques to create new products. Inventive signifies a degree of imagination in handling different materials, techniques, methods, but it does not lead to new ideas, only to new applications of old ones (researchers). Innovative relates to seeking out and understanding the basic principles underlying any action or undertaking, leading to its modification.

Based on the definitions above, it can be inferred that creative product is an outcome that reflecting to some distinguishing signs of creativity. It has the value and interesting itself for the creator or creative person that can create the product. It can be divided into four kind of creative product, such as: expressive, productive, inventive, and innovative.

4) The Creative Press or Place

Everyone has creative potential in varying degrees and in different fields. This potential needs to tend from an early age in order to be realized. It required driving forces, both external (environment) as well as from within the individual himself. It is required to create the environments that influence the creative power of the individual. In this case, it includes both in the narrow sense of the environments (family, school) and in the extensive sense of the word (society, culture). Development of creativity is created by the individual who cannot
escape the influence of culture and influence society in which individuals live and work. As stated by Vernon in Munandar (1992), Creativity is always relative to a particular culture and that there are very few who like Shakespeare, appeal to something as universal in human nature as to retain their reputation over many generations and in diverse cultures.

Furthermore, Santanen, et al (2002) states that the press perspective of the Four P’s frames creativity as an interaction between people and their environments and studies how a person reacts to a particular environment. In this case, there will be presence of challenge, autonomy, access to resources, and organizational support is necessary in order for creativity to emerge in the workplace. In line with the definition, Klenz in Munandar argued that the city as a working place leads to productive activity. It means that workplace relationships are unique interpersonal relationships with important implications for the individuals in those relationships, and the organizations in which the relationships exist and develop.

Based on the definitions above, it can be concluded that creative press or place is an interaction between people and their environments and studies how a person reacts to a particular environment. It has relative to a particular culture and to retain their reputation over many generations and in diverse cultures. The place, the individual live, will be some the important aspects that influence of their creativity.
c. The Characteristics of Creativity

There are several characteristics of creativity that is owned by creative individuals. Guilford in Munandar (1992), distinguishes between cognitive traits (aptitude) and affective characteristics (non-aptitude) are associated with creativity. Cognitive traits (aptitude) are traits that relate to thinking processes which include fluency of thinking, flexibility of thinking, the originality of thinking, and elaboration (develop, enrich, refine) an idea. While, the affective traits (non-aptitude) are traits that have more to do with attitude or a feeling that include curiosity, imaginative, challenged by the complexity, the nature of risk-taking and the nature of appreciating. Both types of characteristics of the creativity are needed in order to the creative behavior can be realized and measured.

Here are the characteristics of cognitive (aptitude) and affective characteristics (non-aptitude) by Guilford (in Munandar, 1992) will be elaborated as follows:

1) The Characteristic of Cognitive (Aptitude)

The creativity is related to the ability to think creatively (divergent) which has five cognitive characteristics, such as: Fluency, flexibility, Originality, and Elaboration. Those are as follows:

a) Fluency

It is the ability to delivery many ideas, express the number of ways to do things and look for the answers to many possible alternatives and problem solving. In fluency of thinking will be an important aspect of creativity. Here are four
fluency factors are indentified, such as: word fluency, associational fluency, expressional fluency, ideational fluency.

b) Flexibility

Flexibility is the ability to use a variety of approaches in addressing the issues. Creative people are the people who have the creativity in thinking; they can easily leave the old ways of thinking and replace new ways of thinking. It can be done a spontaneous and adaptive flexibility. Spontaneous flexibility is the ability to deliver a variety of ideas about anything without any fear. While the adaptive flexibility is the ability to deliver a variety of ideas about anything, but still pay attention to the truth of the idea. These characteristics can be seen in the attitude of the students in providing a variety of interpretations (interpretations) of the pictures, stories or problems, applying a concept a different way. When they are given a problem, they will think of all sorts in the different ways to solve it. They can change the direction of spontaneous thought.

c) Originality

It is the ability to produce ideas and create combinations that are new and unique which use an unusual way and look for a variety of possible solutions. When the students do these ways that might not have thought of by others. These characteristics can be seen in the attitude of the students in thinking about the problems or things that never think about by others.
d) Elaboration

Elaboration is the ability to enrich or develop an idea, a product and to analyze an object, an idea, and the situation. It is not only better but also it will become more attractive. These characteristics can be seen in the attitude of the students in finding a deeper meaning to the answers or solving a problem by performing the steps in detail, develop or enrich other people's ideas and try or test details to see the direction to be taken. It has a strong sense of beauty that is not satisfied appearance of a blank or simple.

2) The Characteristics of Affective (Non- Aptitude)

Affective characteristics of creativity are traits associated mental attitudes or feelings of individuals. The affective characteristics are interrelated and interacted with the cognitive traits. There are several affective characteristics as follows:

a) Curiosity

The students are always encouraged to find something out more, for example: they always ask, pay attention to many things, feel sensitive and want to know or investigate in observation. There are some behaviors that reflect the learner's curiosity, for example, they often give the questioning in everything, and they feel happy in exploring books, maps, drawings. They do not be afraid to explore the new areas to observe the changes of things or events.

b) Imaginative

The students are able to demonstrate or imagine the things that do not or have never happened and use the imagination, but they can distinguish between the
fantasy and the reality. The behavior can be seen of the students who think of or imagine things that never happened. They can also predict what will be said or done to others, have a gut feeling about the things before they happen and see the things in a picture that is not visible to others, making the story about the places that have never visited or about events that have never experienced.

c) The Nature of Risk-taking

The students dare to have opinions even though it is not necessarily true. They do not be afraid of failure or criticism from others. The behavior of the students who possess courage in daring to take risks is to maintain the ideas or opinion, although a challenge or criticism and they will admit their mistakes. They dare to accept a difficult task although it is likely to fail. In making decision, they are not easily influenced by other people and they will do things that are believed.

d) The Nature of Appreciating

It is the ability to be able to appreciate the guidance and direction in life. The behavior of the students who have the nature of appreciate is to respect the rights themselves and others, appreciate the significance of others, respect for family, school and other educational institutions and friends. They will appreciate the freedom, but they also know that the freedom demands responsibility.

Based on the description above, it can be understood that if Creative person has some characteristics in his interactions with the environment. The characteristics of the creativity dominate in his ability to delivery many ideas,
express the number of ways to do things and create combinations that are new and unique which use an unusual way and look for a variety of possible solutions. He is always encouraged to find something out more and he is able to demonstrate or imagine the things that do not or have never happened by using his imagination.

**B. Review on Related Researches**

Collaborative Writing method is one of collaborative learning method that has observed and applied by researcher. The research findings strengthen the positive effects of applying collaborative learning in teaching writing. Lingnau and Mannahaupt (2003) examine Computer Supported Collaborative Writing in an Early Learning Classroom. They describe a collaborative experiment in an early learners’ classroom, equipped with special software and hardware to support the acquisition of initial reading and writing skills. Particularly, a collaborative writing task facilitated by a shared workspace system has been evaluated with a group of first graders using the T3 application. The speciality of this experiment lies in the study of domain-specific collaboration in a rich real world learning setting.

The positive effects of applying collaborative learning in teaching writing is also supported by Brodahl, et.al (2011). They test Collaborative Writing with Web 2.0 Technologies: Education Students’ Perceptions. This work presents a case study investigating education students’ perceptions of collaborative writing using Google Docs and EtherPad. The case study participants were 201 education students who just began their four-year initial teacher education at two study
programs with a total of six classes at the university Teacher Education Unit. They were assigned a collaborative writing task and asked to take an on-line survey on completion. When the survey closed, a total of 166 students (83.6%) had participated. The results were analyzed based on (13.9%) of the students were motivated to use the tools for collaboration, and only a minority of the students (15.7%) reported that the quality of collaboration in the group increased with use of the tools. Likewise, the tools did not work as expected for a majority of the students (70.5%). Forty-seven percent of the students liked to comment and edit others contributions to group work.

In addition, Kessler, et al (2012) describe Collaborative Writing among Second Language Learners in Academic Web-Based Projects. They stated that the purpose of this study is to explore and understand the changing nature of collaborative writing, as it is influenced by Web-based writing contexts. Findings suggest that students focused more on meaning than form, that their grammatical changes were overall more accurate than inaccurate, that they participated with varying frequency, and that they used the tool for simultaneous varied purposes. The result shows that student feedback about the Web-based collaborative activity and use of Google Docs offers additional insights.

In line with the researchers above, Wong, et al (2011), write an article that describes A blended collaborative writing approach for Chinese L2 primary school students. They stated that collaborative writing approach employing a wiki to address the typical weaknesses of young Singaporean Chinese students learning Chinese as second language (L2) in Chinese writing. They analysed the potential
learning effects of the writing process among Primary 4 (10-year-old) students - especially in addressing and leveraging students' individual differences. The results of the pilot study show that the target students' micro-skills for writing were significantly improved, which could be attributed to emerging peer coaching practices among them.

Furthermore, Storch (2005) describes collaborative writing: product, process, and students’ reflections. The study was classroom based, and the participants (23) were adult ESL students completing degree courses. Students were given a choice to write in pairs or individually. The study compared texts produced by pairs with those produced by individual learners and investigated the nature of the writing processes evident in the pair talk. The study also elicited the learners’ reflections on the experience of collaborative writing. The result shows that pairs produced shorter but better texts in terms of task fulfilment, grammatical accuracy, and complexity. Collaboration afforded students the opportunity to pool ideas and provide each other with feedback. Most students were positive about the experience, although some did express some reservations about collaborative writing.

Besides teaching method, creativity also has great influence in teaching learning process, especially in teaching writing. Fraser (2006) conducts a research that describes the creative potential of metaphorical writing in the literacy classroom. Creativity can also encourage to surface original ideas through constructing their own creative texts. His research was focuses on metaphorical writing with students in the primary school setting. When teachers foster
creativity in the literacy classroom, they provide open-ended lessons, encourage variety and innovation, and allow time to play with ideas. The result shows that creative writing should be an enjoyable (and challenging) undertaking. The students’ texts reveal unique voices that range from the playful to the dramatic in their creative exploration of what it means to be human. The potential of such writing for engaging students is discussed alongside the value of metaphorical writing for encouraging emotional exploration, imagination and sheer enjoyment.

C. Rationale

1. The Differences between Collaborative Writing Method and Direct Instruction Method for Teaching Writing.

Collaborative Writing is a program of collaborative learning that helps students to learn well. In teaching writing, Collaborative Writing method gives students chance to dig their own ideas and share their ideas in groups before they share their works in front of the class. While, students learn to share in different opinions, contribute toward the groups in seeking for the best work, and accept criticism or suggestion from their teammates. They can also learn from other students and this reduces affective filters such as: fear, shyness, and frustration.

Furthermore, Collaborative Writing is a commonly used method where two or more students co-write a piece of text either with or without editorial oversight. It refers to writing in groups but there are as many ways to write in groups as there are possible combinations of individuals. Collaborative Writing assignments transform the usually solitary work of writing and editing papers into...
a group endeavor. After all, in most workplaces writing is typically produced by a team or goes through multiple hands for revising. It opens students’ eyes to know the result of their work that will be compared to their peers or groups. This process gives them a better sense of their own strengths and weaknesses as writers and thinkers.

Meanwhile, Direct Instruction is a teacher-centered instructional approach that is focused on helping students to learn basic skills and information. In this method, teachers provide instruction in a step-by-step manner. They may develop their own direct instruction lessons by breaking the desired concept into smaller tasks and then developing scripted, fast-moving sessions. In the last activities, they must regularly check for understanding and provide immediate feedback.

In Direct Instruction, teachers decide what is to be learned. The students are under the teachers’ control. Thus, they do not have chance to dig and develop their ideas. Students’ works are tightly controlled and they often only give reinforcement to their learning without any challenge to develop their own ideas. In learning process, not all the students’ progress at the same pace, individualized instruction needs to be developed to accommodate different learners. Consequently, some students will be waiting for other to master the content in order to move on.

On the other hand, by applying Collaborative Writing method, students learn by themselves, learn to feel more confident, feel more decided, and enjoy the class to teach each other. By using Collaborative Writing method in teaching and learning, the students can use their own knowledge and share their knowledge
with their friends. Besides that, they can interact with each other to solve problems. It also helps weaker students in learning.

Related to teaching writing, Collaborative Writing is a teaching method where students can work together in small group to help each other before they do independently. It can be assumed that there is a significant difference of effect on the students writing skill by Collaborative Writing. Thus, Collaborative Writing is more effective than Direct Instruction to teach writing.

2. The Differences between Students who have High and Low Level of Creativity in Writing.

Writing activity involves students' creativity since creativity will allow them to generate new ideas in solving an existing problem. A creative student will think beyond what he sees, reads, and listens. In a learning process, a creative student will be able to come up with unexpected ideas better than a student who has a low creativity level. As a result, creativity in writing gives students the power to create an imaginative, original literary production or composition.

In writing process, creative writing is a form of writing whereby it is written to test ones creativity. Creative writing should be original and can be either explaining an event or even tale telling. Creative writing in most cases tends to explain what one is imagining. Therefore, the teacher will be facilitator who gives more opportunities for the students to analyze, discuss, and share the process of writing. Creative students will write a written text better since they have more analytical thoughts to analyze, synthesize, and determine their ideas.
On the contrary, students who have low creativity will just write what they see, read, and listen without being able to think what is beyond. They are unable to come up with their own fresh ideas and opinions when writing process. They will find many difficulties of writing, such as: how to get the information, how to develop their ideas, and how to arrange the sentences. The students of this type will not be active and creative in learning process of writing. Finally, they will give up easily when they have to do that.

Based on the short explanation above, the researcher assumes that students who have high creativity will have better writing skill than those who have low creativity level.

3. Interaction between Methods and Students’ Creativity for Teaching Writing.

Interaction is reciprocal events that require at least two objects and two actions. Interactions occur when these objects and events mutually influence one another. There is a general concept that success of teaching and learning process is determined by some factors, such as methods and students’ creativity. In other words, there is an interaction between methods in teaching writing and students’ creativity.

Collaborative Writing method emphasizes on group writing project. This method will support the students to construct the project and then share the knowledge to each other through students-centered in the form of small group learning. The success of all members in mastering the learning materials is the responsibility of the group. By using this method, it will help the students in writing process. It is a method that can stimulate the students for developing ideas
creatively and they have much time to discuss and write. For the students who have high creativity, it is assumed by using Collaborative Writing is better than those by using Direct Instruction in teaching writing because the students who have high creativity find no problem at all to come up with their fresh, original, and new ideas when they share and discuss with others so that they can be more creative.

On the contrary, Direct Instruction emphasizes on teaching and learning process on teacher-centered. In this method, the students tend be passive because the teacher has a dominant to be model. The interaction between the teacher and the students is usually in the form of one-way communication from the teacher to the students. And the students become recipients who absorb the teacher’s information or explanation. Besides that, the students’ scientific and creative thinking cannot be facilitated properly. For the students who have low creativity, it is assumed that by using Direct Instruction is better than Collaborative Writing in teaching writing because the students who have low creativity are helped by the teacher for developing their creativity step by the step.

Based on the explanations above, it can be assumed that the implementation of two different methods for teaching writing gives the different result to the students having low and high creativity. It is assumed that there is an interaction between methods and students’ creativity for teaching writing.
D. Hypothesis

Based on review of related literature and rationale, the hypothesis can be formulated as follows:

1. Collaborative writing method is more effective than Direct Instruction method to teach writing skill.

2. The students who have high creativity have better writing achievement than those who have low creativity.

3. There is an interaction effect between teaching methods and students’ creativity on students’ writing skill. It means that in teaching writing, the students who have high creativity are more appropriate taught by using Collaborative Writing method than those are having low creativity. On the contrary, the students who have low creativity are more appropriate taught by Direct Instruction method than those are having high creativity.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHOD

A. Place and Time of Research

This research was carried out at State Islamic College (STAIN) of Jurai Siwo Metro in the academic year of 2012/2013. It is a State Islamic College which has the principle of Islamic ethics. It is located on Jl. Ki. Hajar Dewantara Kampus 15 A Iringmulyo, Metro Timur 34111 (see Appendix 21). STAIN is one of colleges in Metro which has eight programs which one of them is English Department. In this research, the researcher has investigated the third semester students of English Department at State Islamic College (STAIN) of Jurai Siwo Metro who took the Writing III in the academic year of 2012/2013.

Most of the students are the new comer in the Metro city to study at STAIN Jurai Siwo Metro. They always want to improve their ability in English. This condition gives much influence to the learning habit of the students. Most of the students have high spirit to learn and practice English. It can be seen from the enthusiasm of the students to use English in the classroom when they do conversation and produce the written text.

This research was done from July 2012 to February 2013. It was included to preparation of making the instrument, finishing the licensed research, trying out of the instrument, revising of the proposal, conducting the research, analyzing the data, and writing the result of the research. The schedule of conducting this research can be seen in the following table.
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Table 3.1 Time Schedule of Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July</td>
<td>Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranging proposal</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing instrument</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting and analyzing the data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making report</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitting the thesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Profile of the Writing Class

Writing subject is one of the compulsory subjects that obliged to be thought in English Department of STAIN Jurai Siwo Metro. The level of Writing subject is divided into four levels, such as Writing I, Writing II, Writing III, and Writing IV. In Writing I, the students are focused on how to make a good sentence accurately which involves grammatical accuracy, writing mechanics, spelling, punctuation, and capitalization. In Writing II, the students are focused on how to make a good paragraph accurately and acceptably which involves the various types of sentence forms: definition, classification, chronological order, comparison and contrast, and cause and effect. In Writing III, the students are focused on how to make some paragraphs coherently that include making an outline and expressing meaning in written functional text and simple essay. Then, In Writing IV, the students are focused on how to make scientific writing accurately and acceptably, especially in the form of a research proposal for the thesis.
The Writing III class introduces students to produce the best writing text in English. It complements the focus on making an outline and expressing meaning in written functional text and simple essay. The genre includes narration, description, exposition, and persuasion or argumentation. The subject code of the Writing III is MKK.BI.04.3. It is the requirement to the students who are going to take the Writing IV. In this course, the students will have contact hours 45x2 minutes or totally 95 minutes in a week.

Focusing on the Writing III class, the researcher has some indicators to the students which are able to (1) understand the learning process in Writing III, (2) understand of the learning contract, (3) arrange an outline for a narrative, a descriptive, a expository, and a persuasive (argumentative) composition, (4) write the composition of a narrative, a descriptive, a expository, and a persuasive (argumentative) composition.

This subject fosters the students’ careful thinking, and effective critical writing. The students will be introduced to a range of the most exciting, most challenging, and most pleasurable contemporary writing in English. They will have the opportunity to discover some key critical concepts and terms for writing learning and creative writing. Each class is taught by a professional lecturer at helping the students discover and develop their unique voices in written text. These classes are fun and free pressure. Besides, the students will develop of thinking and writing skill that is able to prove creative writing in classroom.
C. Research Design

This research is aimed at investigating the effectiveness of the Collaborative Writing method to teach writing skill viewed from students’ creativity. Due to inability of assigning subjects to groups randomly at STAIN Jurai Siwo Metro, this research is a quasi-experimental design. It is not possible to assign students randomly, due to the system at STAIN Jurai Siwo Metro that does not allow the researcher to assign the subjects randomly, into experimental group and control group. Therefore, the researcher used the preexisting classes for the experimental group and the control group. When randomized designs are not feasible, researchers must often make use of quasi-experimental designs (Marczyk et al., 2005: 37).

Furthermore, the variable in this research consists of two variables; dependent and independent variables. The dependent variable is writing skill. The independent variable consists of two kinds of variable, namely active and attributes variables. An active independent variable is one that researcher can manipulate directly (Ary et al, 2002: 311). The active independent variables are Collaborative Writing method and Direct Instruction method. In contrast, an attribute independent variable is one that the researcher cannot actively manipulate (Ary, et al, 2002:311). In this research, the attribute variable is students’ creativity. Further, the researcher embeds attributes variables into this research by assigning subjects to groups based on such preexisting variables. The independent variables of either type are known as factors. Therefore, this research uses a quasi-factorial design.
The factorial design has several important strengths. First, it permits the simultaneous examination of more than one independent variable. This can be critical because most, if not all, human behavior is determined by more than one variable. A second and related strength is the efficiency of the factorial design. Because it allows us to test several hypotheses in a single research study, it can be more economical to use a factorial design than to conduct several individual studies, in terms of both number of participants and researcher effort. Last, and perhaps most important, the factorial design allows us to look for interactions between independent variables (Marczyk et al., 2005:35).

In line with this, Ary et al, (2006: 335) note that a factorial design is a design in which the researcher can simultaneously assess the effect of two or more independent variables on the dependent variable. Factorial designs have been developed at varying level of complexity. This research applied the simplest factorial design that is 2 x 2, which is further read as 2 by 2. In this design, both independent and dependent variables have two levels. The design is as follows:

**Table 3.2 The Simplest Factorial Design**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students' Creativity (B)</th>
<th>Method (A)</th>
<th>Collaborative Writing (A₁)</th>
<th>Direct Instruction (A₂)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High (B₁)</td>
<td>A₁B₁</td>
<td>A₂B₁</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (B₂)</td>
<td>A₁B₂</td>
<td>A₂B₂</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Where:

$A_1B_1$: Students taught by using the Collaborative Writing method with the high creativity.

$A_1B_2$: Students taught by using the Collaborative Writing method with the low creativity.

$A_2B_1$: Students taught by using the Direct Instruction method with the high creativity.

$A_2B_2$: Students taught by using the Direct Instruction method with the low creativity.

D. Population, Sample, and Sampling

Frankel and Walen (2000: 103-104) state that population is the larger group to which one hopes to apply the results. The population in this research is all the third semester students of English Department at STAIN Jurai Siwo Metro in the academic year of 2012/2013 which consists of five classes, those are A, B, C, D, and E which consist of 218 students. The third semester students of English Department are included having high interested in English. It can be proved by the total of classes in English Department. Among the programs in STAIN Jurai Siwo Metro, English Department is one of the most favorite programs for students.

Furthermore, sample is group in a research study from which information is obtained (Frankel and Walen, 2000: 103). According Arikunto (2002: 109), sample is a half or a part of the population which is being researched. Based on the theories, the researcher decided to take only 80 students or two classes from
all of population as the sample of this study. One class was experimental group and the other was control group.

Meanwhile, the researcher used cluster random sampling in this study. Cluster random sampling is a sampling in which group, not individuals, are randomly selected (Gay, 1992: 132). In this case, the researcher was carried out to take samples of the research and to determine two preexisting classes used as experimental and control groups. It was carried out by doing lottery. The lottery was carried out towards the five classes of the population. Each group has the same possibility to be the sample of the research. Based on the lottery, there were two classes chosen to be the subjects of the research, that was class B and class C. Then, the second lottery was carried out to assign which class, class B or class C, became the experimental and control groups. The result of the lottery revealed that class C became the experimental group and class B became the control group. The experimental group that was chosen would be given a treatment by using Collaborative Writing method. On the other hand, the control group was taught by using Direct Instruction method.

E. Technique of Collecting Data

There were two instruments used in this research; writing test and creativity test. The first instrument, a writing test, was constructed to investigate students’ writing skill. Then, the second instrument, creativity test, was constructed to classify students in to different creativity level: students’ high
creativity, and students’ low creativity. Table 3.3 shows the function of each instrument.

**Table 3.3 Research Instruments and Variables to Measure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
<th>Variables to measure</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>Students’ writing skill after treatment</td>
<td>To test the hypotheses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Test for the students’</td>
<td>Students’ creativity</td>
<td>To classify students’ creativity level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>creativity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The writing test was in the form of essay writing test. The test was administered due to a limited time, 90 minutes. In this research, an essay writing test was a teacher’s made test which was constructed to achieve objectives of writing skill being tested. Before the test is constructed, blueprint was designed (see Appendix 4). The syllabus for Writing III employed in STAIN Jurai Siwo Metro focused on making an outline and expressing meaning in written functional text by the increasing of their ability in simple essay in the form of texts (see Appendix 1).

Furthermore, to make sure the test was appropriate for the skill measured, the researcher assessed the readability of the test instruction which informs whether the test instructions were appropriately readable for the students. It means that if the test is tested to some students out of the sample group, they understand the instructions of the test and do as the instruction asks them to do. In other words, the instruction of the writing test should be clear and easy to be understood. It is essential that the researcher obtains feedback to check that the test instructions have been received and understood. The success is the extent to
which they understand it, read it at an optimum speed, and find it interesting. Before the test was used in this research, it was tried out to 45 students.

In order to know the students’ creativity, the students were given the creativity test of Torrance Test of Creative Thinking (TTCT). The Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking (TTCT) is a test of creativity, originally involved simple tests of divergent thinking and other problem-solving skills, which were scored on four scales: Fluency, Flexibility, Originality, and Elaboration (Munandar, 2009: 65). Torrance Test consists of two forms, namely verbal and figural forms; both associated with the creative process and include the type of different thinking. The Figural TTCT is thinking creatively with pictures which appropriate at all levels, kindergarten through adult. Then, the Verbal TTCT is thinking creatively with words use six word-based exercises to assess three mental characteristics: Fluency, Flexibility, and Originality.

In this research, the researcher used the verbal TTCT to know the students’ creativity. The tests were adapted from Munandar Creativity and Education (1992). The researcher decided to adapt the creativity test was due to the appropriateness of the content, easier calculation, and practicability. The kinds of the tests consist of Word Beginnings, Anagram, Three-Word-Sentences, Thing Categories, Unusual Use, and Consequences. Because of the tests were included of the productive skill, they were assessed by using readability of the test instruction which informs whether the test instructions were appropriately readable for students (see Appendix 7).
F. Technique for Analyzing Data

Data analysis is aimed at testing the research hypotheses. The researcher used a descriptive and inferential statistics. The descriptive statistics is used to know the mean, median, mode, standard deviation, histogram, and polygon of students’ scores in writing. Inferential statistics is used to test the research hypothesis. Testing hypothesis is conducted in order to manage the research data which are in the form of numbers, so that they can produce a real conclusion. It is also used to test whether the hypothesis of the research is accepted or rejected.

The researcher used Analysis of Variances (ANOVA). It is used to know the variances which appear due to the different treatments as a basis for the conclusion whether there is the different mean of the population or not (Budiyono, 2003: 183). The procedure is also used to examine the significant effects of two independent variables to dependent variable. The two independent variables are methods which are called as ‘column’ (A: Collaborative Writing Method and Direct Instruction Method) and the other independent variable (attribute variable) is called ‘row’ (B: Students’ Creativity). To be clearer, it is designed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Collaborative Writing (A₁)</th>
<th>Direct Instruction (A₂)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students’ Creativity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (B₁)</td>
<td>A₁ B₁</td>
<td>A₂ B₁</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (B₂)</td>
<td>A₁ B₂</td>
<td>A₂ B₂</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2 Factorial Design of 2x2 ANOVA
Furthermore, ANOVA is also used to examine the significant interaction between the two independent variables to the dependent variable. Before applying ANOVA, the researcher conducted the prerequisite test which consists of normality and homogeneity tests.

1. Prerequisite Test

a. Normality Test

The normality test is used to determine whether the sample in this research is in normal distribution or not. To test population normality, Lilliefors test is used. The sample of population can be said normal if $L_o < L_\alpha$. The significant degree: $\alpha = 0.05$. The procedure of this test is as follows:

$$z_i = \frac{X - \bar{X}}{s}$$

$$s = \sqrt{\frac{(X - \bar{X})^2}{n-1} \text{ or } \frac{\sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2}{n(n-1)} \text{ or } \frac{\sum x^2}{n-1}}$$

$$F(z_i) = 0.5 - F$$

$$S(Z_i) = \frac{\text{Rank}}{n}$$

$$L_o = |F(z_i) - s(z_i)|$$

b. Homogeneity Test

This test is used in order to find out whether the data are homogeneous or not. The homogeneity of the population is tested by Bartlett test. The significant
degree $\alpha = 0.05$. The two groups are homogeneous if the values of $\chi_0^2$ are smaller than $\chi_t^2$. The procedure of this test is as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\delta_1^2 &= \frac{\sum X_1^2 - \left(\frac{\sum X_1}{n}\right)^2}{n-1} \\
\delta_2^2 &= \frac{\sum X_2^2 - \left(\frac{\sum X_2}{n}\right)^2}{n-1} \\
\delta_3^2 &= \frac{\sum X_3^2 - \left(\frac{\sum X_3}{n}\right)^2}{n-1} \\
\delta_4^2 &= \frac{\sum X_4^2 - \left(\frac{\sum X_4}{n}\right)^2}{n-1} \\
\delta^2 &= \left\{\frac{\sum (n_i-1)\delta_i^2}{\sum (n_i-1)}\right\} \\
\log s^2 &\quad \log \delta^2 \sum (n_i-1) \\
B &= (\log \delta^2) \sum (n_i-1) \\
\chi_\alpha^2 &= (\ln 10)\left\{B - \sum (n_i-1)\log \delta_i^2\right\}
\end{align*}
\]

2. Hypothesis Testing

The test for the hypothesis in this research uses Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). It is also used to examine the significant effects of two independent variables to dependent variable. Furthermore, ANOVA is also used to examine the significant interaction between the two independent variables to the dependent variable.
a. The total sum of squares:

$$\sum x_i^2 = \sum x_t^2 - \left( \frac{\sum x_t}{N} \right)^2$$

b. The sum of squares between groups:

$$\sum x_b^2 = \frac{(\sum X_1)^2}{n_1} + \frac{(\sum X_2)^2}{n_2} + \frac{(\sum X_3)^2}{n_3} + \frac{(\sum X_4)^2}{n_4} - \left( \frac{\sum x_t}{N} \right)^2$$

c. The sum of squares within groups:

$$\sum x_w^2 = \sum x_t^2 - \sum x_b^2$$

d. The between-columns sum of squares:

$$\sum x_{bc}^2 = \frac{(\sum X_{11})^2}{n_{c1}} + \frac{(\sum X_{12})^2}{n_{c2}} - \frac{(\sum X_t)^2}{N}$$

e. The between-rows sum of squares:

$$\sum x_{br}^2 = \frac{(\sum X_{r1})^2}{n_{r1}} + \frac{(\sum X_{r2})^2}{n_{r2}} - \frac{(\sum X_t)^2}{N}$$

f. The sum of squares interaction:

$$\sum x_{int} = \sum x_b^2 - (\sum x_{bc}^2 + (\sum x_{br}^2))$$

g. The number of degrees of freedom associated with each source of variation:

- df for between – columns sum of squares = C – 1
- df for between – rows sum of squares = R – 1
- df for interaction = (C – 1) (R – 1)
- df for between – groups sum of squares = G – 1
- df for within – groups sum of squares = \( \sum (n - 1) \)
- df for total sum of squares = N – 1
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Where:

\( C \) = the number of columns

\( R \) = the number of rows

\( G \) = the number of groups

\( n \) = the number of subjects in one group

\( N \) = the number of subjects in all groups

3. Tukey Test

The ANOVA test is used to find out if there is a significant different between groups. However, the analysis only indicates that there is a difference between group means, but it does not show the means difference between cells. Thus, a post hoc test needs to be done. Tukey test is post hoc test designed to perform a pair wise comparison of the means to see where the significant difference is. The formula of the Tukey test is as follows:

a. Collaborative Writing Method compared with Direct Instruction Method in teaching writing.

\[
q = \frac{\bar{X}_{1j} - \bar{X}_{2j}}{\sqrt{\text{Error Variance} / n}}
\]

b. Students having high creativity are compared with students having low creativity.

\[
q = \frac{\bar{X}_{1k} - \bar{X}_{2k}}{\sqrt{\text{Error Variance} / n}}
\]
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c. Collaborative Writing Method compared with Direct Instruction Method in teaching writing for students having high creativity.

\[ q = \frac{\bar{X}_{c} - \bar{X}_{d}}{\sqrt{\text{Error Variance} \cdot \frac{1}{n}}} \]

d. Collaborative Writing Method compared with Direct Instruction Method in teaching writing for students having low creativity.

\[ q = \frac{\bar{X}_{c} - \bar{X}_{d}}{\sqrt{\text{Error Variance} \cdot \frac{1}{n}}} \quad \text{or} \quad q = \frac{\bar{X}_{c2} - \bar{X}_{d2}}{\sqrt{\text{Error Variance} \cdot \frac{1}{n}}} \]

The analysis of the result of the computation of \( q \) is compared with \( q_t \). If \( q_o > q_t \), the difference is significant. To know which one is better, the means are compared.

4. Statistical Hypotheses

In this research, the researcher formulates the statistical hypotheses that consist of null hypotheses (\( H_0 \)) and alternative hypothesis (\( H_a \)). The statistical hypotheses are as follows:

a. The difference between Collaborative Writing Method (\( A_1 \)) and Direct Instruction Method (\( A_2 \)) to teach writing.

\[ H_0 : \mu_{A_1} = \mu_{A_2} \]
\[ H_a : \mu_{A_1} > \mu_{A_2} \]

\( H_0 \): there is no difference in the effectiveness between Collaborative Writing method and Direct Instruction method in teaching writing.
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Ha: Collaborative Writing method is more effective than Direct Instruction method in teaching writing.

b. The difference between the students having high creativity ($B_1$) have better writing skill than those having low creativity ($B_2$).

$H_0$: $\mu_{B_1} = \mu_{B_2}$

$H_a$: $\mu_{B_1} > \mu_{B_2}$

$H_0$: there is no difference in writing ability between the students having high creativity and those having low creativity.

$H_a$: the students having high creativity have better writing ability than those having low creativity.

c. Interaction between teaching methods used, Collaborative Writing method and Direct Instruction method ($A$), and students’ Creativity ($B$) in teaching writing.

It means that in teaching writing, the students who have high creativity are more appropriate taught by using Collaborative Writing method than those having low creativity. On the contrary, the students who have low creativity are more appropriate taught by Direct Instruction method than those having high creativity.

$H_0$: $A \times B = 0$

$H_a$: $A \times B > 0$

$H_0$ : there is no an interaction between teaching methods and creativity in teaching writing.

$H_a$ : there is an interaction between teaching methods and creativity in teaching writing.
CHAPTER IV
THE RESULTS OF THE RESEARCH

This chapter presents the result of the research which is administered to investigate the effectiveness of Collaborative Writing method in teaching writing skill viewed from students’ creativity. The discussion includes the implementation of the research, research design, prerequisite test, hypothesis test, discussion of the result.

A. The Implementation of the Research

In the treatment, two teaching writing methods were implemented. The Collaborative Writing method was implemented on the experimental group, and the Direct Instruction method was implemented on the control group. At first, the researcher conducted the treatment in ten meetings. Finally, after having treatment, both groups were post-tested.

The lesson plan used for both experimental group and control group were designed by the researcher. Both groups had the same materials, referring to the catalog used in STAIN Jurai Siwo. In Development the material, the researcher used some topics in descriptive text attached in the lesson plan, such as: My weekend, My Idol, My favorite food, My favorite place, My Ideal Bedroom, What Happens to Your Body When You are Nervous, The Shoes that You are Wearing Today, A Pet that You Would Like to Have, Describe Your Family Portrait that You Have at Your Home, Your Hometown. The researcher implemented the
Collaborative Writing method in the experimental group and the Direct Instruction method in the control group.

Since the Collaborative Writing method seems new for the experimental group, the treatment in the experimental group was conducted in the following stages: modeling, guiding, and practicing. In the modeling stage, the researcher will demonstrate how the Collaborative Writing method works. Then, the researcher taught the students each strategy in the Collaborative Writing method and model them how to use them in learning. In the guiding stage, students are asked to be in groups of five. The researcher guided the students how to use them correctly. In the practicing stages, the researcher asked students to practice the Collaborative Writing method independently.

Due to the syllabus employed in STAIN Jurai Siwo consists of the variety text that used in the classroom. Therefore, in this research, the researcher focuses on the descriptive text only in ten meetings. The schedule for experimental group and control group is as follow:

**Table 4.1 Schedule for Experimental Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Experimental group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Modeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Guiding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Practicing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Practicing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Practicing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Practicing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Practicing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Practicing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>Practicing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Practicing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2 Schedule for Control Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Control group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Direct Instruction method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Direct Instruction method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Direct Instruction method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Direct Instruction method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Direct Instruction method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Direct Instruction method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Direct Instruction method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Direct Instruction method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>Direct Instruction method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Direct Instruction method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Data Description

The data are divided into 8 groups as follows: (1) The data of the students who are taught using Collaborative Writing method (A₁); (2) The data of the students who are taught using Direct Instruction method (A₂); (3) The data of the students having high creativity (B₁); (4) The data of the students having low creativity (B₂); (5) The data of the students having high creativity who are taught by using Collaborative Writing method (A₁,B₁); (6) The data of the students having low creativity who are taught by using Collaborative Writing method (A₁,B₂); (7) The data of the students having high creativity who are taught by using Direct Instruction method (A₂,B₁); and (8) The data of the students having low creativity who are taught by using Direct Instruction method (A₂,B₂).

The data of each group presented above are described as follows:

1. The data of students who are taught using Collaborative Writing method (A₁).

The descriptive analysis of the data of A₁ shows that the score is 60 up to 86, the mean is 73, the mode is 76.62, the median is 74.81, and the standard
deviation is 7.24 (see Appendix 12). Then, the frequency distribution and histogram/polygon can be seen in the table 4.3 and figure 4.1 as follows:

**Table 4.3 Frequency Distribution of Data A₁**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Limit</th>
<th>Class Boundaries</th>
<th>Midpoint (Xi)</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59-62</td>
<td>58.5-62.5</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-66</td>
<td>62.5-66.5</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67-70</td>
<td>66.5-70.5</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>71-74</strong></td>
<td><strong>70.5-74.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>72.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-78</td>
<td>74.5-78.5</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79-82</td>
<td>78.5-82.5</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83-86</td>
<td>82.5-86.5</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Σ</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.1 Histogram and Polygon of Data A₁**

2. The data of the students who are taught using Direct Instruction method (A₂)

The descriptive analysis of the data of A₂ shows that the score is 52 up to 82. The mean is 66, the mode is 59.85, the median is 64.17, and the standard deviation is 8.81 (see Appendix 12). Then, the frequency distribution and histogram/polygon can be seen in the table 4.4 and figure 4.2 as follows:
### Table 4.4 Frequency Distribution of Data $A_2$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Limit</th>
<th>Class Boundaries</th>
<th>Midpoint ($X_i$)</th>
<th>$f$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48-52</td>
<td>47.5-52.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53-57</td>
<td>52.5-57.5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58-62</td>
<td>57.5-62.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-67</td>
<td>62.5-67.5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68-72</td>
<td>67.5-72.5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>73-77</strong></td>
<td><strong>72.5-77.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-82</td>
<td>77.5-82.5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sum$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>455</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Histogram and Polygon of Data $A_2$](image)

**Figure 4.2 Histogram and Polygon of Data $A_2$**

3. The data of the students having high creativity ($B_1$)

The descriptive analysis of the data of $B_1$ shows that the score is 60 up to 86. The mean is 74, the mode is 56.52, the median is 75.36, and the standard deviation is 6.57 (see Appendix 12). Then, the frequency distribution and histogram/polygon can be seen in the table 4.5 and figure 4.3.
Table 4.5 Frequency Distribution of Data $B_1$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval</th>
<th>Class Boundaries</th>
<th>Midpoint ($X_i$)</th>
<th>$f$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59-62</td>
<td>58.5-62.5</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-66</td>
<td>62.5-66.5</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67-70</td>
<td>66.5-70.5</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-74</td>
<td>70.5-74.5</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-78</td>
<td>74.5-78.5</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79-82</td>
<td>78.5-82.5</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83-86</td>
<td>82.5-86.5</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>∑</strong></td>
<td><strong>507.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>507.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Histogram and Polygon of Data $B_1$](image)

Figure 4.3 Histogram and Polygon of Data $B_1$

4. The data of the students having low creativity ($B_2$)

The descriptive analysis of the data of $B_2$ shows that the score is 52 up to 82. The mean is 65, the mode is 60.50, the median is 63.21, and the standard deviation is 8.28 (see Appendix 12). Then, the frequency distribution and histogram/polygon can be seen in the table 4.6 and figure 4.4
Table 4.6 Frequency Distribution of Data $B_2$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval</th>
<th>Class Boundaries</th>
<th>Midpoint ($X_i$)</th>
<th>$f$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48-52</td>
<td>47.5-52.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53-57</td>
<td>52.5-57.5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>58-62</strong></td>
<td><strong>57.5-62.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-67</td>
<td>62.5-67.5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68-72</td>
<td>67.5-72.5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73-77</td>
<td>72.5-77.5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-82</td>
<td>77.5-82.5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sum$</td>
<td>455</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.4 Histogram and Polygon of Data $B_2$

5. The data of the students having high creativity who are taught using Collaborative Writing method ($A_1, B_1$)

The descriptive analysis of the data of $A_1B_1$ shows that the score is 64 up to 86. The mean is 76, the mode is 78.50, the median is 77.21 and the standard
deviation is 5.90 (see Appendix 12). Then, the frequency distribution and histogram/polygon can be seen in the table 4.7 and figure 4.5.

Table 4.7 Frequency Distribution of Data $A_1 B_1$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval</th>
<th>Class Boundaries</th>
<th>Midpoint ($X_i$)</th>
<th>$f$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63-67</td>
<td>62.5-67.5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68-71</td>
<td>67.5-71.5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72-76</td>
<td>71.5-76.5</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77-81</td>
<td>76.5-81.5</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82-86</td>
<td>81.5-86.5</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Sigma$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$371.5$</td>
<td>$20$</td>
<td>$100$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.5 Histogram and Polygon of Data $A_1 B_1$

6. The data of the students having low creativity who are taught using Collaborative Writing method ($A_1, B_2$)

The descriptive analysis of the data of $A_2 B_1$ shows that the score is 60 up to 82. The mean is 70, the mode is 5.00, the median is 68.75, and the standard deviation is 5.90 (see Appendix 12). Then, the frequency distribution and histogram/polygon can be seen in the table 4.7 and figure 4.5.

Table 4.7 Frequency Distribution of Data $A_1 B_1$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval</th>
<th>Class Boundaries</th>
<th>Midpoint ($X_i$)</th>
<th>$f$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63-67</td>
<td>62.5-67.5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68-71</td>
<td>67.5-71.5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72-76</td>
<td>71.5-76.5</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77-81</td>
<td>76.5-81.5</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82-86</td>
<td>81.5-86.5</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Sigma$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$371.5$</td>
<td>$20$</td>
<td>$100$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.5 Histogram and Polygon of Data $A_1 B_1$
deviation is 7.52 (see Appendix 12). Then, the frequency distribution and histogram/polygon can be seen in table 4.8 the figure 4.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval</th>
<th>Class Boundaries</th>
<th>Midpoint (Xi)</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58-62</td>
<td>57.5-62.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-67</td>
<td>62.5-67.5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68-72</td>
<td>67.5-72.5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73-77</td>
<td>72.5-77.5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-82</td>
<td>77.5-82.5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>350</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Figure 4.6 Histogram and Polygon of Data A1, B2](image)

**Figure 4.6 Histogram and Polygon of Data A1, B2**

7. The data of the students having high creativity who are taught using Direct Instruction method (A2, B1)

The descriptive analysis of the data of A1 B2 shows that the score is 60 up to 82. The mean is 73, the mode is 72.83, the median is 82.83, and the standard
deviation is 5.83 (see Appendix 12). Then, the frequency distribution and histogram/polygon can be seen in the table 4.9 and figure 4.7.

Table 4.9 Frequency Distribution of Data A₂ B₁

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval</th>
<th>Class Boundaries</th>
<th>Midpoint (Xi)</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58-62</td>
<td>57.5-62.5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-67</td>
<td>62.5-67.5</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68-72</td>
<td>67.5-72.5</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73-77</td>
<td>72.5-77.5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-82</td>
<td>77.5-82.5</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>360</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.7 Histogram and Polygon of Data A₂, B₁

8. The data of the students having low creativity who are taught using Direct Instruction method (A₂, B₂).

The descriptive analysis of the data of A₂, B₂ shows that the score is 52 up to 72. The mean is 60, the mode is 69, the median is 59.36, and the standard
deviation is 5.82 (see Appendix 12). Then, the frequency distribution and histogram or polygon can be seen in the table 4.10 and figure 4.8.

**Table 4.10 Frequency Distribution of Data A₂ B₂**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval</th>
<th>Class Boundaries</th>
<th>Midpoint (Xi)</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52-56</td>
<td>52.5-56.5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57-61</td>
<td>56.5-61.5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-66</td>
<td>61.5-66.5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67-71</td>
<td>66.5-71.5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72-76</td>
<td>71.5-76.5</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σ</td>
<td></td>
<td>320</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Histogram and Polygon Data A₂ B₂](image)

**Figure 4.8 Histogram and Polygon Data A₂ B₂**

C. **Prerequisite Test**

Before testing the hypothesis, the researcher does the normality and homogeneity test. The normality test is used to know whether the sample is in normal distribution or not and homogeneity test is used to know whether the data
are homogeneous or not. Both normality and homogeneity test can be seen as follows:

1. Normality Test

The sample is in normal distribution if $L_o$ ($L$ obtained) is lower than $L_t$ ($L$ table) at the level significance $\alpha = 0.05$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>No of Sample</th>
<th>$L_o$</th>
<th>$L_t$</th>
<th>$A$</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The group treated with Collaborative Writing method ($A_1$)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The group treated with Direct Instruction method ($A_2$)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The group having high creativity ($B_1$)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The group having low creativity ($B_2$)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The group having high creativity taught with Collaborative Writing method ($A_1$, $B_1$)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The group having low creativity taught with Collaborative Writing method ($A_1$, $B_2$)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The group having high creativity taught with Direct Instruction method ($A_2$, $B_1$)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The group having low creativity taught with Direct Instruction method ($A_2$, $B_2$)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the table above, the value of $L_o$ from the data $A_1$, $A_2$, $B_1$, $B_2$, $A_1B_1$, $A_1B_2$, $A_2$, $B_1$, $A_2B_2$ are lower than $L_t$ at level significance $\alpha = 0.05$ ($L_o < L_t$). Therefore, it can be assumed that the samples are in normal distribution.
2. Homogeneity Test

It can be stated that the data are homogeneous if $\chi^2_o$ is lower than $\chi^2_t$ at the level significance $\alpha = 0.05$. The result of the analysis is as follows:

Table 4.12 The Result of Homogeneity Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$1/(df)$</th>
<th>$S_i^2$</th>
<th>Log $S_i^2$</th>
<th>(df)Log $S_i^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>34.89</td>
<td>1.5428</td>
<td>29.3124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>49.88</td>
<td>1.6980</td>
<td>32.2613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>43.06</td>
<td>1.6341</td>
<td>31.0480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>35.57</td>
<td>1.5511</td>
<td>29.4702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σ</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>122.0920</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the above computation result, it can be seen that $\chi^2_o$ (4.73) is lower than $\chi^2_t$ at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (7.81) or $\chi^2_o < \chi^2_t$ (4.73< 7.81).

Thus, it can be stated that the data are homogenous.

D. Hypothesis Test

The test can be conducted after the result of normality and homogeneity tests are calculated and fulfilled. The data analysis is conducted by using Multifactor Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) 2x2. The null hypothesis ($H_o$) is rejected if $F_o$ is higher than $F_t$ ($F_o > F_t$). It means that there is a significant effect of two independent variables to dependent variable. After knowing that the null hypothesis ($H_o$) is rejected, the analysis is continued by performing the
comparison of the mean between cells to see where the significant difference is using Tukey test. To know which group is better, the means between cells are compared. The 2 x 2 ANOVA and Tukey test are listed as follows:

Table 4.13 Summary of a 2x2 Multifactor Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variance</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>( F_a )</th>
<th>( F_{a.05} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between columns (Methods)</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between rows (Students’ Creativity)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columns by rows (interaction)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.14 Mean Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Because \( F_o (25.38) \) is higher than \( F_t \) at the level of significance \( \alpha = 0.05 (4.17) \), the null hypothesis (\( H_o \)) is rejected and the difference between columns is significant. It can be concluded that Collaborative Writing method to teach writing at the third semester students of STAIN Jurai Siwo Metro differs significantly from Direct Instruction method. In addition, the mean score of students who are taught by using Collaborative Writing method (73) is higher than that of those who are taught by using Direct Instruction method (66). It can be concluded that teaching writing using Collaborative Writing method is more effective than Direct Instruction method.

2. Because \( F_o (43.26) \) is higher than \( F_t \) at the level of significance \( \alpha = 0.05 (4.17) \), the null hypothesis (\( H_o \)) is rejected and the difference between rows is
significant. It can be concluded that students having high creativity differ significantly from those having low creativity. In addition, the mean score of students who have high creativity (74) is higher than that of those who have low creativity (65). It can be concluded that the students having high creativity have better writing ability than those who have low creativity.

3. Because $F_o$ interaction (4.41) is higher than $F_t$ at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (4.17), the null hypothesis ($H_o$) is rejected and there is interaction between the two variables, the teaching method and students’ creativity to teach writing at the third semester students of STAIN Jurai Siwo Metro. It means that the students who have high creativity are more appropriate taught by using Collaborative Writing method than those are having low creativity. On the contrary, the students who have low creativity are more appropriate taught by Direct Instruction method than those are having high creativity.

The researcher continued analyzing the data using Tukey test. The following is the result of analyzing of the data using 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>$A_1$ dan $A_2$</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7.223</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$B_1$ and $B_2$</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8.906</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$A_1B_1$ and $A_2B_1$</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.149</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$A_1B_2$ and $A_2B_2$</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.137</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Because $q_o$ between columns (7.223) is higher than $q_t$ at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (2.86), applying Collaborative Writing method differs significantly from Direct Instruction method to teach writing. Because the
mean of $A_1$ (73) is higher than $A_2$ (66), it can be concluded that Collaborative Writing method is more effective than Direct Instruction method to teach writing.

2. Because $q_o$ between rows (8.906) is higher than $q_t$ at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (2.86), it can be concluded that the students who have high creativity and those who have low creativity significantly different in their writing ability. Because the mean of $B_1$ (74) is higher than $B_2$ (65), it can be concluded that the students who have high creativity have better writing ability than those who have low creativity.

3. Because $q_o$ between cells $A_1B_1$ and $A_2B_1$ (3.149) is higher than $q_t$ at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (2.95), applying Collaborative Writing method differs significantly from Direct Instruction method for teaching writing to the students who have high creativity. The null hypothesis ($H_0$) is rejected and Collaborative Writing method differs significantly from Direct Instruction method to teach writing to the students having high creativity. In addition, the mean score of students having high creativity who are taught by using Collaborative Writing method $A_1B_1$ (77) is higher than those having high creativity who are taught by using Direct Instruction method $A_2B_1$ (72). It can be concluded that Collaborative Writing method is more effective than Direct Instruction method for teaching writing to the students having high creativity.

4. Because $q_o$ between cells $A_1B_2$ and $A_2B_2$ (7.137) is higher than $q_t$ at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (2.95), applying Direct Instruction method differs
significantly from Collaborative Writing method for teaching writing to the students who have low creativity. The null hypothesis ($H_0$) is rejected and Collaborative Writing method differs significantly from Direct Instruction method to teach writing to the students having low creativity. In addition, the mean score of students having high creativity who are taught by using Collaborative Writing method $A_1B_2$ (70) is higher than those having low creativity who are taught by Direct Instruction method $A_2B_2$ (60), it can be concluded that Direct Instruction method is more effective than Collaborative Writing method for teaching writing to the students who have low creativity.

E. Discussion of the Result

1. Collaborative Writing is more effective than Direct Instruction method in teaching writing.

Collaborative Writing method is one of methods to teach writing that gives the opportunity for students to develope oral and aural skills, such as negotiation, discussion, and turn-taking in written communication. Collaborative Writing method supports students to involve actively in learning. It can also involve several students working on a part of a text each and then creating the whole from the parts, such as a class working together to write a report. As stated by Allen, et al, in Benjamin (2004), Collaborative Writing is as collaborators producing a shared document, engaging in substantive interaction about that document, and sharing decision-making power and responsibility for it. Then, Barkley, et al, (2005: 256) define that in Collaborative Writing, student pairs or triads write a formal paper together. Each student contributes at each stage of the
writing process: brainstorming ideas; gathering and organizing information; and drafting, revising, and editing the writing.

Collaborative Writing method allows for students to undertake different roles with which they feel comfortable to make one document. It is supported by Mulligan (2011) that his research has shown that Collaborative Writing assignments and peer editing, as done in pairs or small groups, can have numerous affective benefits for the learner. Then, Bosley in Benjamin (2004: 71) defines Collaborative Writing as two or more people working together to produce one written document in a situation in which a group takes responsibility for having produced the document. Collaborative or team writing is the process of producing a written work as a group where all team members contributed to the content and the decisions about how the group will function. Moreover, Hodges (2002) argues that working collaboratively can motivate writers in way which encourage them to redraft their work purposefully and explicitly in pursuit of particular creative effect. When teacher uses Collaborative Writing method in teaching writing, the students are active and creative to cooperate in making a document. They will make a good interaction among the member of the group to increase creativity and tolerance each other. It can help them to utilize a range of social skills in writing skill.

Meanwhile, Direct Instruction method is a method of teaching writing which focuses on directing and explicit in the specific skills and strategies that are necessary for writing ability. It allows teacher to scaffold instruction, gradually shifting and releasing responsibility for completing a task from him to students.
As stated by Luke (2006: 7), Direct Instruction, an alternative instructional method that emphasizes fast-paced teacher probes and sequenced drill-repetition-practice routines. In line with the theory, Joyce & Weil (2000) define that Direct Instruction method consists of five phases, such as (1) orientation, (2) presentation, (3) structured practiced (4) guided practice, and (5) independent practice. During the phases, teacher gives responsibility for students to pay attention and practice the steps.

Moreover, When teacher teaches writing by using this method, he provides constant interaction between students and the teacher. It means that the teacher will be a model in learning process to give explanation and demonstration the material for students and they will apply all the teacher’s steps that have done in front of the class. Valiathan (2009) stated that Direct Instruction (DI) is used to describe learning material in which the teacher or expert transmits information directly to learners structuring learning time to reach a clearly defined set of objectives as efficiently as possible. Then, Stein, et al. in Viel-Ruma (1998) define that Direct Instruction is an explicit instructional approach that focuses on teacher modeling, task analysis, frequent questioning of the learners with directed feedback, scripted lessons, and choral response. Furthermore, Vukmir (2002: 42) defines that Direct Instruction is best characterized by its teacher directed and skills-oriented approach that uses small-group instruction. Therefore, the students have to accept what the teacher gives passively. They have no chance to express their own idea on some topics and of course they have no way to create new strategy in
learning process. That is why Collaborative Writing method is more effective for teaching writing that Direce Instruction (DI) method.

2. The students having high creativity have better writing ability than those having low creativity.

In a second language learning situation, creativity has important role for students of a foreign language because it can influence with the acquisition, invention, and production of the new language. It supported by Anwar, et al (2012), Creative thinking is an important human characteristic. It is the best thought as a process, requiring a mixture of ingredients, including personality traits, abilities and skills. Moreover, according to Piaget in Anwar, et al (2012), the most initial aim of education is not to train individuals who repeat the previous generations, but to train inventors who have the skill of producing new things and who are creative. In technology era, the creativity concerns and needs of creative individual.

The students with high creativity are usually the people who are able to come up their ideas to solve the problem. As stated by Cheung (2007), creativity is a useful and powerful tool in the mental toolbox of an individual. Moreover, Higgins in Sefertzi (2000: 2), states that a creative solution can simply integrate existing knowledge in a different way. Then, Heye in Baldacchino (2009) say that creativity is seen as going beyond new products, new services and improved processes. It allows a person to solve problems, negotiate with other people, and look at the world in a different perspective.
In learning process of writing, they feel easily to solve the problem in writing, such as: (1) Editing various genres including poetry, scriptwriting, fiction, and essays, (2) Developing broad understanding of effective written communications and their professional contexts. (3) Developing effective rhetorical capacities through reflection on the written language. It is supported by Temizkan (2011) who examines “The Effect of Creative Writing Activities on the Story Writing Skill”. There are 60 students participate in the research in total. The data obtained from the result of creative writing activities processed in 10 weeks are evaluated with regard to “The Scale of Story Writing Skill”. It has been revealed that according to scale of story writing skill there is statistically a significant difference between the points \( t(29) = -5.172; p \leq 0.05 \) the students got from the post-test in the experimental and the control group. The result shows that creative writing activities are as effective in both writing activity and on the attitude of the students related to course as on the performance of the writing.

On the contrary, the students who have low creativity tend to sit passively in classroom and withdraw from activities that could increase their language skills. They do not have ideas to arrange the sentences in a good paragraph and have less willing to try uncertain linguistic forms. Mostly, the students with low creativity are less confidence in learning process. That is why the students having high creativity have better writing skill than those having low creativity.
3. There is an interaction between methodes and students’ creativity for teaching writing.

The success of learning includes not only the teaching methods but also the students’ creativity. The students with high creativity tend to be motivated to learn. They are willing to take risks and solve the problem. Creative students think laterally and make associations between things that are not usually connected. They regard most the problem in learning process is a challenge to be solved by many ways in learning. Using Collaborative Writing method in teaching writing is really hoped by them. It is supported by what Fortune (2003) stated that immersion teachers are encouraged to design learning experiences that thoughtfully integrate all four language modalities and provide numerous opportunities across the curriculum for collaborative writing that taps student creativity.

In Collaborative Writing method gives opportunity for the students to be active and creative in learning process. They explore ideas and options when they do the writing process collaboratively to make one document. It is supported by Kennedy in Hadjerrouit (2011) Collaborative Writing involves active participation of the project members, shared editing, reading and group writing strategies, revisions, peer-review, and group evaluations of contributions. Each student contributes at each stage of the writing process: brainstorming ideas; gathering and organizing information; and drafting, revising, and editing the writing.

On the other hand, Direct Instruction method is another method in which the teaching and learning process focus on the teacher. In this method, the
students tend to be passive because the teacher has a dominant figure. The interaction between the teacher and the students is usually in the form of one-way communication from the teacher to the students. Besides, the students’ scientific and creative thinking cannot be facilitated properly. Therefore, teaching writing using Direct Instruction method is more effective than Collaborative Writing method for the students having low creativity because the students with low creativity are always helped by the teacher for developing their writing step by step. It is supported by Peterson in Cruiskshank, Bainer, and Metcalf (1999:231), Direct Instruction is similar to traditional teaching. The teacher becomes the decision maker and a dominant figure so that the students tend to be passive and become recipients who absorb the teacher's information.

The explanations above show that the implementation of two different methods for teaching writing gives the different result to the students having high and low creativity. Therefore, there is an interaction between teaching methods and students’ creativity for teaching writing. Collaborative Writing method is suitable for students having high creativity and Direct Instruction method is suitable for students having low creativity.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION, IMPLICATION, AND SUGGESTION

A. Conclusion

Based on the result of the data analysis, the research findings are as follows:

1. Collaborative Writing method is more effective than Direct Instruction method to teach writing because $F_0$ (25.38) is higher than $F_1$ at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (4.17), and the mean score of students who are taught using Collaborative Writing method (73) is higher than that of those who are taught using Direct Instruction method (66) (see Appendix 15). Then, $q_o$ between columns (7.223) is higher than $q_t$ at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (2.86).

2. The students having high creativity have better writing ability than those having low creativity because $F_0$ (43.26) is higher than $F_1$ at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (4.17), and the mean score of students who have high creativity (74) is higher than that of those who have low creativity (65) (see Appendix 15). Then, $q_o$ between rows (8.906) is higher than $q_t$ at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (2.86).

3. There is an interaction between teaching method and students’ creativity in teaching writing because $F_0$ interaction (4.41) is higher than $F_1$ at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (4.17). In addition, $q_o$ between cells A$_1$B$_1$ and A$_2$B$_1$ (3.149) is higher than $q_t$ at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (2.95). and the mean score of students having high creativity who are taught by using
Collaborative Writing method $A_1B_1$ (77) is higher than that of those having high creativity who are taught using Direct Instruction method $A_2B_1$ (72). Then, $q_o$ between cells $A_1B_2$ and $A_2B_2$ (7.137) is higher than $q_i$ at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (2.95), and the mean score of students having low creativity who are taught by using Collaborative Writing method $A_1B_2$ (70) is higher than those having low creativity who are taught by Direct Instruction method $A_2B_2$ (60). It means that in teaching writing, the students who have high creativity are more appropriate taught by using Collaborative Writing method than those are having low creativity. On the contrary, the students who have low creativity are more appropriate taught by Direct Instruction method than those are having high creativity.

From the research findings, it can be concluded that Collaborative Writing method is an effective method in teaching writing for the third semester students of STAIN Jurai Siwo Metro in the academic year of 2012/2013. The effectiveness of the method is influenced by the students’ creativity.

**B. Implication**

The results of the research imply that Collaborative Writing method can affect the students’ writing ability. It is proved from the research finding that Collaborative Writing method is more effective than Direct Instruction method to teach writing to the third semester students of STAIN Jurai Siwo Metro in the academic year of 2012/2013. Viewed from the students’ creativity, the students having high creativity who are taught using Collaborative Writing method have...
better writing skill than those who have low creativity. It means that it suitably used for high creativity students. For students with low creativity, Direct Instruction method is more effective than Collaborative Writing method. The teachers need to consider when they teach second language learners. The teachers should make the learning context creative by providing a supportive environment, encourage non-threatening teaching techniques, and use relevant topics. They should not only be concerned about the curriculum content but also students’ creativity, so that they can select the teaching methods which are suitable for the students having high and low creativity in teaching writing. Because each class has students having high and low creativity, Collaborative Writing method can be used with Direct Instruction method to complete each other.

C. Suggestion

Some suggestions for teachers, students, and future researchers can be listed as follows:

1. For the lecturers

   It is better for the lecturers to use Collaborative Writing method of teaching writing. In learning of writing process, it can be applied in the class which is suitable for the students having high and low creativity in teaching writing. Therefore, the lecturers are also recommended to make the learning context more creative by providing a supportive environment, to encourage non-threatening teaching methods, and to use relevant topics so that the lecturers can encourage the students’ communicative competence in written language.
2. For the students

The students should realize that they have important roles in teaching-learning process. That is why the students should be more active in order to improve their writing ability. For low creativity students, they should encourage themselves to involve in activities that could increase their language skills. Moreover, they should be motivated to learn and are willing to take risks of making mistakes so that they can find good performance.

3. For the future researchers

Other researchers can use this result of the study as the starting point to continue the research. It may also be useful to have research with students’ different psychological aspects like students’ interest, self-esteem, locus of control, and others.