TEACHING WRITING THROUGH COOPERATIVE INTEGRATED READING AND COMPOSITION (CIRC) VIEWED FROM STUDENTS' CREATIVITY

Ani Fiani
Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, STKIP PGRI Lubuklinggau
annie_fiani@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

This study aims to examine whether: (1) CIRC is more effective than direct instruction to teach writing to the seventh-grade students of MTs N Lubuklinggau in the academic year of 2012/2013; (2) the seventh-grade students who have high creativity have better writing skill than those who have low creativity; (3) there is an interaction between teaching methods and students' creativity for teaching writing. This research uses a quasi-experimental study, especially a factorial design. The results indicate that: (1) CIRC is more effective than direct instruction to teach writing in the seventh-grade students of MTs N Lubuklinggau in the academic year of 2012/2013; (2) the students having high creativity have better writing skills than the students having low creativity; and (3) there is an interaction between teaching methods (CIRC and Direct Instruction) and the students' creativity (high and low) for teaching writing. EFL teachers in Indonesia can consider CIRC an alternative way to improve their students' writing ability, mainly writing descriptive texts.

Keywords: *CIRC, DI, Creativity, Descriptive text.*

A. Pendahuluan

Writing is one of the productive language skills. Writing is not the same as other skills that can be done one time. Moreover, Langan (2001: 12) states that writing is a process of continuous discovery that involves a series of steps, not an automatic process. There is no doubt that writing is the most challenging skill for L_2 learners to master. Murcia (2000: 161) states that the most challenging language skill is writing, which requires a high level of effective language control than the other skills. It is also supported by Nunan (1998: 35) that the most difficult of macro skills for all language users is how to write fluently and expressively. That is why writing is considered a difficult skill to be mastered, requiring a particular skill in producing a written form.

Even though it is regarded as a complex and challenging skill, it must be given to use the language effectively in the teaching and learning process. In this study, the

researcher used CIRC concerning was writing. CIRC is a comprehensive program to teach reading, writing, and language arts. According to Slavin (1995: 104), the development of CIRC is focused on curriculum simultaneously, and the instructional method attempts to use cooperative learning as a vehicle for introducing state-of-the-art curricular practices on the practical teaching of reading and writing. It is concerned with group goals and individual responsibility.

As a comparison, the researcher used direct instruction. It is a program that consists of four phases of activity: lesson introduction (orientation), development, structured practice or guided practice, and independent practice. The teacher has a dominant role in explaining more to ensure that the students have already had prerequisite knowledge or skills to do independent practice. CIRC and direct instruction are the methods that can be implemented in the classroom.

Another aspect that the researcher can see based on the students is creativity. In the classroom, some students have high creativity and low creativity. Their creativity can appear when they produce or apply something new such as writing activities. Creativity is the activity to convey something new. In other words, creativity involves thinking that is aimed at producing ideas or products that are relatively novel and that are, in some respect, compelling (Kaufman and Sternberg, 2006: 2). Creativity as a supporting element of learning plays an essential role in the teaching and learning process. The students who have high creativity can produce a writing form quickly than the low one. In short, creativity is a natural process for the students, so that the researcher can be helped after the researcher knows the students who have high creativity and the low one.

Therefore, this study investigates whether CIRC is more effective than direct instruction to teach writing viewed from students' creativity in MTs N Lubuklinggau in the academic year of 2012/2013.

B. Metode Penelitian

The research method used for the research was an experimental study. The purpose of an experimental study was to investigate the correlation between cause and effect and how far its correlation was by giving specific treatment to the experimental class and the

control class as the comparison. In other words, in this study, this experimental research was aimed at observing whether there is an interaction between teaching methods and writing skills viewed from students' creativity. The research design used for the research was factorial design 2 X 2 using multifactor analysis of variance (ANOVA).

The research population was the seventh-grade students of MTs N Lubuklinggau in 2012/2013. The research sample used was two classes of MTs N Lubuklinggau at the seventh-grade students in the academic year of 2012/2013, and the sampling technique was random cluster sampling. Moreover, to know which one was controlling and which one was experiment class, a lottery was used.

There was one technique used to collect the research data. It was a test. The test was used to collect data on students' writing skills, and another test was used to collect data on students' creativity levels. Moreover, the techniques of analyzing data used for the research were descriptive analysis and inferential analysis. Descriptive analysis was used to know: mean, median, mode, and standard deviation of the writing test. Before conducting an ANOVA test, normality and homogeneity test had to be conducted. Next, to test the research hypothesis, inferential analysis was used. The testing hypothesis was conducted to manage the research data, which are numbers, to produce a natural conclusion. It is also used to test whether the hypothesis of the research is accepted or rejected. Besides the ANOVA test, Tukey's test is used to find the level of the mean difference.

C. Hasil dan Pembahasan

In this study, the hypotheses tests were aimed at findings out if there were effects of the independent and dependent variables upon the dependent variables. Tests were also intended to reveal if there was an interaction among those variables. The summary of the data is shown in the following data:

Table 1
The summary of the main scores

Creativity (B)	Teaching methods		Total
	CIRC (A_1)	DI (A_2)	
High Creativity (B_1)	$\bar{X}$ A_1B_1 = 86.18	$\bar{X}$ A_2B_1 = 78.45	$\bar{X}$ = 82.32

Low Creativity (B_2)	$\bar{X}A_1B_2$ = 64.73	$\bar{X}$ A_2B_1 = 64.91	$\bar{X}$= 64.82
	$\bar{X}$ = 75.5	$\bar{X}$= 71.68	$\bar{X}$= 73.57

Table 2

The summary result of two-way ANOVA with the same cells

Source of Variance	SS	Df	MS	F_o	$F_{t(0.05)}$	P	Test Decision
Between columns	156.57	1	156.57	5.36	4.08	< 0.05	H_{oA} was rejected
Between row	3368.75	1	3368.75	115.42		< 0.05	H_{oB} was rejected
Interaction	172.02	1	172.02	5.89		< 0.05	H_{oAB} was rejected
Between groups	3697.34	3	1232.45				
Within-group	1167.46	40	29.19				
Total	4864.80	43					

Based on the previous table, some interpretations could be described in three points. Firstly, the data showed the impact of employing teaching methods on the students' writing skills. Based on the computation or the result of the two-way ANOVA with the same cells, the value of teaching methods was compared to the F_t in which $_{\text{the numerator}}$ is 1, and the $df_{denominator}$ was 40 at the level of significance α=0.05. Based on the table, the value of F_o (5.36)>F_t (4.08) means that H_o was rejected. Then, a conclusion could be described that there was a significant difference in teaching by using CIRC and DI to the students' writing skills. The table revealed that the mean score for students taught using CIRC was 75.5, and the mean score of the students with direct instruction (DI) was 71.68. Then, it is summarized that students taught by using CIRC have better achievement than those taught by using DI.

The next point, the data indicated the effect of creativity level upon the students' writing achievement. The result of the two-way ANOVA with the same cells showed

that F_o of the value of creativity was 115.42. This value was then compared to F_t in which $df_{numerator}$ was 1 and $df_{denominator}$ was 40 at the significant level α=0.05, and the value of F_t was 4.08. Then, as F_o (115.42)>F_t (4.08), H_o was rejected. It meant that there was a significant difference in creativity level upon the students' writing skills. The table revealed that the mean of the students' writing scores for the students with high creativity was 82.32; meanwhile, the mean of the students' writing scores for the students with low creativity was 64.82. Therefore, the students who had high creativity have better writing skills than those having low creativity.

Finally, the last data revealed the interaction of teaching methods (CIRC and DI) and creativity level (high and low) upon the students' writing skills. The results of the two-way ANOVA with the same cells show that the value of interaction (F_o) was 5.89. This value was then compared to F_t in which $df_{numerator}$ was 1 and $df_{denominator}$ was 40 at the significance α=0.05, and the value F_t was 4.08. From the table, it was known that the value of F_o was (5.89) > F_t (4.08). Consequently, H_o was rejected. It meant a significant interaction between the teaching methods and the level of creativity to teach writing.

In conclusion, all of the analyses using the two-way ANOVA with the same cells revealed that the value of H_{oA}, $H_{ob,}$ and H_{oAB} was rejected. It meant that null hypotheses were rejected. Therefore, it was urgent to find out the significant impacts or mean test with multiple comparative tests. Tukey's test then was employed to find which means were significantly different from one another. The test compared the means of every treatment to every other treatment; that was, it applied simultaneously to the set of all pair-wise comparisons and identified where the difference between two means was more significant than the standard error expected to allow.

Table 3

The summary of comparative test between cells using Tukey's test

No.	The significance level of mean difference	q_o	q_t	Description
1.	Between columns q	4.63	2.86	H_o is rejected
2.	Between column (HC)	6.71	2.92	H_o is rejected

3.	Between column (LC)	0.16	2.92	H_o is accepted
4.	Between rows A_1	18.63	2.92	H_o is rejected
5.	Between rows A_2	11.76	2.92	H_o is rejected
6.	Between rows HC and LC	21.49	2.86	H_o is rejected

The table described six points. The first, the score of q_o between columns was 4.63, and the score of q of Tukey's table at the level of significance α=0.05 and n=44 was 2.86. because $q_o > q_t$ or q_o (4.63) was higher than $q_{t(0.05)}$ (2.86), it could be concluded that there was a significant difference in the student's writing skills between those who were taught by using CIRC and those who were taught by using DI. Based on the calculation result, the mean score of the students who were taught using CIRC (75.5) was higher than those taught using direct instruction (71.68). Thus, it could be concluded that the students who were taught using CIRC had better writing skills than those taught by using DI.

The second, the score of q between columns (HC) was 6.71, and the score of q of Tukey's table at the level of significance α=0.05 and n=22 was 2.92. because $q_o > q_t$ or q_o (6.71) was higher than $q_{t(0.05)}$(2.92), it could be concluded that there was a significant difference in the student's writing skills between those who had high creativity who were taught by using CIRC and those who had high creativity who were taught by using direct instruction. Based on the calculation result, the mean score of the students who had high creativity who were taught using CIRC (86.18) was higher than those who had high creativity who were taught using DI (78.45). Thus, it could be concluded that the students who had high creativity who were taught by using CIRC had better writing skills than those who had high creativity who were taught by using DI had better writing skills.

The third, the score of q between columns (LC) was 0.16, and the q_o of Tukey's table at the level of significance α=0.05 and n=22 was 2.92. because $q_o < q_t$ or q_o (0.16) was lower than $q_{t(0.05)}$ (2.92), it could be concluded that there was no significant difference in the student's writing skill between those who had low creativity who were taught by using CIRC and those who had low creativity who were taught by using DI.

The fourth, the score of $_{qo}$ between rows (A_1) was 18.63, and the score of q of Tukey's table at the level of significance α=0.05 and n=22 was 2.92. because $_{qo}>_{qt}$ or $_{qo}$ (18.63) was higher than $_{qt(0.05)}$ (2.92), it could be concluded that there was a significant difference in the student's writing skills between those who had high creativity who were taught by using CIRC than those who had low creativity. Based on the calculation result, the mean score of the students who had high creativity who were taught using CIRC (86.18) was higher than those who had low creativity (64.73). Thus, it could be concluded that the students who had high creativity who were taught by using CIRC had better writing skills than those who had low creativity.

The fifth, the score of q_o between rows (A_2) was 11.76, and the score of q of Tukey's table at the level of significance α=0.05 and n=22 was 2.92. Because $q_o>q_t$ or q_o (11.76) was higher than $q_{t(0.05)}$ (2.92), it could be concluded that there was a significant difference in the student's writing skills between those who had high creativity who were taught by using direct instruction than those who had low creativity. Based on the calculation result, the mean score of the students who had high creativity who were taught using direct instruction (78.45) was higher than those who had low creativity (64.91). Thus, it could be concluded that the students who had high creativity who were taught using direct instruction had better writing skills than those who had low creativity.

Finally, the score of q_o between rows (HC and LC) was 21.49, and the score of q_o of Tukey's table at the level of significance α=0.05 and n=44 was 2.86. Because $q_o>q_t$ or q_o (21.49) was higher than $q_{t(0.05)}$ (2.92), it could be concluded that there was a significant difference in the student's writing skill between those who had high creativity than those had low creativity. Based on the calculation result, the mean score of the students (82.32) was higher than those who had low creativity (64.82). Thus, it could be concluded that the students who had high creativity had better writing skills than those who had low creativity.

Based on the explanation above, three points could be concluded here. Firstly, based on the result, there was a significant difference in teaching methods (CIRC is better than DI) upon writing skill. CIRC was proven to be able to enhance student's writing skills. The method is a program of cooperative learning that helps students to

learn well. Slavin (1995:106) states that students plan, revise, and edit their compositions in close collaboration with teammates in CIRC. This method also make students learn from other students and this reduces affective filters such as fear, shyness, and frustration. In other words, CIRC has many advantages in the classroom so that it can enhance students' writing skills.

Moreover, the students who had high creativity were better in writing than those who, reducing. Creativity is a general ability to create something new and share new ideas implemented in problem-solving. It can be stated to understand new relationships among previous elements (Munandar, 1999:25). Based on this study, creativity plays a crucial role in helping students express their ideas in the written form, especially in descriptive texts. Furthermore, Getzels and Csikszentmihalyi (in Good and Brophy, 1979: 520) stress that the high-divergent creativity group was able to free themselves from the stimulus low-divergent group focused on it. In this case, the students who had high creativity could develop their idea from the text or the stimulus and their new ideas. Besides that, the students who had low creativity only focused on the stimulus or the texts and could not show something new from their ideas. This can be seen from the results of their writing skill in which the scores of both control and experimental classes were lower than those of having a high level of creativity from both classes given treatment.

The next point, there was an interaction between teaching method and creativity to teach writing. CIRC is one of the cooperative methods and focuses on the students. This method is a comprehensive program for teaching reading, writing, and language arts (Slavin, 1995:104). It means that this method can be used to improve language use and stimulate students' creative ideas. Based on the results, CIRC in teaching writing is better for the students who have high creativity than those who have low creativity, and direct instruction is better for the students who have low creativity than those who have high creativity so that it can be concluded that there is an interaction between learning methods and creativity for teaching writing.

D. Kesimpulan

Based on the hypotheses testing, research findings are as follows:

1. The students who are taught CIRC have better writing ability than those who are using direct instruction. In other words, the use of CIRC is more effective than direct instruction for the seventh-grade students of MTs N Lubuklinggau.
2. The students who have a high level of creativity have better writing ability than those who have a low level of creativity for the seventh-grade students of MTs N Lubuklinggau.
3. There is an interaction between teaching methods and creativity. This can be seen from the finding of this study that the students taught by CIRC have better writing skills than those taught by direct instruction (DI) for the students who have high creativity. Moreover, the students taught by direct instruction (DI) have better writing skills than those taught by CIRC for the students who have low creativity.

Based on the research findings, it can be concluded that CIRC is effective for teaching writing for the seventh-grade students of MTs N Lubuklinggau in the academic year of 2012/2013.

There are some suggestions which are addressed to the teachers. Teachers are suggested to be more creative and innovative in using various teaching methods that accompany the materials). Students then are suggested to ask and discuss what they do not know with their peers and the teachers so that it is easy for them to solve the problem. Finally, other researchers can do further research by applying some other variables involving self-esteem, self-confidence, linguistic intelligence, and many others.

REFERENCES

Arends, Richard I. 2001. *Learning to Teach.* Singapore: McGraw-Hill Companies.

Arikunto, Suharsimi. 2010. *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Ary, Donald; Jacobs, L.C., and Razavieeh, Asghar, et al. 1979. *Introduction to Research in Education (2nd Edition).* New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.

Brown, H.D. 2001. Teaching by Principles: *An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy (2nd Edition)*. San Francisco: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.

Budiyono. 2004. *Metodologi Penelitian Pendidikan.* Surakarta: UNS Press.

Byrne, Donn. 1997. *Teaching Writing Skills*. New York: Longman Inc..

Crawford, William R., and John P. De Cecco. 1974. *The Psychology of Learning and Instruction: Educational Psychology*. United States of America: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Fawcett, S & Sandberg, A. 1988. *A Grammar and Guide to Writing (3rd Edition).* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Foster, John. 1971. *Creativity and the Teacher.* London: MacMillan Education Ltd.

Harris, David D. 1969. *Testing English as a second language*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Harris, John. 1993. *Introducing Writing*. England: Penguin English.

Heaton, J. B. 1998. *Writing English Language Tests*. New York: Longman Inc.

Henson, Kenneth T., and Ben F. Eller. 1999. *Educational Psychology for Effective Teaching*. United States of America: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Johnson, David W. & Johnson, Roger T. 1991. *Learning Together & Alone: Cooperative, Competitive, and Individualistic Learning (3rd Edition).* Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon.

Kessler, Carolyn. 1992. *Cooperative Language Learning.* New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Langan, John. 1985. *College Writing Skills with Readings*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Leighton, M. S. 1999. *Classroom Teaching Skill*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Munandar, Utami. 1992. *Mengembangkan Bakat dan Kreativitas Anak Sekolah*. Jakarta: Grasindo.

Munandar, Utami. 2009. *Pengembangan Kreativitas Anak Berbakat*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Ngadiso. 2008. *Statistics*. Materi Kuliah Pascasarjana UNS Surakarta.

Nunan, David. 1993. *Introducing Discourse Analysis*. England: Penguin Books.

O'Malley, J. Michael, and Lorraine Valdez Pierce. 1996. *Authentic Assessment for English Language Learners: Practical Approaches for Teachers*. United States of America: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Orlich, D. C., Harder, R.J., Callahan, R. C., and Gibson, H.W. 1998. *Teaching Strategies*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Oshima, Alice, and Ann Hogue. 2006. *Writing Academic English (4th Edition)*. United States of America: Longman Inc.

Raimes, A. 1983. *Techniques in Teaching Writing*. New York: Oxford University.

Richards, Jack C., and Theodore S. Rodgers. 2001. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching (2nd Edition)*. United States of America: Cambridge University Press.

Rockler, Michael J. 1988. *Innovative Teaching Strategies*. United States of America: Gorsuch Scarisbrick Publishers.

Slavin, Robert E. 1995. *Cooperative Learning: Theory, Research, and Practice (2nd edition)*. United States of America: Allyn and Bacon: A Simon & Schuster Company.

Smalley, Regina L, Mary K. Ruetten, Joann Rishel Kozyrev. 2001. *Refining Composition Skills: Rhetoric and Grammar*. United States of America: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Taylor, Calvin W. 1964. *Creativity: Progress and Potential.* United States of America: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Tompkins, G. E. 1994. *Teaching Writing: Balancing Process and Product.* New York: Macmillan College Company, Inc.

Tuckman, Bruce W. 1978. *Conducting Educational Research (2nd Edition)*. United States of America: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Inc.

Ur, Penny. 1996. *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory*. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.

White, Ron. 1997. *Process Writing*. England: Longman, Inc.

Yanni, Robert Di, and William Smith. 1989. *The Act of Writing*. United States of America: Rndom House Inc.