TEACHING WRITING OF ARGUMENTATIVE ESSAY USING COLLABORATIVE WRITING TECHNIQUE VIEWED FROM STUDENTS' CREATIVITY: AN EXPERIMENTAL

M. Ali Ghufron and Masnuatul Hawa
English IKIP PGRI Bojonegoro, East Java, Indonesia

Corresponding e-mail: alghufron.87@gmail.com; pamujihawa@yahoo.co.id

Abstract: The use of small group and pair work in classrooms, particularly in second language (L2) classrooms, rests on strong theoretical and pedagogical bases. This research was aimed at finding out: (1) whether or not Collaborative Writing Technique is more effective than Direct Instruction in teaching writing of argumentative essay; (2) whether the students who have high creativity have better writing ability than those who have low creativity; and (3) whether there is an interaction between teaching techniques and creativity in teaching writing. This experimental research was carried out in IKIP PGRI Bojonegoro in the academic year of 2014/2015 from March 2015 to June 2015. The population was the fourth semester students of English Education Department in the academic year of 2014/2015, and the number of population was 126 students who were divided into three classes. The samples, which were selected by using cluster random sampling, were IIB as the experimental group and IIA as the control group. Each group consists of 42 students. The experimental group was treated by using Collaborative Writing Technique, while the control group was treated by using Direct Instruction. The data analysis shows the following findings: (1) Collaborative Writing Technique is more effective than Direct Instruction in teaching writing; (2) students with high creativity have better writing ability than those having low creativity; and (3) there is an interaction between teaching techniques and creativity in teaching writing.

Keywords: *Collaborative Writing Technique, Direct Instruction, Writing Ability, Creativity*

1 INTRODUCTION

The use of small group and pair work in classrooms, particularly in second language (L2) classrooms, rests on strong theoretical and pedagogical bases. From a theoretical perspective, the use of small groups/pairs accords with a social constructivist view of learning. The roots of social constructivism are based on the work of Vygotsky (1978).

According to Vygotsky, human development is inherently a socially situated activity. A child's (novice) cognitive development arises in social interaction with a more able member of society. The more able member (expert), by providing the novice with the appropriate level of assistance, stretches the novice beyond their current level towards their potential level of development. Such assistance is now commonly referred to in the literature as scaffolding. However, as a number of researchers have shown (e.g., Donato, 1994; Storch, 2002), scaffolding can also occur among peers when working in group/pair work. Thus, from a social constructivist perspective, learners should be encouraged to participate in activities which foster interaction and co-construction of knowledge. From a pedagogical perspective, the use of small group and pair work is further supported by the communicative approach to L2 instruction and its emphasis on providing learners with opportunities to use the L2.

Writing as a skill involves a number of complex rhetorical and linguistic operations which must be taught. The act of writing is deprived of an immediate context of communication. Thus, for effective writing, the writer has to use a large number of formal features in order to help his/her readers infer the intended meaning. Failure to use these features correctly causes vagueness, ellipsis and ambiguity in some writings.

The use of small group/pair work in writing classes seems quite limited. It tends to be limited to the beginning stages (brainstorming), or more commonly, to the final stages of writing—the peer review stage. In this final stage, students review each other's written text and make suggestions on how it could be improved. A number of researchers (e.g., Ferris,

2003) have noted the benefits of such peer reviews. Foremost among these benefits is that peer reviews are a way of raising students' awareness of audience considerations (Leki, 1993), and at the same time, they may help learners develop analytical and critical reading and writing skills (Nystrand & Brandt, 1989).

Writing in EFL classes is difficult for both teachers and students because there are many aspects to deal with. Raimes (1983: 6) mentions those aspects are syntax, content, the writers' process, audience, purpose, word choice, organization, mechanics and grammar. Byrne (1993: 3) mentions three aspects which make writing difficult. The first is the psychological problem. Writing is a solitary activity. The teachers cannot get direct feedback like in speaking activity. The second is linguistics problem. The writers have to ensure that the choice of words, sentence structure, and other cohesive devices are correct for conveying their message. The last is the cognitive problem. Writing is learned through a process of instruction. It is not a natural process like speaking. Both Raimes and and Byrne basically have the same idea, but Raimes does not classify the problem. Audience and purpose of writing is included in Byrne's psychological problem. Byrne's linguistic problem covered syntax, word choice, mechanic, and grammar. Meanwhile, Raimes' writer process, organization and content are covered in Byrne cognitive problem.

Because of that, learning to write is not an easy task to do. Many students still make errors and mistakes and, then, they are fossilized. Their interest becomes less and less and students begin to create negative stimuli about learning to write. This condition drives the students to assume that writing is a very difficult task to do. The problem emerges as students are not familiar yet with the types of written discourse in English due to lack of exposure. Consequently, they are not able or willing to think directly in English. They, therefore, tend to formulate their ideas in Indonesian language when they express ideas in writing. Afterward they try to translate them in English which is not an easy task and even dangerous.

To help the teachers in teaching writing to university students, teachers may use interesting teaching techniques to present their teaching materials that also help them in creating fun class. Two of the alternative techniques are Collaborative Writing technique and Direct Instruction which are suggested to be applied in teaching writing.

2   LITERATURE REVIEW

Byrne (1993: 1) states that writing is the act of forming graphic symbols. Farbairn and Winch (1996: 32) state that writing is about conveying meaning by using words that have been selected and put together in a written or printed form. Ur (1996: 163) writing is the expressing of ideas, the conveying of a message to the readers, so that the ideas themselves should arguably be seen as the most aspects of writing.

Barkley, Cross, and Major (2005: 256) define that in collaborative writing, students pairs or triads write a formal paper together. Each student contributes at each stage of the writing process: brainstorming ideas, gathering and organizing information, drafting, revising, and editing the writing. It means that in pairs or triads, students will produce better work than when they work 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 in a group as well as the prospect of learning from other students.

According to Barkley, et al (2005: 256) there are seven guidelines for teacher/lecturer in collaborative writing process. The guidelines are as follows: (1) students from pairs or triads at your direction or by shoosing partners and then generate ideas by brainstorming together or conducted 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, 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; and (7) after the final edit, teams submit their

PROSIDING ICTTE FKIP UNS 2015
Vol 1, Nomor 1, Januari 2016
Halaman:

ISSN: 2502-4124

ICTTE
FKIP UNS 2015

papers to the professor for assessment and evaluation.

The Direct instruction, also called the Natural Approach, was developed towards the end of the 19th century. The general goal of the direct instruction is to provide learners with a practically useful knowledge of language. The direct instruction is a method that the goal of instruction becomes the way of learning how to use a foreign language to communicate. The Direct instruction has one very basic rule: no translation is allowed (Freeman, 1983: 18). Teaching learning process is focus on explanation of grammar rules in classroom teaching, teachers must encourage direct and spontaneous use of the foreign language in the classroom. Learners would then be able to induce rules of grammar. All teaching is done in the target language, grammar is taught inductively, there is a focus on speaking and listening, and only useful 'everyday' language is taught (British Council, 2011: 1). Direct instruction focus on question-answer patterns teacher-centeredness 1) classroom instructions are conducted in the target language; 2) only everyday vocabulary and sentences are taught; 3) oral communication skills are built up in a progression organized around question-and-answer exchanges between teacher and students in small intensive classes; 4) grammar is taught inductively; 5) new teaching points are introduced orally; 6) concrete vocabulary is taught through demonstration, objects, and pictures; abstract vocabulary is taught by association of ideas; 7) both speech and listening comprehensions are taught; 8) correct pronunciation and grammar are emphasized.

Munandar (2009: 68) defines verbal creativity as an ability to think creatively and to measure one's fluency, flexibility, and originality of a verbal form which deals with words and sentences.

Mednick and Mednick in Sinolungan (in Faisal, 2010: 42) say that verbal creativity is an ability to see a relationship of different ideas and to combine these ideas into new associations. Children with this special ability are able to create new patterns based on their own thought in their cognitive mind. Guilford in Rockler (1988: 45) also states that verbal creativity is an ability to think divergently. Thinking divergently means that it tries to find any possible alternative solution upon a problem.

3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Related to this study, the writer used experimental study because the aim of this study is revealing the effect of teaching techniques and students' creativity towards the students' writing ability. The population of this study is the Second Semester Students of IKIP PGRI Bojonegoro in the academic year of 2014/2015. The total number of the population in this research is 126 students who are divided into 3 classes, IIA, IIB, and IIC.

In this study, the writer only took two classes of the Second Semester Students of IKIP PGRI Bojonegoro. The two classes were IIB and IIA. IIB was the experimental class and IIA was the control class.

The sample, in this study, was chosen randomly from the population of clusters which is usually called as Cluster Random Sampling. It means that all the members of the cluster must be included in the sample.

4 FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS
4.1 Findings

Table 1. The summary of a 2 x 2 Multifactor Analysis of Variance

Source of variance	SS	df	MS	F_o	$F_{t(.05)}$	Conclusion
Between columns (teaching technique)	618.8571	1	618.8571	36.40336	3.96	Ho is rejected
Between rows (level of creativity)	2928.762	1	2928.762	172.2801	3.96	Ho is rejected
Columns by rows (interaction)	80.04762	1	80.04762	4.708683	3.96	Ho is rejected
Between groups	3627.667	3	1209.222			
Within groups	1360	80	17			
Total	4987.667	83				

Based on the summary of 2 x 2 Multifactor Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) above, some interpretations can be drawn as follows:

1. The impacts of employing teaching techniques (Collaborative Writing technique and Direct Instruction) upon the students' writing ability. Based on the table, it can be seen that Collaborative

Writing technique is more effective than Direct Instruction to teach writing.

2. The effect of creativity level upon the students' writing ability. Based on the table, it can be seen that the students who have high creativity have better writing ability than the students who have low creativity.

3. The interaction effect of teaching techniques and creativity level upon the students' writing ability. Based on the table, it can be seen that there is an interaction effect between teaching techniques and creativity upon students' writing ability. Thus, the effect of teaching techniques on performance of writing depends on the degree of creativity.

Table 2. The Summary of Tukey Test

Between groups	q_o	$q_{t(.05)}$	Meaning	Category
$A_1 - A_2$	8.53	2.86	$q_o > q_t$	Significant
$B_1 - B_2$	18.56	2.86	$q_o > q_t$	Significant
$A_1B_1 - A_2B_1$	6.48	2.95	$q_o > q_t$	Significant
$A_1B_2 - A_2B_2$	2.58	2.95	$q_o < q_t$	Not significant

Based on the summary of Tukey Test above, the interpretations can be drawn as follows:

1. Comparing two means between-columns (Collaborative Writing technique is compared with Direct Instruction)

By comparing two means between-columns ($A_1 - A_2$), it can be found that q_o is 8.53. The value of q_t for α=0.05 and n=42 is 2.86. Because q_o (8.53) is higher than q_t (2.86), Collaborative Writing technique differs significantly from Direct Instruction to teach writing. The mean score of the students who are taught by using Collaborative Writing technique (77.88) is higher than the mean score of the students who are taught by using Direct Instruction (72.45). *Therefore, it can be concluded that Collaborative Writing technique is more effective than Direct Instruction to teach writing.*

2. Comparing two means between-rows (high creativity is compared with low creativity)

By comparing two means between-rows ($B_1 - B_2$), it can be found that q_o is 18.56. The value of q_t for α=0.05 and n=42 is 2.86.

Because q_o (18.56) is higher than q_t (2.86), the students who have high creativity are significantly different from the students who have low creativity in writing ability. The mean score of the students who have high creativity (81.07) is higher than the mean score of the students who have low creativity (69.26). *Therefore, it can be concluded that the students who have high creativity have better writing ability than the students who have low creativity.*

3. Comparing two means columns by rows (Collaborative Writing technique is compared with Direct Instruction) for the students having high creativity

By comparing two means columns by rows ($A_1B_1 - A_2B_1$), it can be found that q_o is 6.48. The value of q_t for α=0.05 and n=21 is 2.95. Because q_o (6.48) is higher than q_t (2.95), the students who have high creativity and taught by using Collaborative Writing technique are significantly different from the students who have high creativity and taught by using Direct Instruction in writing ability. The mean score of the students who have high creativity and taught by using Collaborative Writing technique (84.76) is higher than the mean score of the students who have high creativity and taught by using Direct Instruction (77.38). *Therefore, it can be concluded that the students who have high creativity and taught by using Collaborative Writing technique have better writing ability than the students who have high creativity and taught by using Direct Instruction.*

4. Comparing two means columns by rows (Collaborative Writing technique is compared with Direct Instruction for the students having low creativity)

By comparing two means columns by rows ($A_1B_2 - A_2B_2$), it can be found that q_o is 2.58. The value of q_t for α=0.05 and n=21 is 2.95. Because q_o (2.58) is lower than q_t (2.95), it means that the students who have low creativity and taught by using Collaborative Writing technique are **not significantly different** from the students who have low creativity and taught by using Direct Instruction in writing ability. *Therefore, it can be concluded that the students' writing ability between the students who have low creativity and taught by using Collaborative Writing technique and the*

PROSIDING ICTTE FKIP UNS 2015
Vol 1, Nomor 1, Januari 2016
Halaman:

ISSN: 2502-4124

ICTTE
FKIP UNS 2015

*students who have low creativity and taught by using Direct Instruction is **not significantly different**.*

4.2 Discussion

By considering the data analyses above, there are some conclusions than can be drawn.

1. Collaborative Writing technique is more effective than Direct Instruction to teach writing.

In general, Collaborative Writing technique makes the learning more effective, attractive, meaningful, and successful. Collaborative Writing also can improve students' critical thinking. Research findings on collaborative writing have been positive. Research conducted in L1 settings (e.g., Higgins, Flower, & Petraglia, 1992; Keys, 1994) has shown 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. Research conducted with L2 learners (e.g., Donato, 1988; DiCamilla & Anton, 1997; Storch, 2002; Swain & Lapkin, 1998) has shown that in the process of co-authoring, learners consider not only grammatical accuracy and lexis but also discourse. Furthermore, and depending on the kind of group/pair dynamics formed (see Donato, 1988; Storch, 2002, 2003), collaborative writing may encourage a pooling of knowledge about language, a process Donato termed collective scaffolding (Donato, 1988, 1994). Sherman (1998: 1) states that reflective writing, such as in Collaborative Writing, in the context of a public forum in which students are required to react to each other's writing engages students in a process of critical thinking.

Collaborative Writing technique has many advantages as a functional unit of collaborative learning. Active participation in the collaborative process is essential for learning to occur. By working collaboratively with their friends, the students will try to analyze their friends' work in writing. They can correct the mistakes made by their friends.

> Sherman (1998: 1), states that in Collaborative Writing, the students are relying on peers for learning. It means that students work together to teach one another, and they alternate between the roles of student and teacher. This technique combines elements of both

motivational and cognitive approaches to collaboration. The technique also promotes cognitive processing by using a structured approach to teaching and learning within a tutoring context. This technique also promotes active processing of material using activities that are strongly linked to achievement.

From the statement above, it can be concluded that Collaborative Writing technique has some advantages such as: (1) it can promote effective learning; (2) it can combine both motivational and cognitive approaches to collaboration; (3) it can promote cognitive process through a structured approach to teaching and learning within a tutoring context; (4) it can promote the students' achievement and the students' self confidence.

On the other hand, Direct Instruction does not give enough challenge for students to develop their own creativity. In Direct Instruction, students are only given text and asked to analyze the text. The goal of instruction becomes the way of learning how to use a foreign language to communicate. The Direct Instruction has one very basic rule: no translation is allowed (Freeman, 1983: 18). In this case, the students only develop their mechanical skill without being given chance to create their own ideas.

2. The students who have high creativity have better writing ability than the students who have low creativity.

Creative individuals have a great deal of energy. This great deal of energy makes them energetic and always ready to do everything. They will see any kinds of things, including the difficult one, as challenges to conquer. They like challenges and enjoy its every single activity. They like to explore their ideas and imagination and to think freely.

Furthermore, students with high creativity have a combination of playfulness, discipline, and also responsibility. They like to alternate between imagination and fantasy at one end, and rooted sense of reality at the other. Besides, they do not like to be bound. They like to be given freedom to think and to express themselves in many ways. This kind of characteristics, in the end, leads the students who have creativity to get better score since they have better flexibility, fluency, and

PROSIDING ICTTE FKIP UNS 2015
Vol 1, Nomor 1, Januari 2016
Halaman:

ISSN: 2502-4124
ICTTE
FKIP UNS 2015

originality of thinking which are important in producing a piece of writing.

Csikszentmihalyi (1996: 58-73) defines the characteristics of the creative personality as follows:

a. Creative individuals have a great deal of energy, but they are also often quiet and at rest.
b. Creative individuals tend to be smart, yet also naïve at the same time.
c. Creative individuals have a combination of playfulness and discipline, and responsibility and irresponsibility.
d. Creative individuals alternate between imagination and fantasy at one end, and rooted sense of reality at the other.
e. Creative people seem to harbor opposite tendencies on the continuum between extroversion and introversion.
f. Creative individuals are also remarkable humble and proud at the same time.
g. Creative individuals to a certain extent escape rigid gender role stereotyping and have a tendency toward androgyny.
h. Generally, creative people are thought to be rebellious and independent.
i. Most creative individuals are very passionate about their work, yet they can be extremely objective about it as well.
j. The openness and sensitivity of creative individuals often exposes them to suffering pain yet also a great deal of enjoyment.

On the contrary, according to the statement stated by Csikszentmihalyi (1996: 58-73) about the characteristics of creative personality above, it can also be inferred that students with low creativity tend to be passive. They do any kinds of tasks only based on the instruction given and do not really like if they are asked to think beyond what is given. In addition, they will be reluctant to do activities which require them to think creatively. They like something simple and like being guided. Students with low creativity usually see process and challenge as burdens. The more activities they have to do, the more burdens they will have. They do not really like activities because they like simple, guided, and straightforward activities which in turns make the teacher should control them intensively. Uebergang (2012: 1) states that limited creativity and views affect how we act. It means that the students who have low

creativity will get difficulties in generating ideas and expressing it into written form. Munandar (1999: 25) states that everyone has different level of creativity which affects their ways of thinking, their behavior, and their competences in all aspects. These are some of the reasons why their writing scores are less than those having high creativity. Their low creativity makes them unable to express their ideas better. This can be seen from the results of their writing ability in which the scores of both control and experimental groups are lower than those having high level of creativity from both groups given treatment.

3. There is an interaction between teaching techniques and students' creativity in teaching writing.

Good teaching technique challenges students to perform better learning. They also minimize boredom and energize students to do more than usual. Good teaching technique increases students' creativity. Students are more creative when they are taught using challenging and interesting teaching technique.

In collaborative writing, students in pairs or triads write a formal paper together. Each student contributes at each stage of the writing process: brainstorming ideas, gathering and organizing information, drafting, revising, and editing the writing. It means that in pairs or triads, students will produce better work than when they work 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 in a group as well as the prospect of learning from other students. This, of course, requires students to be more creative in doing so. In short, Collaborative Writing technique is easily done by the students who have high creativity. On the other hand, the students with low creativity have some difficulties in doing Collaborative Writing technique due to their insufficient storage of vocabulary and ability to understand materials. Therefore, the students with high creativity are able to optimize their potentials when Collaborative Writing technique is implemented in their classroom activity.

On the contrary, according to the statement stated by Csikszentmihalyi (1996: 58-73) about the characteristics of creative personality, it can be inferred that students with low creativity tend to be passive. They do any kinds of tasks only based on the instruction given and do not really like if they are asked to think beyond what is given. In addition, they will be reluctant to do activities which require them to think creatively. They like something simple and like being guided. Students with low creativity usually see process and challenge as burdens. The more activities they have to do, the more burdens they will have. They do not really like activities because they like simple, guided, and straightforward activities which in turns make the teacher should control them intensively. Therefore, they need certain techniques to help them generating their ideas into written form.

Direct Instruction asked the students to use both oral and written competence. In this teaching technique, students have no challenges to perform better learning, because the students only imitate what is given. Direct Instruction is a method that the goal of instruction becomes the way of learning how to use a foreign language to communicate. The interaction between teacher and students are like partner in teaching learning process.

Direct Instruction shows that the students are passive in the process of teaching-learning and vocabulary is emphasized over grammar (Freeman: 1983: 18). Krashen and Terrell in Richard and Rodger (2001: 185) said that Direct Instruction do not organize activities of the class about a grammar. Students with low level of creativity are easy to adjust themselves to learn descriptive essay by using Direct Instruction. They are not required to selecting the most suitable words or phrases. Due to their insufficient storage of vocabulary and ability to convey meaning, the teacher emphasized the teaching-learning in increasing their ability in vocabulary. As a result, they are not really able to lead their expression to explore their competence more.

Finally, the result of this research shows that teaching techniques and creativity play an important role to the students' writing ability. Teaching techniques and creativity mutually influence one another in writing ability. It means that writing ability depends on the creativity level and teaching techniques. Collaborative Writing technique is more effective for the students having high creativity and Direct Instruction is more effective for the students having low creativity. Therefore, it can be said that there is an interaction effect between teaching techniques and creativity upon students' writing ability.

5 CONCLUSION

In general, Collaborative Writing technique as one of the models of collaborative learning is more effective than Direct Instruction to teach writing to the fourth semester students of English Education Department, IKIP PGRI Bojonegoro, in the academic year of 2014/2015.

The students having high level of creativity have better writing ability in argumentative essay than those having low level of creativity to the fourth semester students of English Education Department, IKIP PGRI Bojonegoro, in the academic year of 2014/2015.

There is interaction between teaching techniques (Collaborative Writing technique and Direct Instruction) and creativity to teach writing to the fourth semester students of English Education Department, IKIP PGRI Bojonegoro, in the academic year of 2014/2015.

6 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

7 REFERENCES

Barkley, Elizabeth F, Cross, K. Patricia, and Major, Claire Howell. (2005). *Collaborative Learning Techniques: A Handbook for College Faculty.* San Fransisco. Jossey-Bass.

British Council. (2011). *Direct Method.* Available at*:* http://www.teachingenglish. org.uk/knowledge-database/direct-method

Byrne, Donn. (1993). *Teaching Writing ability.* New York: Longman Group Ltd.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1996). *Creativity: Flow and the Psychology of Discovery and Invention.* New York: Harper Collins.

DiCamilla, F. J., & Anton, M. (1997). Repetition in the collaborative discourse of L2 learners: A Vygotskian perspective. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 53, 609–633.

Donato, R. (1988). Beyond group: A psycholinguistic rationale for collective activity in second-language learning. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Newark: University of Delaware.

Donato, R. (1994). *Collective scaffolding in second language learning*. In J. P. Lantolf, & G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research* (pp. 33–56). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Faisal. (2010). *The Effectiveness of Internet-based Materials to Teach Writing Viewed from the Students' Creativity*. Thesis. Sebelas Maret University.

Farbairn, G. and Winch, C. (1996). *Reading, Writing and Reasoning.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Ferris, D. (2003). Response to student writing: Implications for second language students. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Freeman, Diane Larsen. (1983). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Higgins, L., Flower, L., & Petraglia, J. (1992). Planning text together. The role of critical reflection in student collaboration. *Written Communication*, 9(1), 48–84.

Keys, C.W. (1994). The development of scientific reasoning skills in conjunction with collaborative assessments. An interpretive study of 6–9th grade students. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 3(9), 1003–1022.

Leki, I. (1993). *Reciprocal themes in reading and writing*. In J. Carson, & I. Leki (Eds.), *Reading in the composition classroom: second language perspectives* (pp. 9–33). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Munandar, Utami. (1999). *Pengembangan Kreafititas Anak Berbakat.* Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

_____. (2009). *Pengembangan Kreatifitas Anak Berbakat.* Cetakan Ke-3. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Nystrand, M., & Brandt, D. (1989). *Response to writing as a context for learning to write*. In C. M. Anson (Ed.), *Writing and response: Theory, practice, and research* (pp. 209–230). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Raimes, Ann. (1983). *Techniques in Teaching Writing.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Richards, Jack C. And Rodger Theodore S. 2001. *Approches and Methods in Language Teaching: Second Edition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rockler, Michael J. (1998). *Innovative Teaching Strategies*. Arizona: Gorsuch Scarisbrick Publisher

Sherman. (1998). *A Post Modern, Constructivist Pedagogy for Teaching Educational Psychology, Assisted by Computer Mediated Communications.* Available at: http://www.users.muohio.edu/shermalw/aera9 1aa.html#dec.

Storch, N. (2002). Patterns of interaction in ESL pair work. *Language Learning*, 52(1), 119–158.

Storch, N. (2003). Relationships formed in dyadic interaction and opportunity for learning. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 37(3/4), 305–322.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: two adolescent French immersion students working together. *Modern Language Journal*, 82(3), 320–337.

Uebergang, Joshua. (2012). *How to Have Creativity in your Writing Skills.* Available at: http://www.streetdirectory.com/travel_guide/1 49941/writing/how_to_have_creativity_in_you r_writing_skills.html

Ur, Penny. (1996). *A Course in Language Teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society. The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.