

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF STUDENT TEAMS ACHIEVEMENT DIVISION TO TEACH WRITING VIEWED FROM STUDENTS' CREATIVITY

Annisa Rahmatika

Sebelas Maret University, Indonesia

Email: annisarahmatika92@yahoo.com

DOI: 10.26858/ijole.v1i1.6786

Abstract

Student Teams Achievement Division (STAD) is one of the simplest of all cooperative learning methods, where team works in learning English provides students with the team opportunity to express and to communicate with each other. One of the ways to make them express and communicate with each other is by dividing the class into several team works or groups. This experimental study sought to find out the effectiveness of STAD to teach writing viewed from students' creativity in the tenth grade of SMAN 1 JATIWARAS Tasikmalaya in the academic year of 2017/2018. Recruitment strategy was through cluster random sampling resulting 2 classes which consist of 28 students of each class contributed to the study. Data collection technique encompassed creativity test and writing test. The data were analyzed thoroughly by using 2x2 Multifactor Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Tukey's HSD Test. The result revealed that: (1) Student Teams Achievement Division (STAD) was more effective than Direct Method to teach writing; (2) students with high creativity had better writing skill than those having low creativity. (3) there was an interaction between teaching methods and students' creativity.

Keywords: STAD, Direct Method, writing skill, students' creativity.

INTRODUCTION

Writing as an active and productive activity is an ability to produce and deliver a language to other people in a text. Writing is an activity not only to express ideas of thinking result and putting them in written form, but also to make understandable writing by the reader. When someone writes something, he or she is required to be able to communicate with the readers without face-to-face contact.

According to Murcia (2000: 161), "writing skill is often perceived as the most difficult skill to be mastered because it requires many aspects of language in its production such as organization, content, language use, mechanic, and vocabulary. In addition, Richard and Renandya (2002: 303) state that the difficulty lies on how to

generate and organize ideas using an appropriate vocabulary, sentence and paragraph organization, and translate these ideas into a readable text.

Being foreign language learners, many students spend more time to be good writers. Students with a good knowledge can be classified as accurate and efficient writers, so as to get the maximum information or idea to write a text. But it is different from students with medium knowledge because sometimes they cannot develop their ideas. Actually, two hands are better than one hand in writing a text. So, it is clear that when students are writing a text it will be more effective if they write together because they can share their ideas to make a text develop to be a good text.

Based on the preliminary study at SMAN 1 Jatiwaras, the researcher found

that most students can not generate, organize and translate the ideas into readable text. They get difficulty in choosing themes or topics, and they feel confused about what they should write. When they find idea to write, they cannot develop it into the right paragraph. In line with Harmer (2007: 329) some of students are not confident enough to write. They lose their enthusiasm. He thinks that there are some reasons for students not to write, perhaps students have never written much in first language(s) or they do not have anything to say and cannot come up with ideas.

STAD is one kind of cooperative learning, where team works in learning English provides students with the team opportunity to express and to communicate with each other. They can share the knowledge with each other. One of the ways to make them express and communicate with each other is by dividing the class into several team works or groups. This situation may result in more interaction between the members of group. Using STAD teaching method, students are involved in discussing problems together, sharing the difficulties in writing and providing them with knowledge. STAD method in teaching writing begins with presentation. To teach writing using presentation makes it clear to the students about what they should write and easy to be understood by the students.

Slavin (1995:71) clarifies that STAD is one of the simplest of all cooperative learning methods, and is a good model to begin with for teachers who are new to the cooperative approach. STAD is one of the Cooperative Learning methods which emphasizes on teamwork for achieving learning objectives. It also commits and is responsible among heterogenous group members in mastering the materials.

Students' creativity, as a supporting element in learning, plays an important role in teaching learning process. Creativity is a mental and social process of new ideas or

concepts. Creativity is fueled by the process of either conscious or unconscious insight. The type of creativity that has a very influential factor to yield a good writing is verbal creativity. 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. Moreover, verbal creativity is an ability to form and create new ideas and then combine them into something new referring to the existing information. The new ideas reflect fluency, flexibility, and originality that can be seen in divergent thought revealed verbally.

Regarding several cases above, the researcher to be interested in investigating whether or not STAD is more effective than Direct Method to teach writing, revealing whether or not students having high creativity have better writing skill than those having low creativity, and revealing there is an interaction between teaching methods and the level of creativity on students' writing skill.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Nature of Writing

Writing is one of four language skills that should be mastered in learning English. Harmer (2004: 6) states that writing belongs to productive skill besides speaking, in which the language users require the ability to produce language both spoken and written.

Furthermore, Meyers, Alan (2005: 2) says that writing is also an action, a process of discovering and organizing your idea, putting them on paper, and reshaping and revising them. While, Harmer (2001: 79) states that writing is a form of communication to deliver thoughts or to express feelings as written form. In line with this, Sokolik in Nunan (2003: 88) states that writing is the process of thinking to invent ideas, thinking about how to express ideas into good writing, and arranging ideas into a good statement. Next, Harris (1993: 10) states, "writing is a

process that occurs over a period of time, particularly if we take into account sometimes extended periods of thinking that precede creating an initial draft”.

Student Teams Achievement Division

STAD method is one of the oldest and most extensively researched form of cooperative learning. Slavin (1995: 71) states that STAD is one of the simplest of all cooperative learning methods, and is a good model to begin with for teachers who are new to the cooperative approach. In the cooperative learning techniques, students are assigned to four or five members in group.

STAD is a cooperative learning method which emphasizes on students mastering the materials through group learning, and the group has responsibility for their members. In STAD, the teacher presents the content or skill in a large group activities in the regular manner, such as direct instruction and modelling, while students are provided with learning materials that they use in groups to master the content. There are five major components according to Slavin (1995: 71-73), they are: class presentation, teams, quizzes, individual scores, and team recognitions.

Direct Method

Direct method was developed by Maximilian Berlitz towards the end of 19th century as a reaction to Grammar-Translation method (GTM). The direct method is named “direct” because meaning should be connected directly with the target language without translation into other language.

According to Larsen and Freeman (2000: 23), “as with the Grammar-Translation Method, the direct method is not new.” It means that direct method is similar with Grammar Translation Method which is not something new in teaching method, because the goals of this method is how to use a foreign language to communicate so language teachers believe

that direct method is effective for teaching English to the students. In line with Larsen and Freeman, Zainuddin et al (2011: 64) state that “the direct method was a complete departure from the Grammar-Translation Method. Through this method students are able to communicate in foreign language. So, this method become popular rather than Grammar-Translation Method (GTM).

Definition of Creativity

The study of creativity should focus on creative thinking process. Teachers who do not understand the students’ creativity would have difficulty in facilitating the process of developing the individuals’ potential. Generalization to the ability and potential will give negative impact to the students, because they do not have the opportunity to develop their potential optimally.

Rockler (1988: 6) states that creativity is a means by which a person obtains a new perspective and, as a result, brings something new to consciousness. Meanwhile, Kaufman and Sternberg (2006:2) state that creativity involves thinking that is aimed at producing ideas or products that are relatively novel and are, in some respect, compelling. In addition, Ausubel in Crawford (1977:245) states that creativity achievement reflects a rare capacity for developing insight, sensitivities, and appreciations in a circumscribed content area of intellectual or artistic activity. While, Haeefe and Mednick in Foster (1971:12) say that creativity involves the ability to make new combinations. Suharman (2011: 7) defines creativity as a thinking process to create new ideas, approaches, and products, that are useful for solving problem and environment.

METHODOLOGY

This research used experimental method. Experimental research is research in which the researcher manipulates the independent variable. Experimental

research is the most conclusive scientific methods, because the researcher actually establishes the different treatments (Fraenkel and Wallen, 2000: 8). While the research method was experimental research, the design of the research was quasi-experimental design using factorial design 2 x 2. Lodico, Spaulding, and Voegtle (2010: 236) define quasi-experimental research as a form of experimental research in which the researcher does not have control over assignment of individuals to conditions but can randomly assign whole groups to different treatment.

There were 2 classes, consisting of 28 students of each class. The experimental class was taught using STAD, while Direct Method was implemented in control class. The data were obtained from creativity test and writing test. The techniques used in analyzing the data of this research were descriptive and inferential analysis. Descriptive analysis was used to know the mean, median, mode, and standard deviation of the writing test. Before doing further analysis of 2x2 ANOVA, the writer employed a prerequisite test, in which normality and homogeneity tests were assigned previously.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The distribution of data in this research is classified into eight groups: (1) the data of the students who are taught using Student Teams-Achievement Division (A_1); (2) the data of the students who are taught by using Direct Method (A_2); (3) the data of the students having high creativity (B_1); (4) the data of the students having low creativity (B_2); (5) the data of the students having high creativity who are taught by using Students Team-Achievement Division (A_1B_1); (6) the data of the students having low creativity who are taught by using Students Team-Achievement Division (A_1B_2); (7) the data of the students having high creativity who are taught by using Direct Method (A_2B_1);

(8) the data of the students having low creativity who are taught by using Direct Method (A_2B_2).

Normality test is used to determine whether the data are in normal distribution or not. The data are normal if L_o ($L_{obtained}$) is lower than L_t (L_{table}) at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$. The following table depicts the summary of normality using Liliefors test:

Variables	Number of sample	(L _o)	(L _t)	□□□	Description
writing scores of the students taught by using Student Team-Achievement Division (A ₁)	28	0.096	0.167	0.05	Normal
writing scores of the students taught by using Direct Method (A ₂)	28	0.103	0.167	0.05	Normal
writing scores of the students having high creativity (B ₁)	28	0.107	0.167	0.05	Normal
writing scores of the students having low creativity (B ₂)	28	0.127	0.167	0.05	Normal
writing scores of the students having high creativity who are taught by using Student Team-Achievement Division (A ₁ B ₁)	14	0.180	0.237	0.05	Normal
writing scores of the students having low creativity who are taught by using Student Team-Achievement Division (A ₁ B ₂)	14	0.147	0.237	0.05	Normal
writing scores of the students having high creativity who are taught by using Direct Method (A ₂ B ₁)	14	0.123	0.237	0.05	Normal
writing scores of the students having low creativity who are taught by using Direct Method (A ₂ B ₂)	14	0.166	0.237	0.05	Normal

Further analysis was homogeneity test. The data are homogeneous if χ_o^2 ($\chi_{obtained}$) is lower than χ_t^2 (χ_{table}) at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$. Based on the Chi-Square distribution table, the value was χ_o^2 (0.02) is lower than χ_t^2 with the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (7.81) or $\chi_o^2 < \chi_t^2$ (0.02 < 7.81). Therefore, it can be stated that the data are homogeneous. After normality and homogeneity test were

accomplished, the next step was Multifactor Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) 2 x 2. The null hypothesis (H_o) is rejected if F_o is higher than F_t ($F_o > F_t$). It means that independent variables successfully give significant effects to the dependent variable. The summary of ANOVA 2 x 2 is described as follows:

Table 2. The Mean Scores

Teaching methods	Teaching Methods		
	STAD	Direct Method	Total
Students' creativity	(A ₁)	(A ₂)	
High creativity (B ₁)	$\bar{X} = 81.86$	$\bar{X} = 75.29$	$\bar{X} = 78.57$
Low creativity (B ₂)	$\bar{X} = 74.14$	$\bar{X} = 74.43$	$\bar{X} = 74.29$
Total	$\bar{X} = 78.00$	$\bar{X} = 74.86$	$\bar{X} = 76.43$

Table 3. The Summary of Multifactor Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) 2 x 2

Source of Variance	SS	df	MS	F ₀	F _{t(0,05)}
Between Columns	138.29	1	138.29	4.31	4.08
Between Rows	257.14	1	257.14	8.01	
Columns by rows (Interaction)	164.57	1	164.57	5.13	
Between Group	560.00	3	186.66667		
Within Group	1669.71	52	32.10989		
TOTAL	2229.71	55			

- a. Because F_0 between columns (4.31) is higher than F_t at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (4.08), H_0 is rejected and the difference between columns is significant. Because the mean of A_1 (78.00) is higher than that of A_2 (74.86), it can be concluded that Student Team-Achievement Division is more effective than Direct Method to teach writing.
- b. Because F_0 between rows (8.01) is higher than F_t at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (4.08), H_0 is rejected and the difference between rows is significant. It can be concluded that the writing skill of students who have high and those who have low creativity are significantly different. Then, because the mean of B_1 (78.57) is higher than that of B_2 (74.29), it can be concluded that the students having high creativity have better writing skill than those having low creativity.
- c. Because F_0 columns by rows (5.13) is higher than F_t at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (4.08), H_0 is rejected and there is an

interaction between teaching methods and students' creativity in teaching writing. Thus, it can be concluded that there is an interaction between the two variables, teaching methods and students' creativity in teaching writing. In other words, it can be stated that the effect of teaching

methods on students' writing skill depends on the students' creativity. After analyzed the variance, further analysis done by the researcher is Tukey's Test. Tukey test is a statistical procedure used to clary which groups among the sample in specific (between the cells) have significant differences.

Table 4. The Summary of Tuckey's Test

Data	Sample	Erorr Variance	q_0	q_t	Status
A1 and A2	28	1.07	2.93	2.89	Significant
B1 and B2	28	1.07	4.00	2.89	Significant
A1B1 and A2B1	14	1.51	4.34	3.01	Significant
A1B2 and A2B2	14	1.51	0.19	3.01	Not Significant

The results of the Tukey computation above, show the following points:

- a. Because q_0 between columns ($A_1 - A_2$) (2.93) is higher than q_t at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (2.89), applying Student Team-Achievement Method (STAD) is significantly different from Direct Method to teach writing. Because the mean of A_1 (78.00) is higher than that of A_2 (74.86), it can be concluded that Student Team-Achievement Method (STAD) is more effective than Direct Method to teach writing.
- b. Because q_0 between rows ($B_1 - B_2$) (4.00) is higher than q_t at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (2.89), it can be said that the students who have high creativity and those who have low creativity are significantly different in their writing skill. Because the mean of B_1 (78.57) is higher than that of B_2 (74.29), it can be concluded that the Students having high creativity have better writing skill than those having low creativity.

- c. Because q_0 between cells ($A_1B_1 - A_2B_1$) (4.34) is higher than q_t at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (3.01), applying Student Team-Achievement Method (STAD) is significantly different from Direct Method for students who have high creativity. Because the mean of A_1B_1 (81.86) is higher than that of A_2B_1 (75.29), it can be concluded that Student Team-Achievement Method (STAD) is more effective than Direct Method to teach writing for students having high creativity.

Because q_0 between cells ($A_1B_2 - A_2B_2$) (0.19) is lower than q_t at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (3.01), the difference between columns for students having low creativity is not significant. It means that Student Team-Achievement Method (STAD) is as effective as Direct Method to teach writing for students having low creativity.

Based on the analysis above, it can be concluded that STAD is more effective than Direct Method to teach writing. The success of STAD as a part of cooperative learning in improving the learning achievement of the learners has made it largely used in many areas of academic centers such as universities and laboratories. It is as stated by many experts (Johnson and Johnson, 1999; Lord, 2001; Mark et al, 1991; Tlusty, 1993) in Aydin (2011) that cooperative learning methods show that these methods, used in both theoretical and laboratory settings, it can help students improve their academic and social skills by ensuring their active participation in learning process. In addition to the effectiveness of cooperative learning that cooperative learning has recently started to gain attention as an alternative to education strategies applied in universities and high schools. The reason for this attention is that during the group work, students can learn a lot from each other by collecting their own ideas and collaborating in making a good writing text.

The result of the second hypothesis testing shows that the students having high creativity have better writing skill than those having low creativity. The students who have high creativity express their ideas to be a new creation in writing because they can develop and explore their ideas smoothly. Otherwise, the students who have low creativity have difficulty in producing a new creation in writing. This is the reason why students with low creativity have lower achievement in writing than those high creativity students.

The result of third hypothesis test (using ANOVA) shows that there is an interaction between two variables, students' creativity and teaching methods, in teaching writing. In other words, it can be concluded that the effect of teaching method on the students writing ability

depends on the students' level of creativity. Student Teams Achievement Division and Direct Method can be used to teach writing. It may occur because of some characteristics of the students having low creativity which hinder them to show their competence to produce a good writing. Fasco (2001: 3) says that a learning strategy is not successfully applied when it is used to teach the low creative students. Thus, Student Teams Achievement Division is as effective as Direct Method to teach writing for students having low creativity because they reach the same improvement on their writing skill.

CONCLUSION

After discussing the result of the study on how to determine the effectiveness of Student Teams Achievement Division to teach writing viewed from students' creativity, it can be summed up: (1) There is a significant difference of students' writing skill between students who are taught by using Student Teams Achievement Division and those who are taught by using Direct Method. Student Teams Achievement Division is more effective than Direct Method to teach writing; (2) Students having high creativity have better writing skill than those who have low creativity. (3) There is an interaction effect between the two variables, the methods of teaching and the level of creativity on students' writing skill.

REFERENCES

- Fraenkel, J. R and Wallen, N. E. (2008). *How to design and evaluate research in education*, seventh edition. Mc. Graw Hill.
- Harmer, Jeremy. (2001). *How to teach english*. Malaysia: Longman.
- Harmer, Jeremy. (2007). *How to teach english*. Cina: Pearson Longman.

- Johnson, B., Christensen, L. (2000). *Educational research: quantitative, qualitative & mixed approaches*. California: Sage Publication.
- Kaufman, J. C., & Sternberg, R. J. (Eds.) (2006). *International handbook of creativity*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Larsen-Freeman, Dianne. (2000). *Technique and principle in language teaching*, (second edition). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Larsen-Freeman, Dianne. (2011). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. New York: Oxford.
- Lodico, M.G., Spaulding, D.T. and Voegtle, K.H. (2010). *Methods in educational research: from theory to practice. 2nd ed.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Meyers, Alan. (2005). *Gateways to academic writing: effective sentences, paragraphs, and essays*. New York: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Murcia, Marianne Celce and Elite Olshtain. (2000). *Discourse and context in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, David. (1991). *Language teaching methodology*. Oxford: Oxford University.
- Nunan, David (ed). (2003). *Practical english language teaching*. Singapore: Mc.Graw Hill Companies.
- Raimes, A. (1983). *Techniques in teaching writing*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Richard, J.C. and Renandya, W.A. (2002). *Methodology in language teaching*. Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J C & Rodgers. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rockler, Michael J. (1988). *Innovative teaching strategies*. Arizona: Gorsuch Scarisbrick, Publisher.
- Slavin, R.E. (1995). *Cooperative learning: theory, research, and practice, second edition*. Boston, Allyn and Bacon.