

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

Annisa Rahmatika, Abdul Asib, Suparno

Sebelas Maret University, Indonesia
annisarahmatika92@yahoo.com

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) is more effective than Direct Method to teach writing; (2) students having high creativity have better writing skill than those having low creativity. (3) There is 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.

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 can not 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 can not 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

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.

a. 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).

b. 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, Haefele 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.



METHODS

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.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this research reveal that there is significant difference between teaching writing using Student Team-Achievement Division and Direct Method. Student Team-Achievement Division is more effective than Direct Method to teach writing. The mean score of the students who are taught by using Student Team-Achievement Division is higher than students who are taught by using Direct Method.

Student Teams Achievement Division is a teaching method to teach language skills, which is the writing skill. Student Teams Achievement Division fosters the teaching system centralizing the learning on the learners, while the teacher plays roles as the facilitator and feedback providers. When learners are given much more chance to develop and use their own idea to write, the writing



skill is more easily mastered by the learners. There are five components of STAD which are set for students to learn in the class, such as class presentation, forming teams, carrying out quizzes, giving individual improvement scores, and recognizing the winning teams. The application of STAD generates students to use their hidden potentials to perform their best during the learning process. The students' writing achievement significantly improves.

Slavin (1995) reported that STAD consistently had positive effects on learning. Generally, STAD positively affected (a) cross race relation, (b) attitude toward school and class, (c) peer support, (d) locus of control, (e) time on task, (f) peer relationships and, (g) cooperation.

Writing as cooperative activity is not something impossible to do. In the class, students can take advantage in the presence of others to make writing as cooperative activity. Not only the students, but also the teacher can take its advantage. It is easier for them to give more detailed and feedback since they were dealing with the small groups. Individual students also found themselves saying and writing things they might not have come up with on their own, and a team work was boarder than individual's normally was (Bougley in Harmer, 2007: 260). In writing class, it is important for the students to learn together, work cooperatively rather than competitively to improve their writing skill. The students work seriously in order to be able to share and give contribution to others.

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 a, 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.

Meanwhile, Direct Method is similar to traditional teaching. The goal of instruction becomes the way of learning how to use a foreign language to communicate. It is characterized by teacher-centered and teacher dominated classroom. The teacher becomes the decision maker of the class. The teaching learning process in the Direct Method depends on the teacher.

The classroom instruction in the direct method was conducted exclusively in the target language and only everyday vocabulary and sentences are taught (Richards, 2001: 12). In this case, the students insufficient opportunities in the classroom. The students depend on the teacher during the teaching learning process. Students can be passive in the teaching learning process. As the students' attention is limited, they cannot develop their ability in their social and human interaction because they work individually. Therefore, it can be concluded that STAD is more effective than Direct Method to teach writing.

The result of the second hypothesis testing shows that the students having high creativity have better writing skill than those having low creativity. Creativity is known as a general ability to create something new, share new ideas, and make something different in problem solving. Students having high creativity like challenges and try to enjoy step by step of activities exploring ideas and imagination to think freely. A creative student thinks beyond what he or she sees, reads, and listens. In a learning teaching process, a creative student is able to come up with unexpected ideas better than student with a low creativity level.

The students who have high creativity have better attitude in joining teaching and learning process. The highly creative students' are eager to learn something new for them including learning new language. The students having high creativity certainly have different views on difficulty faced during learning than those having low creativity. The students with high creativity search for many alternatives of solutions for solving their difficulty in learning. High creative students have higher achievement in the language learning. Individuals with high



creativity are capable of attaining similar levels of academic achievement due to their creative ability (Yamamoto, 1964)

Creative students are not predictable to make a better writing considering the complex notion. Creativity plays an important role in helping students to express their ideas in the written form especially in the essay form. It is important for students having high creativity because if they are creative they are able to explore their creativity with the way they have in joining the teaching learning process. In other words, creativity involves thinking that is aimed at producing ideas of product that are relatively new (Kaufman and Stenberg, 2006: 2)

Meanwhile, the students who have low creativity tend to be passive. They have a monotonous concept, idea, creation in solving the problem. They limit their way of thinking to explore their idea. The student with low creativity just writes what he/she sees, reads, and listens without being able to think what is beyond. It is supported by Stenberg (2006: 88) states that low creativity persons have a poorer idea, has a difficulty when they solve the problem, and tend to spend relatively more time in planning.

Low creativity students are lazy to explore their ability especially in producing a simple draft or sentence to make a good writing. Students having low creativity prefer to imitate from the teacher or other students during process of writing. Stenberg (1999: 142) states that uncreative students focus their attention too much, and this prevents them from thinking of original ideas.

Based on the elaboration above, it can be stated that 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.

Students having high creativity have strong imagination, initiative, large interest, high curiosity in knowing something, flexible thinking, and brave in taking risk in expressing ideas. In line with Al-Oweide (2012: 29) that creative students have a series of mental abilities, it is a compound purposeful mental activity directed by the strong desire to generate or recognize ideas, alternatives, or possibilities that may be useful in solving problems, and communicating with others.

Moreover, the students who have high creativity also like challenges and try to do their best. They like to explore their ideas. They work hard to achieve the product of their writing. Higgs and McCarthy (2008: 116) add that creative students need to play, give critical judgment, and take risks. The students having high creativity like to explore the ideas to write, and they brave to take risks. They explore their potential to make significant contribution in their writing. They do not afraid to make mistakes. They can work individually although working in a group. It can be concluded that Student Teams Achievement Division is more suitable to teach writing to students having high creativity. Because in this method, the students are the center point in the learning activities while the teacher just has to manage, motivate, facilitate, and control the material and the process of learning in the classroom.

Students having low creativity have different characteristics from creative students. They like waiting for other ideas, no initiation. They do not want to take risks, and they are passive in teaching learning process. The students with low creativity like something simple during the classroom activity, and they like to be guided by the teacher. They just do the task based on the teacher instruction. Manktelow (2004: 9) states that uncreative students do not think about creativity, and do not give themselves the opportunity to create anything new.

Students with low level of creativity do not have curiosity, and do not take part when they work in groups. They cannot give new ideas and share with others.



Kotelnikov (2012: 1) gives some characteristics of uncreative personality, such as lack of inspiring vision, lack of passion, lack of achievement drive, lack of challenge, lack of fun, lack of rebelling, lack of self-confidence, lack of curiosity, lack of knowledge diversity, and lack of creative thinking skills.

Because of the characteristics of the students who have low creativity, Student Teams Achievement Division and Direct Method can be equally used to teach writing. It may occur because the students having low creativity 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.

