

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF COLLABORATIVE WRITING STRATEGY (CWS) IN WRITING LESSON REGARDED TO THE STUDENTS' CREATIVITY

Kiky Soraya

Language Center, Bina Nusantara University
Jln. Kemanggisan Ilir III No. 45. Kemanggisan – Palmerah, Jakarta Barat, 11480
kikysoraya@binus.ac.id

Received: 4th August 2016/ **Revised:** 9th September 2016/ **Accepted:** 28th September 2016

How to Cite: Soraya, K. (2016). The Effectiveness of Collaborative Writing Strategy (CWS) in Writing Lesson Regarded to The Students' Creativity. *Lingua Cultura*, 10(2). 63-67.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.21512/lc.v10i2.898>

ABSTRACT

This study was aimed at finding out what appropriate methods to be used in writing lesson seen from the students' creativity especially for students who have high creativity and low creativity. This study used quasi experimental research. The population of the research was the eighth grade of a Junior High School in Wonosari in the academic year of 2013/2014. The sampling technique used was cluster random sampling. The sample in this study was 64 students covering 32 students of E as experimental class and 32 students of C as control class. The data or the students' writing scores were analyzed in terms of their frequency distribution, normality, homogeneity, then ANOVA and Tuckey tests to test the research hypotheses. Based on the result, the research findings are CWS is more effective than MWS in writing lesson; the high creativity students produced better writing rather than the low creativity student; and the interaction of teaching methods and the students' creativity is existing in this writing lesson. In short, Collaborative Writing Strategy (CWS) is effective to teach writing for the eighth grade of a Junior High School in Wonosari, Gunungkidul. Then, the research result implies that it is better for the teachers to apply CWS in teaching and learning process of writing, to improve the students' writing achievement, CWS needs to be used in the classroom activities, then future research can conduct the similar research with different sample and different students' condition.

Keywords: collaborative writing strategy, metacognitive writing strategy, creativity, narrative essay

INTRODUCTION

Writing is one of the important skills that students need to develop. In the academic context, this ability is used to measure the students' writing proficiency such as composing academic essays or writing some texts which are included in the curriculum. In the business context, the ability to write is important for those who make business relation with others across the nations by sending email or composing business report. Writing a letter or message is also a means of communication which can connect the relationship between people indirectly.

There are numerous methods used in writing lesson. The lesson can emphasize on groups, pairs, or individual. When the teachers have a tendency to provide chances in working together, Collaborative Writing Strategy (CWS) can be used during lessons. On the other hand, when the teaching is more individual, Metacognitive Writing Strategy (MWS) can be implemented inside the classes.

Collaborative Writing Strategy (CWS) is the mixture of cooperative learning and writing strategies. Diaz *et al.*

(2010) argued that collaborative learning is set of methods that group the students together in the same main goal or task. Dulger (2011) stated that many teachers still use metacognitive strategies in teaching writing. Metacognitive Writing Strategy (MWS) is a part of indirect strategies which means beyond, beside or with cognitive. Therefore, here the students are more individual.

Besides the teaching method, psychological aspects or factors such as creativity, self-esteem, IQ, etc. can influence the students' writing skills. As stated before, when the teachers have a tendency to provide chances in working together or individually by using Collaborative or Metacognitive Writing Strategy (CWS/MWS), then creativity development becomes the psychological factor or aspect that will nearly accompany these two methods.

According to Kaufman *et al.* (2008), creativity is activity to convey something new. It involves the way of thinking that is aimed at producing ideas or products that are relatively novel. In writing, students with high creativity will be easy to have a good idea in composing the text and it will make them construct a good composition.

Based on the importance of writing and the problems found in the real situation, the researcher intends to conduct a research on "The Effectiveness of CWS (Compared with Metacognitive Writing Strategy (MWS)) in writing lesson regarded to the Students' Creativity.

The objectives of the research are: whether Collaborative Writing Strategy (CWS) is better than Metacognitive Writing Strategy (MWS) in writing lesson seen from the students' creativity: those high creativity students have better writing skill than the low creativity students; and there is an interaction between the teaching methods and the creativity in writing lesson.

In writing theory, Dvorak (2009) stated that writing is a medium of communication that represents language through the inscription of signs and symbols. In writing, people use graphic symbol such as letter or the combination of letter and sounds that people produce in speaking.

MacArthur *et al.* (2016) stated that writing is a tool of enlightenment which applies the distance between message and author/ reader and the reliance on objectified knowledge. However, writing is not only the medium or tool to communicating meaning by using symbols but it is also an active skill and creative process.

Ferris (2007), writing is an active skill of language that involves creative organic process. Furthermore, Langan (2010) builds on the idea that writing is a skill and process of discovery. Writing is a skill like driving, typing, or cooking, and like any skill. It means that writing is a skill which can be learned.

Fulcher and Davidson (2007) also state that writing is an ability to accomplish intended purposes, to express meaning, ideas, and to communicate with the reader with clear, logical, and well developed organization of text.

Then, Becky *et al.* (2006) state that writing is the motion and ability of designing and creating words into a comprehensive text. According to O'Neill (2011), writing is a complex, multidimensional, contextually situated activity.

Moreover, Coulmas (2007) defines at least six meanings of writing, those meanings of writing are (1) a way of language recording by using noticeable symbol, (2) the action of setting a system to use, (3) a text, (4) form of letter (5) creative composition, and (6) a skilled ability.

Based on the definitions above, writing is a skill to compose or communicate intended implication, idea, and purposes to the reader by using a clear, coherent, and well organized paper through the process of thinking, studying, developing organizing, producing, revising, and editing the product. Brown (2003) discussed the aspects of writing vocabulary, organization, content, syntax, and mechanics are five indicators of the writing assessment. In conclusion, writing is an ability to convey meanings to the reader by using clear text that comes from some activity of letters forming by preparing, producing and editing the text which covers: vocabulary, grammar, content, organization, and mechanics.

The author conclude that writing is a process of discovery is the involvements of a series of steps, and those steps are very often a zigzag journey. The important thing in writing is that the students are ready to learn how to become a competent writer. It means that students can master writing skills with hard work and process of discovering the way to write.

Related to the assessment of writing, assessment is measurement done by the teacher to know how far the students have already understood about the materials that have been discussed. In teaching writing, assessment is

aimed to know how far the students can produce a good composition of text. The teacher usually gives a test to assess the students' ability.

In this research, essay writing was used to measure the students' writing ability. Related to the writing process, the writing process is the stage that the writer goes through in order to produce something in the final written form (Harmer, 2004). Here, the students asked to plan, draft, edit, and write the final draft.

Srinivas (2011) states that collaborative learning is an educational method to teaching and learning that involve groups of learners working together to solve a problem, complete a task, or create a product.

Furthermore, Lee (2011) stated that collaborative writing is a set of writing strategies covered in a system for the English language learners with different levels of capacities including those who have learning disabilities. It offers an authentic learning environment where students not only develop their writing skills but also critical thinking and decision making skills.

From those definitions, it can be concluded that CWS is a writing method in which students should be teamed together on an assignment to complete a task. The procedures that were used in this research are prewriting, drafting, revising, and appreciating.

MWS is related to the metacognition process. Perfect & Schwartz (2004) state that metacognition is the thinking processes. Then, Zohar and Dori (2012) state that metacognition is the reflective thinking and track lining to achieve the goal.

In short, Metacognitive writing strategy is an activity under the thinking process that helps the students to connect their own learning process. Related to this research, MWS procedures that will be used are focusing the goal, prewriting, arranging, planning, creating, and evaluating the learning.

Grainger (2005) defines creativity as a complex capacity of human intelligence to bring something new, which is relevant to everyone and covers both individual and collaborative activities. It highlights five key concepts which we need to understand: using imagination, the creative process, originality, the pursuit of purpose and judging value.

Furthermore, creativity refers to mental processes that lead to solutions, ideas, concepts, artistic expression, theories or products that are unique and novel (Carter & Russell, 2003). Munandar (2012) 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.

From the explanation, it can be concluded that creativity is a mental process and an ability to produce new ideas that covers the fluency, flexibility, elaboration, and originality of thinking and solving problems. Through the definition, it can be seen that there are four indicators of creativity such as: fluency, flexibility, elaboration, and originality.

Based on the previous research, CWS gives a good impact for the students in writing. However, the researcher has not found a study that is finding the effectiveness of collaborative writing strategy compared with metacognitive writing strategy viewed from the students' creativity. That is why, by finding the effectiveness of CWS, it can show the best teaching methods in writing especially for high creativity or low creativity students.

The hypotheses are: CWS is more effective than MWS to teach writing of the eighth grade of a Junior High

School in Wonosari, Gunungkidul in the academic year of 2013/ 2014; Students with high creativity have better writing skills; There is interaction between teaching methods and creativity in teaching writing.

This research was conducted in the eighth grade of a Junior High School in Wonosari, Gunungkidul in the academic year of 2013/ 2014. a Junior High School in Wonosari, Gunungkidul. It was conducted for six months in the second semester of 2013/ 2014 academic year from January to June 2014.

METHODS

The research method used in the research is experimental study. The purpose of an experimental study is to investigate cause and effect by giving certain treatment to the experimental class and to control class as the comparison. Since the experimental study was conducted without randomization, the experiment is not categorized as true experiment. In other words, the experimental research that is used in this research is quasi experiment in which the research is conducted through cluster random sampling. The research design is factorial design 2x2 by using multifactor analysis of variance (ANOVA) technique.

The research population is the students at the eighth grade of SMP Muhammadiyah 2 Wonosari, Gunungkidul in the academic year of 2013/ 2014 which consists of six classes. The total number of the population is 192 students. In each class there are 32 students.

The research samples are two classes of a Junior High School in Wonosari in the academic year of 2013/ 2014. The number of the sample is 64 students.

There are some ways of sampling. However, related to the feasibility of the study, cluster random sampling is the appropriate sampling to use. The writer chooses cluster random sampling because it is impossible to make a real randomization in the schools. Commonly, students in a school have been clustered based on the schools' authority.

This quantitative data is often collected in experiments, manipulated and statistically analyzed. It can be represented visually in graphs, histograms, tables, and charts. To collect the research data, the appropriate instrument in this research is test. A test is used to collect data of students' writing skill and another test is used to collect the data of students' creativity.

To know the students' writing skill, the students are given writing test which is in the form of narrative essay test. Furthermore, in order to know the level of students' creativity, the students are given creativity test. A verbal creativity test was used in this research.

Descriptive and inferential analysis is used in this research. The descriptive analysis covers the mean, median, mode, and standard deviation of the writing test. In conducting ANOVA, the pre activity related to the normality and homogeneity test has been taken.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The test can be conducted after the result of normality and homogeneity tests are calculated and fulfilled. The data analysis is conducted by using Multifactor Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) 2x2. The 2 x 2 ANOVA and Tukey test are listed in table 1.

Table 1 Summary of 2x2 Multifactor Analysis of Variance

Source of variance	SS	df	MS	F ₀	F _{t(0,05)}
Between columns (technique)	105,1	1	105,1	5,30	4,00
Between rows (creativity)	232,6	1	232,6	11,73	
Columns by rows (interacion)	1225	1	1225	61,80	
Between groups	1563	3	520,9		
Within groups	1189	60	19,82		
Total	2752	63			

While the result of mean scores can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2 Mean Scores

	A ₁	A ₂	
B ₁	79,06	67,75	73,41
B ₂	66,50	72,69	69,59
	72,78	70,22	

Because F₀ (5,30) is higher than F_t (4,00) at the level of significance $\alpha=0,05$, H₀ is rejected and the difference between columns is significant. It can be concluded that Collaborative Writing Strategy to teach writing at the eighth grade of a Junior High School in Wonosari, Gunungkidul differs significantly from Metacognitive Writing Strategy. Moreover, the Collaborative Writing Strategy students' mean score (72,78) is higher than that of the Metacognitive Writing Strategy (70,22). It can be concluded that teaching writing using Collaborative Writing Strategy is more effective than Metacognitive Writing Strategy.

Because F₀ (11,73) is higher than F_t at the level of significance $\alpha=0,05$ (4,00), H₀ is rejected and the difference between rows is significant. It can be concluded that students having high creativity differ significantly in writing skill from those having low creativity. It means the mean score of students having high creativity (73,41) is higher than that of those having low creativity (69,59). It can be concluded that the students having creativity have better writing skill than those having low creativity.

Because F₀ interaction (61,80) is higher than F_t at the level of significance $\alpha=0,05$ (4,00), H₀ is rejected and there is interaction between the two variables, the teaching techniques and the creativity of the students' in writing lesson at the eighth grade of SMP Negeri 3 Wonosari, Gunungkidul.

Next, the researcher continued analyzing the data using Tukey test. The result of analyzing of the data using Tukey test can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3 The Result of Tukey Test

No	Data	Sample	q ₀	q _t	α	Status
1	A ₁ and A ₂	32	3,26	2,89	0,05	Sig
2	B ₁ and B ₂	32	4,84	2,89	0,05	Sig
3	A ₁ B ₁ and A ₂ B ₁	16	10,16	3,00	0,05	Sig
4	A ₁ B ₂ and A ₂ B ₂	16	5,56	3,00	0,05	Sig*

*Sig= Significant

Because q_0 between columns (3,26) is higher than q_t at the level of significance $\alpha=0,05$ (2,89), applying Collaborative Writing Strategy differs significantly from Metacognitive Writing Strategy to teach writing. Because the mean of A_1 (72,78) is higher than A_2 (70,22), it means CWS is more effective than MWS to teach writing.

Because q_0 between rows (4,84) is higher than q_t at the level of significance $\alpha=0,05$ (2,89), it can be concluded that high creativity students and those low creativity students are significantly different in their writing skill. Because the mean of B_1 (73,41) is higher than B_2 (69,59), it means that the high creativity students have better writing skill than those low creativity students.

As can be seen that q_0 between cells $A_1 B_1$ and $A_2 B_1$ (10,16) is higher than q_t at the level of significance $\alpha=0,05$ (3,00), applying Collaborative Writing Strategy differs significantly from Metacognitive Writing Strategy in writing lesson to the high creativity students. Then, the mean high creativity students taught by Collaborative Writing Strategy or $A_1 B_1$ (79,06) is higher than the mean of high creativity students taught by Metacognitive Writing Strategy or $A_2 B_1$ (67,75). It can be concluded that CWS work effectively than MWS in writing lesson at high creativity students.

Since q_0 between cells $A_1 B_2$ and $A_2 B_2$ (4,09) is higher than q_t at the level of significance $\alpha=0,05$ (2,97), applying Metacognitive Writing Strategy differs significantly from Collaborative Writing Strategy in writing lesson to the low creativity students. Because $A_2 B_2$ mean (66,50) is lower than $A_1 B_2$ (72,69), shows that Metacognitive Writing Strategy works effectively than Collaborative Writing Strategy for writing lesson at the low creativity students.

From the result of Tukey test number 3 and 4 above, it is known that Collaborative Writing Strategy works more effectively than Metacognitive Writing Strategy in writing lesson to the students having high creativity and Metacognitive Writing Strategy works effectively than Collaborative Writing Strategy in writing lesson to the low creativity students. It means there is an interaction between teaching techniques and students' creativity in teaching writing. The effectiveness of teaching techniques depends on the degree of students' creativity.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the hypothesis testing and research findings, it implies that Collaborative Writing Strategy (CWS) is an effective teaching for teaching writing especially narrative essay to the eighth grade of a Junior High School in Wonosari. It is proved from the research findings that the students who are taught by using Collaborative Writing Strategy (CWS) students can have better writing skill than using Metacognitive Writing Strategy (MWS). Collaborative Writing Strategy (CWS) can encourage the students to write actively in writing process because of the peer review benefits.

The set of the methods are: giving the writing assignment, sharing learning goals, drafting, writing and revising, evaluating, and appreciating. In applying CWS the teachers give a clear writing task, share the learning goals to the students, give an opportunity to the students in a group to help each other during the process of drafting the writing, give opportunity to the students to translate and review the work together, give opportunity to the students to monitor and evaluate their writing together, and give an opportunity to the students to gain appreciation for their group.

In order to achieve the most optimum writing achievement by using CWS, the students have to ask and discuss what they did not know to the peers and the teachers so that they can be easier when solving the problems and writing.

Based on the research findings there are some suggestion for some parties like teachers, students, and also researchers.

Firstly, for teachers: (a) In order to improve the students' writing skills in SMP, English teachers are suggested to apply CWS in writing activities. (b) Teachers are suggested to be creatively and innovatively used various kinds of teaching methods which accompany the appropriate materials in order to encourage the students in learning.

Secondly, for students: (a) Students are suggested to ask and discuss what they do not know to the peers and the teachers so that it is easy for them to solve the problem. (b) Students are suggested to write more and in academic writing, they have to find a pairs in order to help them in correcting their writing.

Thirdly, other researchers: (a) other researchers can do further research in the field by applying some other variables involving self-esteem, self-confidence, linguistics intelligence, and many others. (b) The results of this research can be used as an additional reference for a similar research with different variable.

The result of this research is expected to give some contributions to the teaching and learning English. Theoretically, this research will support the theories on language teaching and learning especially those related to teaching writing in senior High School. This research can support on teaching English writing as foreign language. This will give contributions as it hopefully can add the knowledge about CWS the implementation, strengths, weaknesses, and other.

Furthermore, analyzing the results of this research and identifying research can be used as a resource or guidance for conducting better research in the future. For instance, it is beneficial for other researchers who want to conduct similar research viewed from any different psychological aspects besides creativity that may have a correlation with writing such as intelligence, personality, self-esteem, etc..

REFERENCES

- Becky & Spuvey. (2006). *Innovative teaching*. USA: Gorsuch.
- Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practice*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Carter, P., & Russell, K. (2003). *More Psychometric Testing: 1000 New Ways to Assess Your Personality, Creativity, Intelligence And Lateral Thinking (The IQ Workout Series)*. Mankato: Capstone.
- Coulmas, F. (2008). English Monolingualism in scientific communication and progress in science, Good or Bad?. *AILA Review*, 20, 5-13.
- Diaz, V., Golas, J. M., & Gautsch, S. (2010). Privacy Considerations in Cloud-Based Teaching and Learning Environments. *EDUCAUSE Learning Initiative Paper*, 1(3), 210.
- Dulger, O. (2011). Meta-cognitive strategies in developing

- EFL writing skills. *Contemporary Online Language Education Journal*, 1(2). 82-100.
- Dvorak, K. (2009). Writing Activities for ESL Writers. *ESL Writers: A Guide for Writing Center Tutor*, 127-132.
- Ferris, D. (2007). Preparing teachers to respond to student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(3), 165–193.
- Fulcher, G., & Davidson, F. (2007). *Language Testing and Assessment: An Advanced Resource Book*. Oxfordshire: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Grainger, T. (2005). Teachers as Writers: learning together. *English in Education*. 39(1) 75-87. doi: 10.1111/j.1754-8845.2005.tb00611.x
- Harmer, J. (2004). *How to Teach Writing*. Harlow: Longman.
- Kaufman, J. C., Plucker, J. A., & Baer, J. (2008). *Essential of Creativity Assessment*. New Jersey: Wiley.
- Langan, J. (2010). *Exploring Writing: Sentences and Paragraph*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lee, M. (2011). Decision-Making in a Collaborative Writing Task. *Global Perspectives, Local Initiatives*, 159-168.
- MacArthur, C. A., Graham, S., & Fitzgerald, J. (2016). *Handbook of Writing Research*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Munandar, U. (2012). *Mengembangkan Bakat dan Kreativitas Anak Sekolah*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Widiasarana Indonesia.
- O’Neill, P. (2011). Reframing Reliability for Writing Assessment. *The Journal of Writing Assessment*, 4(1). 1-5.
- Perfect, T. J., & Schwartz, B. L. (2004). *Applied Metacognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Srinivas, H. (2011). What is Collaborative Learning? *The Global Development Research Center*, 2(12), 491-495.
- Zohar, A., & Dori, Y. J. (2012). *Metacognition in Science Education: Trends in Current Research (Contemporary Trends and Issues in Science Education)*. New York: Pearson.