Developing Paragraph Elements at The Sixth Semester Students of UKI-Toraja through Jigsaw Technique

Aris Kaban Sendana

Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris
Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan
Universitas Kristen Indonesia Toraja
Jl. Nusantara No. 12 Makale
Kabupaten Tana Toraja, Sulawesi Selatan
aris_kaban@yahoo.com

ABTRACT

The objectives of this research are (1) to find out the effects of jigsaw technique on students' ability in writing the paragraph elements at the sixth semester students of UKI-Toraja and (2) to find out whether or not the students interrested in using jigsaw technique. This research employed cluster random sampling technique. In this research there were two groups, one received treatment using Jigsaw Technique and the other group received the conventional way from the Lecturer who taught writing two in that semester. The subjects of this research were two classes, class B (22) as experimental group and class C (22) as control group. The data of this research was collected through writing test and questionnaire. The results of the research revealed that (1) using Jigsaw Technique affects the ability of the sixth semester students of UKI-Toraja in writing the elements of a good paragraph.

***Kata Kunci**: Jigsaw technique, paragraph elements, students ability, students' interest*

I. Introduction

Writing skill is one of the four skills in English. This skill is essentially needed for the students of UKI-Toraja as the under graduate students. It is hoped that the graduates who are provided to be professional teachers must keep improving their knowledge by doing scientific research, educational research, improving the materials for teaching, etc. Those required needs cannot be achieved without the skill of writing. According to Olson, et, al (2005:157), mastering writing detail is important, but the main purpose of writing is to communicate a message with a specific purpose to an audience. Most writing does one of three things: inform, explain, or present an argument. Writing effectively involves discovering what you want to say, organizing your ideas, and presenting them in the most logical, effective way.

One of the subjects that is taught at UKI-Toraja is writing. Writing is taught in three semesters, from the basic level to more advan-

ced levels. At the 3rd semester, students learn Writing I, in which they are taught how to compose good sentences. Here, they learn about the use of right punctuation, capitalization and kinds of sentences. When they come to the 4th semester, they learn Writing II in which they learn about the steps to compose good paragraph, and Essay Writing is taught at their 5th semester. Paragraph is one of the importent components of writing discussed in Writing II. The Researcher beliveves that to be able to write kinds of writing of a longer texts. The students needs to be able to write a good paragraph correctly.

According to Zemach & Rumisek (2005:11), a paragraph is a group of sentences about a single topic. Together, the sentences of the paragraph explain the writer's main idea (most important idea) about the topic. In academic writing, a paragraph is often between five and ten sentences long, but it can be longer or shorter, depending on the topic. The first senttence of a paragraph is usually indented (moved in) a few spaces. Furthermore, Zemach & Rumisek (2005:12) give details about the elements of the paragraph, those arethe topic sentence, supporting sentences and concluding sentence.

To be success in learning writing skill, the students need an interest. According to Wintzel and Wigfield (2009:197) Interest also represents a possible antecedent of motivation. A relatively unique feature of interest is its strong emphasis on the content of learning. Unlike many other motivational constructs, such as motives, needs, self-concepts, or goal-orientations, interest is always related to a specific object, activity, or subject area. In his person-object theory of interest, Krapp (2002) described interest as a relational construct that consists of a more or less enduring relationship between a person and an object. This relationship is realized by specific activities, which may comprise concrete or hands-on actions and abstract mental operations. Writing skill, has its own attraction that makes the students interested in learning it, even the techniques used by the Lecturer can bring an interest to the students to learn.Apart from the broader aspects of motivation, the interest has its own unique features namely its strong emphasis on the content of learning and the specifick activity. In teaching certain skill and specific aspect of writing. The researcher is engaged to know and to prove whether the students are interested in writing paragraph elements using jigsaw technique or not.

Based on the researcher interview to a lecturer, Siumarlata (April,4th 2015) who taught writing II, that there were some crucial problems, the students faced in writing a good paragraph. The first while he taught writing II, he found that the students were still unable to construct the sentences, to write the topic sentence, to improve the supporting sentences and to write the concluding sentences. The second when he bacame an advisor to 20 students and he examined 30 students on thesis examination in academic year 2014/2015. He found that all the students both his advising students and the students he examined were still unable to write a good paragraph correctly. On the other hand, the researcher also interviewed two students who are still learning writing II in this semester, Seblon and Kuniawan and one students who have passed the subject, Selviani (April,4th 2015). They said that they got difficulties in finding the appropriate ideas (vocabulary), writing sentences, and even they do not know the structure of the paragraph yet. In addition Selviani said, she is difficult to choose topic sentence and to construct paragraph.

One technique that can be used in teaching writing skill is Jigsaw technique. According to the article from jigsaw. org (2012), the jigsaw structure promotes positive interdependence and also provides a simple method to ensure individual accountability. First introduced by Aronson, et al. (1978) the basic premise

 ISBN: 978-602-18328-9-9

of jigsaw is to divide a problem into sections, one for each group member. Each student receives resources to complete only his/her part. The students who are responsible for the same section join together and form a new, temporary focus group whose purpose is for the students to master the concepts in their section, and to develop a strategy for teaching what they have learned to the other students in their original collaborative learning group.

This method has been proved effective by some researchers in teaching ESL. Maden (2011) proved that, according to the findings relating to the students' views about the Jigsaw I technique obtained at the end of the experimental process, it was seen that most of the students stated that Jigsaw technique increases success, encourages self-confidence, develops cooperation and interaction, makes students more active and encourage them to research.

Based on the problem and the previous study above, the reasearcher conducted research on the effects of jigsaw technique on students' ability in identifying and developing the elements of good paraggraph and on the students' interest in writing the paragraph elements. The Researcher was engaged to know the effects of jigsaw technique on students' ability in identifying and developing paragraph elements and to know the students' interest using jigsaw technique in teaching paragraph elements.

II. Method

In this research, the researcher used the nonequivalent control group design. It used two groups, one received the treatment using jigsaw technique and the other group received general method which was done by the Lecturer who taught writing II in that semester. Both of groups were given pre-test and post-test. The pre-test was done to find out the prior knowledge of students while post-test was done to find out the influence of using Jigsaw Technique in teaching English writing. To obtain the data of the students' interest the resarcher used quetionaire. The design was formulated as follows:

EG	O_1	X	O_2
CG	O_1	-	O_2

Research design (Sugiyono 2013:79)
Where:

EG : Experimental Group
CG : Control Group
O_1 : Pre Test
O_2 : Post Test
X : treatment with jigsaw technique

This research consisted of two variables, namely dependent variable and independent variable. The research had one independent variable and two dependent variables. The tree variables were; the independent variable was jigsaw technique. It was used to facilitate students to improve their ability and cmprehension to write the elements of a good paragraph. the dependent variables of this research were the students' ability in writing the elements of a good paragraph and the students' interest in using jigsaw technique in learning.

The population of this research was the sixth semester students of UKI Toraja, South Sulawesi in academic year 2014/2015. These students had taken Writing I as the prerequisite subject to take writing II. The total number of the classes were nine namely, clas; A-I. Each class consists of different number of students. The population was 322 students.

The sample was selected by using cluster random sampling technique. The writer took two classes. Class B and Class D. Both classes took the subject of writing II, where they were taught how to construct a good paragraph. They were taught by another Lecturer using

 ISBN: 978-602-18328-9-9

traditional technique. Class B was chosen as the experimental class where it consisted 22 students. Class D was the control class. It consisted 25 students. So, the total number of the sample is 45 students.

III. Result and Discussion

To collect the data, the research used pre-test and post-test. The test used was productive test, in the form of writing test. These test aimed at collecting data of students' ability in writing a good paragraph of both classes, experimental and control class.

A. The Ability of the Students in Identifying the Elements of a Good Paragaph.

The students ability in identifying the topic sentence (TS), supporting sentence (SS), and concluding sentence (CS) for pre-test and post test of experimental and control group was described identification test. If a students identified one of the elements correctly, he/she would get score one (1/3*100) but if he/she answered incorrectly, he/she would get zero and if a student answer the three elements correctly he/she will get three (3/3*100). The result of the test was described in the table below:

Tabel 1: *The persentage comparison of pre-test and post-test based on the elements of paragraph*

Group	Pretest		%	Post test		%
Control	TS	22	100	TS	22	100
	TS	22	100	TS	22	100
	SS	22	100	TS	22	100
	CS	18	81.8	CS	19	86.36
Exp'nt	TS	22	100	TS	22	100
	TS	22	100	TS	22	100
	SS	22	100	TS	22	100
	CS	20	90	CS	22	100

Based on the Table 1, it can be seen that from the three elements of a paragraph, in the pre-test of control group, there were 4 (81.81%) students who failed to coplete the identification test, especially in identifying concluding sentence. In the experimental group, there were 2 (90.90%) students who failed to complete the identification test, especially in identifying concluding sentence.

In the post-test, of control group, there were 3 (86.36%) students who failed to identify the concluding sentence. In the experimental class, all the students in the group completed the identification test. So, they completed the identification test 100 percent.

From the analysis above, it can be conluded that using jigsaw techinque can improve the students' ability to identify the elements of a good paragraph.

B. The Ability of the Students in Writing.

B.1. The Percentage of Students' Writing Ability for Pretest in Experimental and Control Group.

Students' score of pre-test were classified into seven classifications namely excellent, very good, good, fairly good, fair, poor, and very poor. The frequency and the rate percentage of the students' score of pre-test in Experimental and control classes are presented in the following: Based on the Table 2 the result of the pre-test both of group was none (0%) of students got excellent and very good. The result of the students' score in experimental class was six (27,27%) students got good, five (22,72%) students got fairly good, six (27,27%) students got fair, and five (22,72%) students got poor, and there was none of students who got very poor.

In control class, the students' score was 5 (22.72%) students got good, three (13,63%) students got fairly good, thirteen (59,09%)

 ISBN: 978-602-18328-9-9

Tabel 2: *The Rate Percentage and Frequency of Students' Score of Pre-Test in Experimental and Control Class*

Calssification	Score	Experimental Class		Control Class	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Excellent	96-100	0	0	0	0
Very good	86-95	0	0	0	0
Good	76-85	6	27,27	5	22,72
Fairly Good	66-75	5	22,72	3	13,63
Fair	56-65	6	27,27	13	59,09
Poor	46-55	5	22,72	1	4,54
Very poor	0-36	0	0	0	0
Total		22	100	22	100

students got fair, one (4,54%) students got poor, and there was none of students who got very poor.

Based on Table 3, the mean score of vocabulary, and language use in control group were higher than in experimental group. On the other hand, content, organization and mechanics in experimental were higher than in control group. The mean score of overall the five components of writing shown the negative difference on -0,02 point which meant that the control group was higher than experimental group although it was not really significant.

B.2. The Percentage of Students' Writing Achievement of Post-test in Experimental and Control Group

Based on the data shown above the result of post-test of experimental class was increased. four (18.18%) students got very good, seven (31,81%) students got good, eight (36,36%) students got fairly good, three (13,63%) students got fair and there was none students who got poor and very poor.

The result of post-test of control class was also shown in table 4.13, none students got excellent and very good, eight (36,36%) students got good, three (13,63%) got fairly good, and eleven (50%) students got fair. There was none (0%) students got poor and very poor.

The data in the Table 5 shows that the mean score of five components of writing in experimental and control group were different in range 6.77 points. The mean score of experimental was 76.55 while the mean score of the control group was 69.78. It means that the mean score of post-test in experimental group was higher than the control group.

The data in Table 6 shown the components that best improved were content and language use. At the pre-test, the mean score of the content was 20.09, at the post-test it become 23.14. It improved 3.03. On the other side the mean score language use at the pre-test was 14.27 and at the post-test was 17.59. It was improved 3.32. The component that moderately improved was vocabulary. At the pre-test the mean score was 13.59 and at the post-test, it become 16.23. It improved 2.64. The components that less improved were organization and mechanics. At the pre-test, the mean score of organization was 14.27, at the post-test it become 16.18. It improved 1.91 and the mean score of mechanics at the pre-test was 3.23 and at the post-test was 3.41. It was improved 0.18.

 ISBN: 978-602-18328-9-9

Tabel 3: *The Rate Percentage and Frequency of Students' Score of Pretest in Experimental and Control Class*

Components of Writing	Mean Score		Diference
	Experimental	Control	
Content	20.09	18.64	1,45
Organization	14.27	13.91	0,36
Vocabulary	13.59	14.32	-0,42
Language use	14.27	15.55	-1,28
Mechanic	3.23	3.05	0,18
Total	65.45	65.47	-0.02

Tabel 4: *The Rate Percentage and Frequency of Students' Score of Post-Test in Experimental and Control Class*

Calssification	Score	Experimental Class		Control Class	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Excellent	96-100	0	0	0	0
Very good	86-95	4	18,18	0	0
Good	76-85	7	31,81	8	36,36
Fairly Good	66-75	8	36,36	3	13,63
Fair	56-65	3	13,63	11	50
Poor	46-55	0	0	0	0
Very poor	0-45	0	0	0	0
Total		22	100	22	100

Tabel 5: *The Mean Score of Post-Test between Experimental and Control Group in Five Components of Writing*

Components of Writing	Mean Score		Diference
	Experimental	Control	
Content	23.14	20.23	2.91
Organization	16.18	14.73	1.45
Vocabulary	16.23	14.91	1.32
Language use	17.59	16.64	0,96
Mechanic	3.41	3.27	0,14
Total	76.55	69.78	6,77

 ISBN: 978-602-18328-9-9

Tabel 6: *The Mean Score Comparison of Experimental Group between Pretest and Post-test from Five Components of Writing*

Components of Writing	Mean Score		Diference
	Experimental	Control	
Content	20.09	23.14	3.03
Organization	14.27	16.18	1.91
Vocabulary	13.59	16.23	2.64
Language use	14.27	17.59	3.32
Mechanic	3.23	3.41	0,18
Total	65.45	76.55	11.10

B.3. The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of Students' Pre-test and Post-test for Experimental and Control Class

The following tables were the result of the students' scores of pre-test and post-test in control and experimental group. The tables showed the difference score on mean score and standard deviation of both groups.

As shown in Table 7, the mean score of pre-test in control group was 65.45 which was categorized as good based on the scoring system by UKIT (2012) and experimental group was 65.45 which was categorized as good, UKIT (2012). In line with this, the researcher concluded that both experimental and control group were at the same level in writing achievement.

Furthermore, the explanation for students' achievement on the post-test score after the treatment was done. In this case, the post-test score was analyzed at the significant level 0.05 or *alpha* equals to 0.05 by using inferential statistic through SPSS program version 21. The result of post-test as follows: Data in Table 7 above showed that the mean scores of both experimental and control group were different after the treatment. The mean score of experimental group was 76.73 (65.45 $<$ 76.73) whereas the control group was 69.68 (65.45 $<$ 69.68). The mean score of post-test for experimental group was higher than the control group (76.73 $>$ 69.68) and the standard deviation for experimental group was 10.03 and control group was 9.64. The mean score both of groups based on the scoring system by UKIT (2012) shows that experimental was on the good category and control was also on the good category. It means that the ability of the experimental group after getting the treatment using jigsaw technique is improved.

B.4. Test of significant (t-test)

This part analyzed about hypotheses by using inferential analysis or the result of hypotheses was computed by SPSS 21 version. In this case, the researcher used t-test (test of significance) independent sample test and t-table. The purpose of test to know the significance of difference between the results of students' means scores in post-test of experimental group and post-test of control group.

After conducting treatment and post-test, the researcher analyzed t-test (test of significance) independent sample test. As it was explained in Procedure of Collecting Data at Chapter III that the purpose of t-test was to Null Hypothesis (H_0) and Alternative Hypothesis (H_1) were accepted. It had been known that the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ with degree of freedom (df) = (n_1 + n_2) – 2 , where n = number of subject (22), df = (22 + 22)–2 = 42, so that the total number of subject (42).

To test of t-table, it was obtained through the formula as follow:

 ISBN: 978-602-18328-9-9

Tabel 7: *The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of the Students' Pre-Test*

Group	Sample	Mean Score	Std. Deviation
Experimental	22	65.45	8,48
Control	22	65.45	11.81

Tabel 8: *The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of the Students' Post-Test*

Group	Sample	Mean Score	Std. Deviation
Experimental	22	76.73	10.03
Control	22	69.68	9.62

$t_{table} = 1 - \frac{\alpha}{2} = N - 2 = t_{table} = 1 - \frac{0.05}{2} = 44 - 2 = 42$ =0.0975 is the column and 60 is line so the result of t-table is 2.02.

Because t-table (2.02) > t-count (0.698) so Null Hypothesis (H0) was accepted and in contrast if t-table < t-count so Null Hypothesis (H0) was rejected. Below is the t-test results in pre-test and post-test in term of literal, inferential, and critical:

The result of data analysis on pre-test of control and experimental groups, the researcher found that the Probability value (1.00) was higher than the level of significance at α = 0.05 and the degree of freedom 44. The data also showed that the t-count value was smaller than t-table (0.00 < 2.02). It indicated that the Alternative Hypothesis (H1) was rejected and the Null Hypothesis (H0) was accepted. In the other word, there was no significant difference between the students English achievement in pre-test before treatment. After treatment, the researcher found that the Probability value 0.02 was smaller than the level of significance at $\alpha = 0.05$ and the degree of freedom 44. The data also showed that the t-count value was higher than t-table (2.377> 2.02). It indicated that the Alternative Hypothesis (H1) was accepted and the Null Hypothesis (H0) was rejected. It means that the implementation of jigsaw technique in writing the elements of a good paragraph could increase the students' ability. Besides $t - test$ above, it could be seen the difference between control and experimental group in their gain scores in the table below: The result of data analysis on control and experimental group, the researcher found that t-value or probability (0.02) was smaller than the level of significance α = (0.02 < 0.05) and t-count was higher than t-table (2.382 > 2.02). It means that there was significant difference of students' achievement between the students who got the treatment using jigsaw technique (experimental group) and the students who were taught by using conventional way (control group), or in the other word Alternative Hypothesis (H1) was accepted.

B.5. The Analysis Data of the Students' Interest

The questionnaire was responded by the students individually based on the students' opinion after the treatment using Jigsaw Technique. The interest of the fourth semester students of UKI-Toraja in writing a good paragrah by using Jigsaw Technique showed great positive effects. Refers to the data analysis of the questionnaire items, the mean score of questionnaire were 73.182 and categorized into very interested classification. The data analysis can be seen in the following table. The data from questionnaire of the experimental group stated that none of the students responded in negative statement toward the use of Jigsaw Technique, it showed that 18 (81.81%) of students were very interested and 4 (18.18%) of students who

 ISBN: 978-602-18328-9-9

Tabel 9. The Probability Value of t-test of the Students' English Achievement in Pre-test and Post-test

	t-table	t-count	2 Tailed Value (Probability Value)	(α)	Remarks
Pre-test in Experimental and Control Groups	2.02	0.00	1.00	0.05	There was no different or Null Hypothesis was accepted
Post-test in Experimental and Control Groups		-2.377	0.02		Significantly Different or Alternative Hypothesis was accepted

Gambar 10. The Probability Value of t-test of the Difference Between Control and Experimental Group in Their Gain Scores

Group	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*	*t-count*	*Calculated t-Value*	*Remarks at (α) = 0.05*
Control Group (N=22)	*04.23*	*7.283*	*2.382*	*00.02*	*Significant*
Experimental Group (N=22)	*11.27*	*11.805*			

Gambar 11. The Rate Percentage of the Students' interest

No.	Classification	Rang Score	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Very Interested	65-80	18	81,81
2.	Interested	50-65	4	18,18
3.	Uninterested	35-50	0	0
4.	Very uninterested	20-35	0	0
	Total		22	100

was interested. Based on the score of the students in questionnaires, it was found that the highest score gotten by one of the students was 79. It is one point below the highest score, 80. The gained score, 79 was categorized as very interested. And the lowest score was 59 which was categorized as interested and most of the students indicated very interested and interested as positive statement about the use of Jigsaw Technique in writing the elements of a good paragraph.

B.6. The Ability of the Students in Identifying the Elements of a Good Paragaph.

The describtion of the students ability through the identification test from both pre-test and post-test done by control and experimental groups can be seen in the following.

The first, through pre-test, four of the students of control group identified the supporting sentence incorrectly. It means that they got only 62 (281.82%) scores. In the other side two students of experimental group identified the concluding sentence incorrectly. It means that they got score only 64 (290.91%).

The second, through the post-test three of the students of the control group identified the concluding sentence (CS) incorrectly. It means that they got score only 63 (286.36%) and the experimental group answered all correctly. It means that they got score 66 (300%). Using Jigsaw Technique is very helpful to identify the the elements of paragraph. It was proved by the experimental group with the score 66 (300%) after getting the treatment.

 ISBN: 978-602-18328-9-9

B.7. The Students' Writing Achievement

Based on previous finding on all writing components, it showed that the writing achievement of the fourth semester students of UKI-Toraja improved especially for experimental class. It was also supported by the students' frequency and rate percentage of the students' pre-test and post-test.

Based on the mean score of pre-test between experrimental and control group can be seen that the difference is only -0.02. It means that there is no significant difference of the both achievement of experimental and control group. On the other side after doing the treatment using Jigsaw Technique in writing the elements of a good paragraph, the difference of mean score from the post-test of both experimental and control group is 6.77 (30,77%). It means that using Jigsaw Technique in writing the elements of a paragraph can improve the students' ability.

Based on the rate percentage and frequency of students' score of pre-test, from the experimental and control group, none of the students who got the score in the category of very poor, very good and excellent. Most of them in the category of good, fairly good, fair and poor. On the other side, after the post test the rate percentage and frequency of the students' score showed that in the exprimental group 4 (18.18%) of the students who got the score in the very good category, 7 (31.81%) in good category, 8 (36.36%) in the fairly good category, 3 (13.63%) in the fair category and none of the students who got the score in the category of very poor, poor and excellent. In the control group the result shows that there is no significant improvement based on the rate percentage and frequency of the students score. It shows that 8 (36.36%) of the students in the good category, 3 (13.63%) in the fairly good category, 11 (50%) in the fair category and none of them in the very poor, poor,very good and excellent category. It means that based on the five components of writing, the ability of the students in experimental group after the treatment using jigsaw technique is improve well or in the other words Jigsaw Technique is working well. It is better than the conventional way.

Referring to the result of the students' writing obtained the stated in finding above, the researcher used t-test in inferential statistic through SPSS version 21 program to test the hypothesis. Before doing the research, test significance of normality and homogeneity as a prerequisite was done and the result of significance of normality and homogenity is higher than the level of significance namely alpha $\alpha = 0.05$. It means means that treatment can be continuosly done.

Test of significance (t-test) was found that the Probability value (1.00) was higher than the level of significance at $\alpha = (0.05)$. The t-count value was smaller than t-table ($0.00 < 2.02$). It indicated that the Alternative Hypothesis (H_1) was rejected and the Null Hypothesis (H_0) was accepted. After treatment, the data was found that the Probability value (0.02) was smaller than the level of significance at $\alpha = 0.05$. The t-count value was higher than t-table ($2.377 > 2.02$). It indicates that the Alternative Hypothesis (H_1) was accepted and the Null Hypothesis (H_0) was rejected.

IV. Conclusion

Based on the findings and discussion in the previous chapter, the researcher concluded that using Jigsaw Technique could affect the ability of the fourth semester students of UKI Toraja to identify paragraph elements and develop the paragraph and the Reseacher also concluded that the Jigsaw Technique used in teaching the students to write the elements of a paragraph could stimulate the interest on the students.

 ISBN: 978-602-18328-9-9

REFERENCE

[1] Aronson, E. (n.d.). 2012. Jigsaw Basics. jigsaw.org

[2] Huda. Miftahul. 2011. Cooparative Learning; Metode, Teknik, Struktur, dan Model Penerapan. Pustaka Pelajar.

[3] Kagan, S. (1994). Cooperative Learning. San Clemente, California: Kagan Publishing.

[4] Maden. Sedat, Dat. Van. 2011. Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice. E*ğ*itim Danışmanlıgı ve Araştırmaları Iletişim Hizmetleri Tic. Ltd. Şti.

[5] Meng. Jing. 2010. Jigsaw Cooperative Learning in English Reading. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, Vol. 1, No. 4. Academy Publisher

[6] Olson. Judith, et. al. 2005.Writing Skills Success in 20 Minutes A Day. Learning Express, LLC, New York.

[7] Richards. Jack. C., Schamidt. Richard. 2002. Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching & Applied Linguistics: Pearson Education Limited.

[8] Starko. Jordan. Alane. 2010. Creativityin The Classroom: Scool of Curious Delight: Routledge

[9] Sugiyono.2013. Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D. Alfabeta. Bandung.

[10] ———.2008. Metode Penelitian Pendidikan. Bandung: Alfabeta. Bandung

[11] Weigle, S. C. 2002. Assessing Writing. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

[12] Wintzel. Cathryn. R., Wigfield. Allan. 2009. Handbook of Motivation at School. Routledge.

[13] Zemach. Dorothy. E., Islam. Carlos. 2006. Writing in Paragraphs. Macmillan Education.

[14] Zemach. Dorothy. E., Rumisek. Lisa. N. 2005. Academic Writing from Paragraph to Essay. Macmillan Publishers Limited.