USING THINK-PAIR-SHARE (TPS) TO IMPROVE STUDENTS' WRITING CREATIVITY
(A Classroom Action Research in the Second Semester Students of STKIP Siliwangi Bandung)

[1] Mundriyah, [2] Aseptiana Parmawati

[2] aseptianaparmawati@gmail.com

[1, 2] STKIP SILIWANGI BANDUNG

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini dilakukan pada siswa semester kedua di STKIP Siliwangi. Kampus ini terletak di jl.Terusan Jenderal Sudirman no.3, Baros Cimahi Tengah, Jawa Barat. Keterampilan menulis penting, itu tidak mendapatkan cukup perhatian dan alokasi waktu yang tepat dalam proses belajar mengajar. Salah satu teknik yang dapat digunakan dalam pengajaran menulis adalah TPS. Tujuan jangka panjang dari penelitian ini adalah untuk menghasilkan teori belajar yang dapat diterapkan tanpa mengubah peran dosen, tetapi dapat mengoptimalkan kreativitas siswa. target yang spesifik untuk dicapai dalam penelitian ini adalah untuk membuktikan metode TPS untuk meningkatkan kreativitas menulis siswa. Output yang dibutuhkan dari penelitian ini sebagai publikasi ilmiah di jurnal lokal yang memiliki ISSN. Para peneliti mengidentifikasi beberapa masalah, seperti: 1) Apakah mengajar menulis menggunakan TPS meningkatkan kreativitas menulis siswa ?, 2) Bagaimana proses belajar mengajar situasi ketika TPS dilaksanakan di kelas menulis? Desain penelitian ini adalah Penelitian Tindakan Kelas (PTK). Dari hasil pre-test, kami menemukan bahwa hasil menulis siswa berada di bawah rata-rata dan masih jauh dari apa yang diharapkan. Temuan ini didukung oleh hasil skor menulis siswa. Skor rata-rata dari pre test adalah 56,09. Setelah pelaksanaan kegiatan TPS di setiap siklus, skor menulis siswa mendapatkan yang lebih baik. Hal ini dapat dilihat dari hasil rata skor siswa Siklus 1 adalah 65,80 dan siklus 2 adalah 80,25. Dapat disimpulkan bahwa TPS dapat meningkatkan kreativitas menulis siswa dan TPS dapat meningkatkan menulis kelas ke dalam situasi yang lebih baik.

Kata Kunci : TPS, Kreativitas, CAR

ABSTRACT

The research was conducted in the second semester students at STKIP Siliwangi. The campus is located at Jl.Terusan Jenderal Sudirman no.3, Baros Cimahi Tengah, West Java. Writing skill is important, it does not get enough attention and proper time allocation in the teaching and learning process. One technique that can be used in teaching writing is TPS. Long term goal of this research is to produce learning theory that can applied without changing the lecturer's role, but can optimize the student's creativity. Specific target to be achieved in this research is to prove TPS method to improve the student's writing creativity. Output required of this research as a scientific publication in local journal that have ISSN. The researchers identify some problems, such as: 1) Does teaching writing using TPS improve the students' writing creativity?, 2) How is the teaching and learning situation when TPS implemented in the writing class? The design of this research is Classroom Action Research (CAR). From the result of pre-test, we found that the result of students' writing was under average and still far from what was expected. The finding was supported by the result of students' writing scores. The average score of pre test was 56.09. After the implementation of TPS activities in every cycle, the students' writing score were getting better. It can be seen from the result of students' average score Cycle 1 was 65,80 and Cycle 2 was 80,25. It can be concluded that TPS can improve students' writing creativity and TPS can improve writing classroom into a better situation.

Keywords: *TPS, Creativity, CAR*

A. Introduction

We all know the importance of English as an International Language and majority used by people all over the world. English is also used in many activities either orally or in written form. There are many fields which can be seen dealing with the role of English, such as: technology, health, tourism, correspondence, etc. In Indonesia, English is taught from Elementary School up to University Level.

Writing is one of English skills besides listening, speaking, and reading. Blanchard and Root (1998: 1) state that learning to write in a new language is not always easy. It is challenging but is also fun. If the students are learning to speak and read in a new language, the students will be ready to begin writing too. The students will feel that writing in English is easy when they find comfort environment, such as a classroom.

Eventhough witing skill is important, it does not get enough attention and proper time allocation in the teaching and learning process. Byrne in Matthews (1993: 3) mentions that most lecturers consider that class time should be almost entirely devoted for developing oral skill except for few exceptions, such as activities closely linked to some forms of oral work. Therefore, writing activity is given to the students as an out-of-class activity which is done in the students own pace and mostly without clear and specific instruction from the lecturer. Lack of lecturers' monitor on the process of the students' writing activity causes a lot of problems in the students writing skill.

The lecturers always faced some problems related to technique of teaching learning process and also media and material. One technique that can be used in teaching writing is cooperative learning. According to Dornyei (1997: 482), in cooperative learning (CL) students settle small groups in order to achieve common learning goals via cooperation. This statement is supported by Joyce (2005: 1) who states that in cooperative learning students group together to accomplish significant cooperative task. Shortly, cooperative learning is a learning activity in which students work together to accomplish the objective of learning.

A variety of cooperative learning models has been developed, such as jigsaw, think-pair-share (TPS), learning together, numbered heads together, students' team achievement division and group investigation. The selection of a particular model or design is influenced by the desired outcomes for instruction, the subject area, and the social skill of students (Joyce, 2005: 1). Concerning with writing, think-pair-share (TPS) is a "multi-mode" technique developed to encourage students' participation in the classroom (Lyman, 2005: 4). This technique allows students to engage in individual and small-group thinking before they asked to answer questions in front of the whole class.

TPS is developed to encourage students' participation in the classroom activities (Lyman, 2005: 1). It means that by using TPS, a lecturer is able to encourage a high degree pupil response and able to help students keep on task. This activity also builds positive interpendence among pair members because of the shared writing surface. Each student should give written contribution for his or her pair of group. It can be assumed that there is a positive correlation among the group members to help each other for gaining the objective of their group. As stated previously, writing skill can be developed through class writing, group writing, individual writing, and community writing. It can be develop to the students' social character building when they work together in a team.

B. Literature Review
1. The Nature of Writing
Writing is one of the four skills which have to be mastered in learning language. But in fact, the students still cannot transfer their idea when they are asked to write in English. Students' skill in writing can increase if they are given opportunities to learn before the lecturer gives an assignment. Zamel in Nunan (1991: 88) states that writing skill can develop rapidly when students' concerns and interests are acknowledged, when they are given numerous opportunities to write.

Classroom has important role for the students to practice their writing in English because the society, in this case is their classmates, have ability in the same range. Blanchard and Root (1998: 1) state that learning to write in a new language is not always easy. It is challenging but is also fun. If the students are learning to speak and read in a new language, the students will be ready to begin writing too. The students will feel that writing in English is easy when they find comfort environment, such as a classroom. A writer should master the aspects of writing. Dealing with the aspects of writing, Hughes (1996: 91) mentions five aspects of writing; they are (1) grammar, (2)

vocabulary, (3) mechanics, (4) fluency and (5) form.

2. Teaching Writing

Angelo (1980: 1) says that writing would still be valuable in education because writing can help one think critically, to clarify thoughts, and the deeper perception. Another opinion is from Byrne (1995: 5); writing is often needed for formal and informal test, to get through college with good grades. Many tests are essay to test, and even in other subjects than English, composition researches are required.

According to Byrne (1995: 4) there are three factors which influence writing process, they are: (1) psychology problem, a lecturer is expected to be able to write his/her own without the possibility of interaction or feedback, and itself makes the act of writing difficulties; (2) linguistics problem, a lecturer must keep the communication through his/her own efforts and to ensure, both through his/her choice of sentences structure and by the way his/her sentences are linked together and sequenced, that the text he/ she writes or produces can be interpreted on its own; (3) cognitive problem, a lecturer has to master the written form of the language and to learn certain structures which are important for effective communication in writing. A lecturer learns how to organize his/her ideas and thought in such a way that they can be understood by the reader who is not present, and perhaps by the reader who is not known to us.

To overcome those problems mentioned above, the English lecturers need to be aware that writing should be taught in various ways and manners so that the students are interested in studying. The lecturer should also phase the writing tasks from the simplest stage to the more complex one, so that the students are not frustrated with writing.

3. Writing Assessment

a. The Definition of Assessment

One of the purposes of doing classroom assessment is to help the students take ownership of their learning, seeing, and planning ways to foster their own literacy growth. When the students think about and reflect on their learning, they become more active participants in the teaching and learning process.

b. Kinds of Writing Assessment

There are five kinds of assessment activities to assess both linguistic and non-linguistic aspects in EFL writing class as authentic procedure: monitoring students' progress in writing process, self-assessment, peer-assessment, conference, and assessment on sample folio.

c. Types of Scoring

Thornbbury (2005: 127) proposes two main ways of scoring in written test, *holistic scoring and analytic scoring*. Holistic scoring uses a variety of criteria to produce a single score. Analytic scoring focuses on the principal function of the text and therefore offers some feedback potential, but no wash back for any of the written production that enhance the ultimate accomplishment of the purpose. In holistic score, writing is viewed as an integrated whole (O'Malley, in Waluyo, 1996: 142). Brown (2001: 78) also states that each point on a holistic scale is given a systematic sets of descriptors, and the reader-evaluator matches an overall impression with the descriptor to arrive at a score. Descriptors usually follow a prescribed pattern. The content of the holistic scoring involved four dimension as stated by O'Malley (1996: 142) namely:

1) Organization : focuses on central idea with appropriate elaboration and conclusion.
2) Fluency/structure: appropriate verb tense used with variety of grammatical and syntactic structures.
3) Word choice: uses varied and precise diction appropriate for purposes.
4) Mechanics: absence of errors in spelling, capitalization, and punctuation. The rater selects a score on a 1 – 6 holistic scale that best describes the writing sample.

4. TPS

For teaching writing, Suhartono (2007: 50) suggests the steps as follows:

1. Pair the students up and provide them with interesting topics of a specific genre to write on.
2. Give them two or three minutes of "silent period" to think deeply about the outline and the generic structure of the genre.
3. Ask the students to share their thought with their partners to draw or unify ideas.
4. Group the students of four or six and ask each group to share the ideas within the group to draw a new concept.
5. Ask each group to formulate the new ideas based on the ideas of each pair.
6. Let each group to share the ideas with the rest of the class, give correction or criticize.
7. Write the new text.

Based on the steps in using TPS model of cooperative learning above, it can be seen that TPS

is truly simple. Lecturer can easily use TPS for teaching writing. TPS offers some benefits and it can build positive interdependence with their partner because in doing TPS, the students are able to learn from each other.

Think-Pair-Share (TPS) is one of the models in cooperative learning. Its implementation in the classroom begins with the chance for the students to think, followed by sharing the ideas in pairs and small group discussion, and sharing the ideas with the whole class. It is assumed as a good method in teaching writing since it gives students chance to dig their own ideas on what to write, share ideas with peer students, develop ideas, learn to criticize and accept criticisms, and promote effective team work.

5. Creativity

Thrower in Hanson and Eller (1999: 358) defines that creativity is a critical part of the learning environment with both lecturers and students. Research on creativity in the learning environments has shown that given students of equal intelligence, the more creative student will demonstrate higher levels of achievement. As a lecturer, creativity is behavior that can be facilitated and encouraged in the classroom. According to Rockler (1998: 6), creativity theory derives from two separate sources: the study of intelligence and the development of psychoanalysis. The relationship between intelligence theory and education can predict the potential school process of children.

C. Research Methodology

The research was conducted in the second semester students at STKIP Siliwangi. The campus is located at jl.Terusan Jenderal Sudirman no.3, Baros Cimahi Tengah, West Java .The campus insists the lecturers of content subjects to teach writing in their lessons. This aims at improving students' knowledge in content while fostering comprehension in content writing creativity using English, especially in subject of writing class.

There are three steps in this research: preparation, implementation, analysis of the data, and research report. This research used Collaborative Classroom Action Research. This research composed for two or more cycles then it observed and evaluated to identify all facts including the success and the failure of the action. It means that the action should be stopped or continued and revised to the next cycle based on the selected criteria of success. The techniques of collecting

data in this research can be seen in the following table:

Table 1
Technique of Collecting Data

Techni-que	Target	Purpose	Data
Observa-tion	Students	To watch and record action	Field note Lecturer's diary
	Teaching and Learning activity		
	Lecturer		
Inter-view	Students	To know the Participants feeling In face-to-face Interaction	Interview
	Collaborator		Interview
Quest-ionnaire	Students	To get response in non-face-to-face Interaction	Question-naire scoring
Test	Students	To get information About the current and previous mark, judgment and situation	Writing scores

There are two types of data in the research. First is quantitative data that is in the form of writing score which is gained from the result of pre-test or post-test in this research. The score will be analyzed with comparing the mean of each test to find out the improvement of students' achievement in writing.

Another type of data is in the form of qualitative data. The data will be analyzed by using the constant comparative method as suggested by Strauss and Glasser in Lincoln and Guba (1985: 339). The process includes the following steps:
1. Observe the students during the writing process, starting from pre-writing activities by using observation sheet. The observation sheet contains some indicators that show the students' activities.

2. Analyze the result of the interview to find out the information about the implementation of TPS in teaching writing
3. Analyze the result of the questionnaire to know the students personal impression about the use of TPS in teaching writing
4. Analyze the students' writing progress based on the result of analytic scoring rubric.

After analyzing the scores of the written text, we use statistical technique to find the mean score. The formula to find the mean as stated by Ngadiso (2007: 5-7) is follows:

$$M = \frac{\sum X}{N}$$

M   = Mean score
$\sum X$ = Total score
N   = Total students

If the mean score increases, the students' writing creativity is considered improving.

D. Research Findings
The pre-test was conducted on April 19, 2016 by the researchers. It covered 40 students of the second semester. Based on preliminary observation, the researcher found the factual problem that the students' writing creativity was low. In order to get authentic evidence, the researchers conducted a pre-test. It aimed to gain the score of the students' creativity in writing before treatment of the action. (The results of pre-test were presented in table 2).

Table 2
Result of Pre-test

ISSUES	INDICATORS
Students' creativity in writing	1. Low achievement in writing 2. Difficulty to express ideas using appropriate vocabulary and grammatical form. 3. Does not know writing elements. 4. Using mother tongue in writing class.
Classroom situation	1. Not alive atmosphere. 2. Low participation of students.

ISSUES	INDICATORS
	3. Limited writing practice.

After conducting pre-test, the researchers then conducted interview with the students. The purpose of the interview was exploring the students' perception about writing. The interview had more concerns on their difficulties in writing text and how they solved their problems. The researchers also interviewed them about their responses toward the teaching and learning process activities they joined. The answers helped us plan the treatment to solve the problem. The result of the interview can be seen in Table 3 and 4.

Table 3
Result of First Interview

No.	Questions	Students response	
		Yes	No
1.	Do you like English?	97,5%	2,5%
2.	Is English important?	100%	0%
3.	Are you able to write English?	60%	40%
4.	Do you like writing?	67,5%	32,5%
5.	Is writing difficult?	67,5%	32,5%

Table 4
Result of Second Interview

1. How interesting did you find your work in the group?
a. very interesting (77,5%)
b. not interesting (22,5%)

2. Did you understand exactly what the group was supposed to do?
a. I knew exactly what to do (90%)
b. I didn't understand (10%)

3. How many times approximately did you have the chance to talk during group work today?
a. a lot (77,5%)
b. none (22,5%)

4. If you talked less than you wanted to, what were the main reasons?
a. I felt afraid to give my opinion (72,5%)
b. somebody kept interrupting me (27,5%)

5. Did you help each other with the task?
a. never (12,5 %)
b. always (87,5%)

The last point of the interview was about participation in writing activity. Some of the students thirty two point five percent claimed that they did not like the writing activity. On the contrary only sixty seven point five of the students stated that they liked writing activity. The implementation of the research can be seen in Table 5.

Table 5
Overall Implementation of the Research

Problem	Students had low writing ability
Solution	Teaching writing through TPS
Students	Second semester at STKIP SILIWANGI BANDUNG
Cycle 1 : Describing Things	
Planning	Giving a task in each meeting (pre-task, task, and language focus), Using picture and real object
Action	A1 :Describe and Draw; A2 :Guess my hidden object, A3 : How is your living room?, A4 : Post test
Observation	SS : active, interest, is achieved, L : worksheet, too many tasks, lack of modeling, grammar discussion, and monitoring, CS : alive, enjoyable, but crowded
Reflection	(+) Raise SS ability through various activities; success in group work (-) Lack of monitoring, modeling, grammar and vocabulary building, too many tasks
Cycle 2 : Describing event	
Planning	Using A1 for vocabulary building; A2 for main tasks, A3 for language focus. Using picture
Action	A1 : Pre-task; A2 Task: Tell me the differences!; A3: Language focus; A4 : Post test
Observation	SS : improving students' ability especially in learning writing and self-confidence, L : guiding the students conduct activities CS : more alive, enjoyment in doing the tasks was increased
Reflection	(+) Improve writing ability, effective group work, more alive class (-) Lack of self-confidence in writing, mother tongue use, need more challenge
Final reflection	Writing ability raised, fluency in writing was achieved, mother tongue pattern use decreased CS : alive, SS writing ability increased, bigger chances for writing. L : more innovative, explored students' potentials

1. Findings

The students' creativity in writing descriptive text improved TPS. It can be concluded that TPS is one of good ways to improve students' writing ability since it can help them to organize the words into descriptive text, give a bit fun, make them more relaxed and help them to generate the needed words to construct a descriptive text.

The improvement of the students' ability can also be seen from the results of the students' pre-test and post-test which were done in every cycle. The average score of the pre-test was 56,09, the average score of the Cycle 1 was 65,80, the average score of the Cycle2 was 80,25. All the data showed that the improvement of writing achievement from cycle to cycle was significant.

Table 6
Post-test average score of cycle II from the first corrector

No	Explanations	Scores
1.	The highest score	86
2	The lowest score	72
3	The average score	79

Table 7
Post-test average scores of writing elements of Cycle II first corrector

No	Writing element	Average score
1	Organization	75,00
2	Content	78,00
3	Grammar	78,00
4	Diction	83,00
5	Mechanics	80,00
	Average score	78,80

Table 8
Post-test average score of cycle II from the second corrector

No	Explanations	Scores
1.	The highest score	88
2	The lowest score	75
3	The average score	81,5

Table 9
Post-test average scores of writing elements of Cycle II second corrector

No	Writing element	Average score
1	Organization	79,00
2	Content	78,00
3	Grammar	82,00
4	Diction	78,00
5	Mechanics	79,00
	Average score	79,20

Table 10
Post-test average score of Cycle II from the two correctors

No	Explanation	Scores
1	The highest score	87
2	The lowest score	73,5
3	Average score	80,25

In more detail, the summary of the research findings is described in the following section:

1. Improving in students' writing creativity
From the result of pre-test, I found that the result of students' writing was under average and still far from what was expected. The finding was supported by the result of students' writing scores. The average score was 56.09. The score of the students indicated that the students faced many problems in writing. They have many problems in making a piece of English writing, because their writing mastery was low. This condition can be seen during the writing process, they could not express their idea, how to start writing, and the students always lost their ideas and stuck so they could not continue their writing, they lack of vocabulary so their ideas were constructed incoherently and the students' writing mostly influenced by their mother tongue.

Due to the fact, it is necessarily needed to make an attempt to improve students writing creativity by applying a teaching technique that makes the students understand what everything related to make a good writing, make them interest in teaching and learning English by creating an interesting atmosphere in the classroom, and giving a bit fun.

After the implementation of TPS activities in every cycle, the students' writing score were getting better. It can be seen from the result of students' average score Cycle 1 was 65,80 and Cycle 2 was 80,25. It also influenced the students' interest during the lesson, the reducing of the rule of their mother tongue in their writing.

2. Improvement in Classroom situation
Before conducting the research, the teaching-learning process was not alive as the teacher used to apply the conventional technique. The students show low participation on writing class as they were seldom taught to make a better writing by using various technique because the teacher monotonous in teaching writing. The condition after the implementation of the research was showing improvement. The atmosphere of the class more was more live as there are many interesting activities. The student gave attention to the lessons they were very active to conduct the activities and dominated the activities. No more lecturers' domination. The lecturer started to recognize the students' problem and potential in writing.

Another finding in this research is dealing with the lecturer. Lecturer takes many kinds of roles during the teaching and learning process: a leader, manager, counselor, director, friend, facilitator, motivator, creator or parent. If the lecturer is more creative and innovative to carry out the teaching and learning process so the students will be more interested in joining the lesson.

2. Discussion
The research which is applying action research to use TPS activities in improving students' writing ability brought satisfying result both in term of the improvement of students' writing ability and classroom situation. The findings then can be theorized in two major points as follows: 1) TPS activity can improve students' writing ability; and 2) TPS activity can improve classroom situation.

E. Conclusion

Having conducted the research in using TPS to improve students' writing ability it can be drawn some conclusions as follows:

1. TPS can improve students' writing creativity. The improvement of students' writing creativity can be identified from the improvement of writing achievement. It shows that there is a comparison between the students' writing creativity during the intervention and the performance criteria of success. The improvement was also observed from several aspects of the composition they produced. First, the students were able to define the topic they choose into concrete ideas. Secondly, they could generate suitable supporting sentences to the topic sentences they wrote. Third, they could write acceptable introductory paragraph by providing general statement. Fourth, the students could write concluding paragraphs that reviewed the main points of the ideas. Finally, they could tolerably maintain the unity and the coherence in their essay.

2. TPS can improve writing classroom into a better situation. They were motivated in joining writing class. Their motivation is reflected in their efforts in providing sources – the information materials – to support their writing.

References

Angelo, Frank J. 1980. *Process of Thought in Composition*. Winthrop: Winthrop Publisher Inc.

Blanchard, Kareen and Root, Christine. 1998. *Get Ready to Write: A Beginning Writing Text*. London: Longman Group.

Brown, H Douglas. 2004. *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*. New York: Addison Wesley Longan, Inc.

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

Carr and Kemmis. 1993. *Classroom Action Research*. (http://www.madison.k12.wi.us/sod/car.car homepage.html). Accessed on March 4th 2010.

Dorney, Zoltan. 1997. *Motivational Stategies in the Language Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambride University Press.

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

Fowler, Mary Elizabeth. 1965. *Teaching Language Composition and Literature*. New York: Mc. Graw Hill Inc.

Glaser, BG. & Strauss, AL. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.

Hanson, Kenneth and Eller, Ben F. 1999. *Educational Psychology for Effective Teaching*. London: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Hughes, A. 1996. *Testing for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Joyce, B. 2005. *A Guide to Cooperative Learning*. Available at http://P9CDS.P9. K12.md.us/-elc/learning.html. Retrieved on July 28th, 2012.

Lyman, F. 2008. *Appendix. Description of Exemplary Techniques and Methods. Think-Pair-Share*. Available at: http//www.users.edu.html. Retrieved on July 28th, 2012.

Ngadiso. 2009. *Statistic Materi Matakuliah Pascasarjana UNS Surakarta*.

Nunan, David (ed). 2003. *Practical English Language Teaching*. Singapore: Mc.Graw Hill Companies.

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

Thornbury, Scott. 2005. *How to Teach Speaking*. Harlow: Longman Group Ltd.

Trianto. 2009. *Model-Model Pembelajaran Inovatif*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.