

**P ISSN : 2503 - 1708**

**E ISSN : 2722 - 7340**

# **REALITA**

*Jurnal Bimbingan dan Konseling*

<b>JURNAL REALITA</b>	<b>VOLUME 5</b>	<b>NOMOR 2</b>	<b>EDISI OKTOBER 2020</b>	<b>HALAMAN 1016 - 1153</b>	<b>P ISSN : 2503 - 1708 E ISSN : 2722 - 7340</b>
---------------------------	---------------------	--------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	--

**Diterbitkan Oleh:**

**PRODI BIMBINGAN DAN KONSELING**

**FIPP UNIVERISTAS PENDIDIKAN MANDALIKA**

# **REALITA**

## **BIMBINGAN DAN KONSELING**

*Jurnal Penelitian dan Pengembangan Pendidikan*

### **DEWAN REDAKASI**

Pelindung dan Penasehat	: Prof. Drs. Kusno, DEA., Ph.D
	: Drs. Wayan Tamba, M.Pd
Penanggung Jawab	: Farida Herna Astuti, M.Pd
Ketua Penyunting	: Mustakim, M.Pd
Sekretaris Penyunting	: Hariadi Ahmad, M.Pd
Kuangan	: Aluh Hartati, M.Pd
Penyunting Ahli	: 1. Prof. Dr. Gede Sedanayasa, M.Pd
	: 2. Prof. Dr. Wayan Maba
	: 3. Dr. A. Hari Witono, M.Pd
	: 4. Dr. Gunawan, M.Pd
	: 5. Dr. I Made Sonny Gunawan, S.Pd., M.Pd.
	: 6. Dr. Haromain, S.Pd., M.Pd.
Penyunting Pelaksana	: 1. Dr. Abdurrahman, M.Pd
	: 2. Mujiburrahman, M.Pd
	: 3. Drs. I Made Gunawan, M.Pd
Pelaksana Ketatalaksanaan	: 1. Ahmad Muzanni, M.Pd
	: 2. Baiq Sarlita Kartiani, M.Pd
	: 3. M. Chaerul Anam, M.Pd
Distributor	: Nuraeni, S.Pd., M.Si
Desain Cover	: Ihwan Mustakim, M.Pd

### **Alamat Redaksi:**

Redaksi Jurnal Realita

Program Studi Bimbingan dan Konseling

Fakultas Ilmu Pendidikan dan Psikologi Universitas Pendidikan Mandalika

Gedung Dwitiya, Lt. 3 Jalan Pemuda No. 59 A Mataram Telp. (0370) 638991

Email : [bk\\_fip@ikipmataram.ac.id](mailto:bk_fip@ikipmataram.ac.id)

Web : [ojs.ikipmataram.ac.id](http://ojs.ikipmataram.ac.id); [fip.ikipmataram.ac.id](http://fip.ikipmataram.ac.id)

**Jurnal Realita Bimbingan dan Konseling** menerima naskah tulisan penulis yang original (belum pernah diterbitkan sebelumnya) dalam bentuk *soft file, office word document (CD/Flashdisk/Email)* yang diterbitkan setiap bulan April dan Oktober setiap tahun.

**Diterbitkan Oleh:** Program Studi Bimbingan dan Konseling, FIPP UNDIKMA.

**DAFTAR ISI****Halaman****Nurul Iman, Ahmad Zainul Irfan, Ani Endriani**

Pengaruh Teknik Role Playing Terhadap Sikap Pemalu Anak Usia 4-5 Tahun di Kelas A Paud Al-Khair Lingkungan Udayana Mataram Tahun Pelajaran 2019/2020 ..... 1016 – 1027

**Khairul Huda, dan M. Najamuddin**

Pengaruh Metode Menyimak terhadap Kemampuan Membaca pada Anak Usia 5 – 6 Tahun di PAUD Berseri Kecamatan Kopang Kabupaten Lombok Tengah Tahun Pelajaran 2019/2020 ..... 1028 – 1043

**Nuraini, Nuraeni, dan Ni Made Sulastris**

Pengaruh Bimbingan Sosial Terhadap Kemampuan Beradaptasi Siswa Kelas VIII SMPN 2 Batukliang Kabupaten Lombok Tengah ..... 1044 – 1050

**Aluh Hartati, Hariadi Ahmad, dan Andika Rifzar Mandasingi**

Hubungan antara Pengendalian Diri dengan Prestasi Belajar Siswa SMKN 1 Sumbawa Besar ..... 1051 – 1066

**Dewi rayani**

Pentingnya Pembiasaan Komunikasi Positif dalam Keluarga di Masa Pandemi Covid 19 ..... 1067 – 1075

**Abdurrahman**

Evaluasi Pelaksanaan Kurikulum di Madrasah Ibtidaiyah ..... 1076 – 1090

**Hariadi Ahmad, Aluh Hartati dan Jessica Festy Maharani**

Pengaruh Dukungan Psikologis Awal pada Remaja dalam Pencegahan Covid – 19 pada Siswa Madrasah Aliyah Al Badriyah ..... 1091 – 1106

**Suhaemi**

The Effectiveness of Two Stay Two Stray Model to Teach Writing Viewed From Students' Creativity ..... 1107 – 1123

**Baiq Sarlita Kartiani**

Pengaruh Konseling Kelompok terhadap Kemampuan Komunikasi Interpersonal Siswa ..... 1124 – 1129

**Mustakim dan Niken Indriana Pratiwi**

Hubungan Antara Kecerdasan Interpersonal dengan Sikap Empati pada Siswa ..... 1130 – 1144

## THE EFFECTIVENESS OF TWO STAY TWO STRAY MODEL TO TEACH WRITING VIEWED FROM STUDENTS' CREATIVITY

Suhaemi

Dosen Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Kesehatan Hamzar Lombok Timur

e-mail: emy\_amy0609@yahoo.com

**Abstrak:** Tujuan utama dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui apakah (1) model Two stay two stray lebih efektif daripada model pembelajaran Direct untuk mengajarkan keterampilan menulis; (2) siswa yang memiliki kreativitas tinggi memiliki keterampilan menulis yang lebih baik daripada siswa yang memiliki kreativitas rendah; dan (3) terdapat interaksi antara model pembelajaran dengan kreativitas siswa dalam pembelajaran keterampilan menulis pada siswa STIKes Hamzar. Penelitian yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah penelitian eksperimental. Model pembelajaran yang digunakan adalah Two Stay Two Stray Model dan Direct Instruction Model. Kreativitas sebagai variabel atribut dibagi menjadi kreativitas tinggi dan kreativitas rendah. Populasi penelitian ini adalah mahasiswa STIKes Hamzar tahun ajaran 2018/2019. Sampel penelitian ini adalah Kelas Keperawatan sebagai kelas eksperimen dan Kebidanan sebagai kelas kontrol yang terdiri dari 18 siswa di setiap kelas. Sampel diambil dengan menggunakan cluster random sampling. Data dikumpulkan dari tes kreativitas dan menulis. Analisis data menggunakan: (1) statistik deskriptif dan statistik inferensial yang digunakan untuk mengetahui normalitas dan homogenitas data; dan (2) uji Multifactor Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) 2x2 dan uji Tukey digunakan untuk menguji hipotesis penelitian. Hasil analisis data menunjukkan bahwa: (1) Two Stay Two Stray Model lebih efektif dibandingkan Direct Instruction Model dalam pembelajaran keterampilan menulis; (2) Siswa yang memiliki kreativitas tinggi memiliki keterampilan menulis yang lebih baik daripada siswa yang memiliki kreativitas rendah; dan (3) Terdapat interaksi antara model pembelajaran dengan kreativitas siswa dalam pembelajaran keterampilan menulis pada siswa STIKes Hamzar. Berdasarkan hasil penelitian dapat disimpulkan bahwa Two Stay Two Stray Model merupakan model yang efektif dalam pembelajaran keterampilan menulis, dan keefektifannya dipengaruhi oleh tingkat kreativitas siswa. Model Two Stay Two Stray merupakan model pembelajaran yang efektif. Disarankan agar guru menerapkannya dalam pengajaran menulis.

**Kata Kunci:** *Two Stay Two Stray Model, Direct Instruction Model, Menulis, Kreativitas*

**Abstract:** The main objectives of the research are to reveal whether (1) Two stay two stray model is more effective than Direct instruction model to teach writing skill; (2) students having high creativity have better writing skill than those having low creativity; and (3) there is any interaction between teaching models and students' creativity in teaching writing skill for the students of *STIKes Hamzar*. The reseach applied in this research was an experimental research. The teaching models were Two Stay Two Stray Model and Direct Instruction Model. Creativity as the attribute variable was divided into high creativity and low creativity. The population of the research was the students of *STIKes Hamzar* in the academic year of 2018/2019. The samples of this research were the Nursing as experimental class and Midwifery as control class that consisted of 18 students in each class. The samples were taken by using cluster random sampling. The data were collected from creativity and writing tests. These data were analysed using: (1) descriptive statistics and inferential statistics which were used to find out the normality and homogeneity of the data; and (2) Multifactor Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test of 2x2 and Tukey test were used to test the research hypothesis. The result of data analysis shows that: (1) Two Stay Two Stray Model is more effective than Direct Instruction Model in teaching writing skill; (2) Students having high creativity have better writing skill than those having low creativity; and (3) There is an interaction between teaching models and students' creativity in teaching writing skill for the students of *STIKes Hamzar*. Based on the research findings, it can be concluded that Two Stay Two Stray Model is an effective model in teaching writing skill, and the effectiveness is affected by the degree of students' creativity. Two Stay Two Stray Model is an effective teaching model, it is suggested that teachers apply it in their teaching writing.

**Keywords:** *Two Stay Two Stray Model, Direct Instruction Model, Writing, Creativity*

**BACKGROUND**

One of the goals of teaching English is that the students can develop their competency in form of spoken and written to get informational literacy level. However, if teachers do not take any further steps to change their teaching models in teaching learning process; the possible result of teaching learning process will not be achieved appropriately. It means that both the teachers and the students will far from goals of teaching-learning.

In communication, people have to arrange the discourse in order to make the audiences understand. Writing is one way to foster the ideas to the readers or the audiences. By writing, someone can share the taught; ideas, information, and understanding even persuade the readers to follow his or her thinking.

In writing, the writer must master content, organization, grammar, mechanic, and vocabulary. Writing reinforces the grammatical structures, idiom, and vocabulary that have been teaching. Second, when students write, they also have a chance to be adventurous with the language, to go beyond what they have just learned to say, to take a risks. Third, when they write, they necessarily become varied that involved with the new language; the

effort to express ideas and the constant use of eye, hand, and brain is a unique way to reinforce learning”.

Writing is a complex process that involves some steps or process to make a product of writing. It makes writing differ from those other skills. Hyland (2002: 9) states that writing is learned, not taught. Writing is a way of sharing personal meanings and writing courses emphasize the power of the individual to construct his or her own views on a topic. Writing is not instant skill that can be achieved without any preparation. Since in writing, writer should pass three main activates in writing such as preparation in which a writer should have some important things before making writing, drafting is a process in which information or ideas can be added or changed in order to make a good writing, and the last is revenging. In this step, a writer revises his drafting in order to make a final version.

Models in teaching learning process also has important role. The use of model in different skill will help both teachers and students achieve the goal of teaching learning process. Every subject even skill needs different models. Since every applied model has its own steps or stages in order to achieve the goal of teaching learning process. One of the

models that can be applied to teach writing is Two Stay Two Stray model. The Two Stay Two Stray Model from its origin name “one stray” adapted from Kagan (1994) expands on the basic principles of cooperative learning where the students work and share together in group. It gives the opportunity to the entire group to share their information and findings to another group available. This teaching model has been used in many researches and the result of using this model showed that it can be applied in many fields of teaching-learning process. The researchers that used Two Stay Two Stray in teaching learning process such as; (1) Abdul Kadir Bagis with his result of the study showed that Two Stay Two Stray is an effective teaching to teach speaking; (2) August Lewaherilla proves that teaching reading to the students through Two Stay Two Stray Model can improve students’ competence in teaching reading; and (3) Ardiana applied Two Stay Two Stray in teaching writing and the result of her study is Two Stay Two Stray is an effective teaching technique in teaching writing.

This teaching model can give chance to every student to be actively involved during teaching learning process. Two Stay Two Stray Model is

one of cooperative teaching models that consist of four students that have role to the success of the group. This teaching model gives a chance to every group in the class to share information to other group. In this case, they can give and get information to and from another group. The students can develop their creativity and strengthen their relationship among students during teaching learning process since this model supports students’ cooperativeness during teaching-learning process. From the explanation above, It can be assumed that this teaching model is appropriate to develop students writing skill.

Another model that can be used is Direct Instruction Model. Direct Instruction is teacher-centred. Direct Instruction Model refers to the instruction led by the teacher. Direct Instruction also refers to a specific pattern of instruction that is emerged from studies which is attempted to identify the instructional procedures used by the most effective teachers, those teachers whose students made the greatest gains in achievement (Rosenshine. 2008:1). Rosenshine explains that Direct Instruction Model can reduce the difficulty in initial practice in teaching learning process, can support and guide during initial practice,

provide supportive feedback, and provide extensive students' independent practice. From this statement, it is hoped that Direct Instruction could lead the students having good writing skill.

The other thing that can affect the students' writing skill is the students' creativity. In writing, creativity also plays important role to produce a good and understandable writing. Creativity is one of the key factors that drive civilization forward. Creativity has important role in which students can share new ideas or concepts in communication. Boden (2004:1) states that creativity is the capability to come up with ideas or artefacts that are new, surprising and valuable. Creativity is a way to show new ideas, concepts in minds that can be useful in solving problems, communicating with others, and entertaining others and ourselves. Related to writing, creativity is form-thinking process that pours out through writing. A creative person will be able to produce or create something new. It makes a creative person differ from uncreative person. Related to teaching writing, a creative student has more ideas that can be showed through his/her writing. The creative students will be able to create a text with their new ideas and apply them in their writing product.

Based on the description above, the researcher is interested in conducting an experimental research to know the effectiveness of Two Stay Two Stray Model to teach writing viewed from students' creativity.

## RESEARCH METHOD

This study was an experimental research done from April to December 2019. This reseach was conducted on students of STIKes Hamzar in the academic year of 2018/2019. A factorial design is used to analyse the main effects for both experimental variables as well as an analysis of the interaction between treatments. In this reseach, the population was the students of STIKes Hamzar academic year of 2018/2019. To take sample from the population, researcher used cluster random sampling. The students of STIKes Hamzar are divided into two programs; Nusring and Midwifery. To find out which program to be selected as sample the researcher used lottery. the first class was put as experimental class and the second class was put as control class. To find the experiment and control class, researcher used lottery. The first and the second lottery that appear were chosen as those two categories. The first lottrey was categorized as experiment class and the

second lottrey was categorized as control class.

To collect the data, the researcher used test. In this research, researcher used writing test to know student's skill in writing and creativity test to know how creative the students based on provided question. The models used in analysing the data were descriptive analysis and inferential analysis. Descriptive analysis was used to know the mean, median, mode, and standard deviation of the score of test. In addition, inferential analysis was to know the normality and the homogeneity of the data. The normality and homogeneity test were done before testing the hypothesis using ANOVA test.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

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 null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) is rejected if  $F_o$  is higher than  $F_t$  ( $F_o > F_t$ ). It means that there is a significant effect of two independent variables to dependent variable. After knowing that the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) is rejected, the analysis is continued by performing the comparison of the means between cells to see where

the significant difference is using Tukey test. To know which group is better, the means between cells are compared. The 2 x 2 ANOVA and Tukey test can be seen in the table below.

**Table. The Result of 2x2 Multifactor Analysis of Variance**

Source of variance	SS	df	MS	$F_o$	$F_t(0.05)$
Between columns	183.68	1	183.68	5.14	3.98
Between rows	203.35	1	203.35	5.69	3.98
Columns by rows (interaction)	1128.13	1	1128.13	31.56	3.98
Between groups	1515.15	3	505.05		
Within groups	2430.50	68	35.74		
Total	3945.65	71			

**Table. Mean Scores**

	A <sub>1</sub>	A <sub>2</sub>
B <sub>1</sub>	79.56	68.44
B <sub>2</sub>	68.28	73.00
	73.92	70.72

The table above shows that:

1. Because  $F_o$  between columns (5.14) is higher than  $F_t$  at the level of significance  $\alpha = 0.05$  (3.98), the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) is rejected and the difference between columns is significant. The mean score of students who were taught by using Two Stay



Two Stray (73.92) is higher than those who were taught by using Direct Instruction Model (70.72). It can be concluded that Two Stay Two Stray Model in teaching writing skill for the students of *STIKes Hamzar* is significantly different from Direct Instruction Model and the teaching writing using Two Stay Two Stray Model is more effective than Direct instruction.

2. Because  $F_o$  between rows (5.69) is higher than  $F_t$  at the level of significance  $\alpha = 0.05$  (3.98), the null hypothesis ( $H_o$ ) is rejected and the difference between rows is significant. The mean score of students who have high creativity (74.00) is higher than those who have low creativity (70.64). It can be concluded that the students having high creativity have better writing skill than those who have low creativity.
3. Because  $F_o$  columns by rows (31.56) is higher than  $F_t$  at the level of significance  $\alpha = 0.05$  (3.98), the null hypothesis ( $H_o$ ) is rejected and it is concluded that there is interaction between the two variables, the teaching models and students' creativity in

teaching writing skill to the students of *STIKes Hamzar*. In other words, it can be stated that the effect of teaching models toward students' writing skill depends on the students' creativity.

### 1. Tukey Test

Furthermore, the researcher needs to use Tukey test to compare the means of every treatment with the other means. It is used to identify which means are significantly different from the other. It can be seen in the table 4.14.

**Table 4. The Result of Tukey Test**

Tukey y	q <sub>o</sub>		q <sub>t</sub>	
q1	3.21	>	2.86	Significant
q2	3.37	>	2.86	Significant
q3	7.88	>	2.97	Significant
q4	3.35	>	2.97	Significant

1. Because  $q_o$  between columns (3.21) is higher than  $q_t$  at the level of significance  $\alpha = 0.05$  (2.86), using Two Stay Two Stray is significantly different from Direct Instruction in teaching writing skill. Because the mean of  $A_1$  (73.92) is higher than  $A_2$  (70.72), it can be concluded that Two Stay

Two Stray is more effective than Direct Instruction in teaching writing skill.

2. Because  $q_0$  between rows (3.37) is higher than  $q_t$  at the level of significance  $\alpha = 0.05$  (2.86), it can be concluded that the students who have high creativity and those who have low creativity are significantly different in their writing skill. Because the mean of  $B_1$  (74.00) is higher than  $B_2$  (70.64), it can be concluded that the students who have high creativity have better writing skill than those who have low creativity.
3. Because  $q_0$  between cells  $A_1B_1$  and  $A_2B_1$  (7.88) is higher than  $q_t$  at the level of significance  $\alpha = 0.05$  (2.97), using Two Stay Two Stray is significantly different from Direct Instruction in teaching writing skill to the students who have high creativity. Because the mean of  $A_1B_1$  (79.56) is higher than  $A_2B_1$  (68.44), it can be concluded that Two Stay Two Stray is more effective than Direct Instruction to teach writing skill to the students having high creativity.

4. Because  $q_0$  between cells  $A_1B_2$  and  $A_2B_2$  (3.35) is higher than  $q_t$  at the level of significance  $\alpha = 0.05$  (2.97), using Direct Instruction is significantly different from Two Stay Two Stray in teaching writing skill to the students who have low creativity. Because the mean score of  $A_1B_2$  (68.28) is lower than the mean score of  $A_2B_2$  (73.00), it can be concluded that using Direct Instruction is more effective than Two Stay Two Stray in teaching writing skill to the students who have low creativity.

By virtue of the findings in point 3 and point 4, it is known that Two Stay Two Stray is more effective than Direct Instruction in teaching writing skill to the students having high creativity and Direct Instruction is more effective than Two Stay Two Stray in teaching writing skill to the students having low creativity, therefore, there is interaction between the teaching models and the students' creativity in teach writing skill and the effectiveness is affected by the degree of students' creativity.

## A. Discussion of the Result of the Study

### 1. The Difference between Two Stay Two Stray and Direct Instruction in teaching writing.

Teaching writing using Two Stay Two Stray Model for the students of STIKes Hamzar is more effective than teaching writing using Direct Instruction Model. The result of hypothesis testing shows that there is significant difference on the students' writing skill between the students taught using Two Stay Two Stray Model and those taught using Direct Instruction Model because the finding of ANOVA shows that  $F_o$  between columns (5.14) is higher than  $F_t$  at the level of significance  $\alpha = 0.05$  (3.98). Moreover, the finding of mean score between the students taught using Two Stay Two Stray Model (73.92) is higher than the students taught using Direct Instruction Model (70.72).

In Two Stay Two Stray, the teaching learning process is students centered. Students have a great chance to present, share and get information during teaching learning process. Students have responsibility to their group that means they have to play their role in order to achieve the teaching learning goal. As stated by Hammiddin (2010: 316), Two Stay Two Stray is a group discussion and each member of groups has responsibility

to their group. The students have more chance to appreciate differences and share experiences through group participation. In this case, Two Stay Two Stray gives the students chance to actualize themselves with other students' in-group as team to be actively involved.

In Two Stay Two Stray model, there are two main activities that students should pass through, in-group discussion and stray to other groups. In a group discussion, the students should actively participate in producing ideas and opinions on a selected topic before they stray to other groups. During this section, the students helped each other to get the successful of teaching-learning goals. Locker (2000: 1) states that students work in group provide great motivation; the students are forced to be responsible to other members of the group and frequently do more and better work on writing project when they only responsible to themselves. It describes that working in a group have the students to be actively involved in activities that promotes the activeness of the students.

Haycraft (1986: 17) states that to give more practices to your class, break them up into pairs or small groups. This encourages those who are shy or reluctant to participate. Group work gives the students chances for greater

independence. Jolliffe (2007: 3) reveals that students work together in small group to support each other to improve their own learning and that of others. This statement supports what Two Stay Two Stray does. In Two Stay Two Stray, the students stayed after they have discussed in their group and the other member of the group stayed to have guest from other members' group to share information about their writing product as well. Through these activities, the students improved their writing skill since they practice revising and editing.

Meanwhile, Direct Instruction is teacher centered.. The teacher has great power to control the role of the students by giving certain instruction that students should do in order to get the teaching learning goal. In this case, the teacher withdraws support gradually and only when students show that they can work on their own. It means that every activity in the class played based on the instruction of the teacher. Direct Instruction is a model of teaching which focuses on directing and expliciting in the specific skills and strategies that are necessary for writing skill. It allows teacher to scaffold instruction, gradually shifting and releasing responsibility for completing a task from him to students.

Joyce, et al (2009: 431) define that Direct Instruction Model consists of five phases, such as (1) orientation, (2) presentation, (3) structured practiced (4) guided practice, and (5) independent practice. During the phases, teacher gives responsibility for students to pay attention and practice the steps. In general, Direct Instruction models advocate that essential content should be exposed to students via an active presentation of information, Rosenshine (in Huitt, et.al. 2009: 3). According to Huitt (2009: 9), Direct Instruction has the teacher to be actively present new content of skills to the students covering small amounts of material in an organized, step-by-step manner, having them practice that and provide corrective feedback and reinforcement continuously throughout the lesson.

From the elaboration above, the differences between Two Stay Two Stray and Direct Instruction can be seen on the learning activity and the involvement of the teacher and the students. As stated above, Two Stay Two Stray is students centered while DI is teacher centered. Two Stay Two Stray promotes the student's activeness in teaching learning process while DI promotes teacher instruction on the student's activity during teaching learning process.

Form the statements above and the result of the research; it can be concluded that Two Stay Two Stray is more effective than Direct Instruction in teaching writing skill.

## 2. The Differences between Students' Having High Creativity and Students Having Low Creativity.

The students of STIKes Hamzar who have high creativity have better writing skill that those having low creativity. The result of the second hypothesis testing shows that there is significant difference on the students' writing skill between those who have high creativity and those who have low creativity because the finding of ANOVA shows that  $F_o$  between rows (5.69) is higher than  $F_t$  at the level of significance  $\alpha = 0.05$  (3.98). Moreover, the finding of mean score between students having high creativity (74.00) is higher than the mean score of students having low creativity (70.64). Thus, It can be stated that Two Stay Two Stray is more effective than Direct Instruction in teaching writing skill to the students having high creativity.

Creativity has an important role in learning. More creative students are a better they will get the achievements. As stated by Munandar (2012: 25), everyone

has different level of creativity which affects to their ways of thinking, their behavior and their competences in all aspects. The difference between students having high and low creativity can be seen from their writing. Students with high creativity showed that their writing skills are better than those having low creativity. Lau (2011: 215) states that creative people are often diligent, discipline, and highly focused. It shows that students having high creativity produce more ideas than those having low creativity. The teacher can see students' ability in producing ideas from the ideas in students written product while for those having low creativity, they make their writing as they are. They might provide their writing with no new ideas. As stated by Simonton and Amabile (in Herwageen 2002: 4) Creative individuals have several features that distinguish them from their less creative peers: They have a rich body of domain-relevant knowledge and well-developed skills, and they find their work intrinsically motivating. They tend to be independent, unconventional, and more risk-taking, and to have wide interests and a greater openness to new experiences.

The students with high creativity showed their ability to produce many

ideas, show a conceptual of thinking, produce unusual ideas, and add detail to the basic idea that differ from student who have low creativity. Creativity can influence the success of teaching learning. According to Guilford (in Good and Brophy, 1990: 619), creativity involves divergent thinking as represented by the fluency, flexibility, and originality of thought process. These statements show that creative students can generate ideas at rapid pace in order to solve problem in new perspective and generate new and genuinely different ideas. Thus, the high creative students expressed their ideas and thoughts freely.

On the other hand, students with low creativity tend to express their ideas as they are. It means they have low passion to create their ideas or develop their thought. The low creativity students sometimes are afraid of making mistake rather than try to explore their ideas and show them to their friends. Students with low creativity have lack of curiosity toward something new that they find. As the result of their low creativity, it is quite difficult for them to think creatively and share their ideas. Stenberg and Williams (1996: 11) state that students who are less creative often make mistakes in encouraging ideas and solutions. Guilford and Torrance (in

Rockler, 1988: 45) explain that without creativity, people find it difficult to solve problems and they have little opportunity for creative expression.

According to Munandar (2004: 105) the students having low creativity have less imagination. The students get difficulty to develop the writing product, to make the writing interesting, and to arrange the organization well. In producing writing, a student is hoped to be able to produce many ideas in order to develop a writing product. It is opposite to the students having high creativity. They are supposed to produce many ideas in the beginning of writing. This activity happens in drafting process. It is supported by the result of the research

Thrower (in Hanson and Eller, 1999: 358) regards more creative students demonstrate higher level of achievement. By considering the explanation of high and low creativity students and the role of creativity on writing, it can be concluded that there is significant difference between students having high creativity and students having low creativity. Since creativity becomes one of factors in learning writing. The students having high creativity have ability in producing a better writing text than students having low creativity. Thus, it can be stated that

students having high creativity have better writing skill than those having low creativity.

From the elaboration above and the result of the research, it can be concluded that there is difference between students having high and low creativity in writing. The students have better writing skill when the students are taught by Two Stay Two Stray model.

### 3. Interaction between Teaching Models and Students' Creativity

Based on the finding of hypothesis testing, there is interaction between teaching models and students' creativity on the students' writing skill. The result of ANOVA shows that  $F_{columns by rows}$  (31.56) is higher than  $F_t$  (3.98). The finding of test shows that the mean score between students having high creativity taught using Two Stay Two Stray Model (79.56) is higher than those taught using Direct Instruction Model (68.44); and the mean score of students having low creativity taught using Direct Instruction Model (73.00) is higher than those taught using Two Stay Two Stray Model (68.28). It means that Two Stay Two Stray Model is more effective for the students who have high creativity, while Direct Instruction Model is more effective for the students who have low creativity. In other words, the

effectiveness of the models in teaching writing depends on the degree of students' creativity.

Two Stay Two Stray is one of cooperative learnings that give students' chance cooperatively work together that is adapted from kagan's One Stay Three Stray. According to Lie (2007: 60), Two Stay Two Stray gives opportunity for the result to the other groups, either as guesses or as hosts. This cooperative learning stimulates the students to give and share their ideas or information to other students. It means that there is a big chance for them to respect each other upon the different ideas. Huda (2012: 140) states that Two Stay Two Stray can be applied in every subject and every level. Two Stay Two Stray supports students to be actively involved since every student member have to contribute to share their ideas in making writing product. The students through this teaching model could develop their creativity in producing ideas freely.

To get a maximum goal in teaching-learning process using this model, creativity needs to be considered. Two Stay Two Stray Model is one of the teaching models that accommodate students having high creativity. This model does not limit the students to participate and to develop their

competence. However, this model supports the students to help their friends and to be actively involved in teaching-learning process. Two Stay Two Stray stimulates the students produce new ideas even give new information during teaching-learning process. Furthermore, Two Stay Two Stray is students centered, most of the teaching learning activities is on students' activity. According to Crawford (2005: 63), this model is usefull for sharing ideas in which the students have responsibility to provide information to others.

According to Crawford (in Hamiddin, 2012: 3), Two Stay Two Stray offers a low-treat forum where students can exchange ideas and build social skill. After discussing and producing a draft within the group, they have to stay and stray to the other groups to share their writing product. Lie (2004) explains that Two Stay Two Stray Model gives the students chance to every member of the group to share the result and infromation with other groups. In this case, the students in the class partcipated or involved actively to the success of the group to get the goal of teaching learning process. During teaching-learning process, the students were free to develop and create their ideas. The students could give any input to other students toward

their writing and also took advantages to make the written product better. From the elaboration above, it can be stated that two stay is suitable to teach writing skill for the students having high creativity.

On the other hand, Direct Instruction Model is another model in which the teaching and learning process focuses on the teacher. It makes Direct Instruction is known as teacher centered. It means that the students cannot freely active in teaching learning process since they have to follow the instruction. The role in teaching learning process is mainly on the teacher. The students tend to be passive and they were not creative students. The students do activity based on the instruction given by the teacher. As cited by Cohen (in Magliaro, Lockee, & Burton, 2008: 6) posit that Direct Instruction Model should not be used for higher level learning or performance, but in situations where motor skills or prerequisite intellectual skills are being instructed. Related to the level of creativity, the students having low creativity is suitable to teach using this model, since the students just waited the teacher's instruction and input to do the activities without any freedom of action to develop their writing. The students with low creativity were afraid to take



risk, were not able to accomplish hard effort and passive.

In this model, the students tend to be passive because the teacher has a dominant figure. The interaction between the teacher and the students are usually in the form of one-way communication from the teacher to the students. Besides, the students' scientific and creative thinking cannot be facilitated properly. Therefore, teaching writing using Direct Instruction Model is more effective than Two Stay Two Stray Model for the students having low creativity because the students with low creativity are always helped by the teacher for developing their writing step by step. As stated by Huitt (2009: 9), Direct Instruction made the teacher to be actively present new content of skills to the students in order to make the teaching learning process is achieved. Duran and Carnine (2003: 3) state that in direct instruction, the teaching process may include the teacher signalling, modelling, and following a lesson which is scripted and is designed to have the students respond chorally as teacher signals the small group or an entire group of students.

Based on the elaboration and the result of the research above, the implementation of two different models

for teaching writing gives different result to the students having high and low creativity. Therefore, there is an interaction between teaching models and students' creativity for teaching writing skill. It can be inferred that Two Stay Two Stray is suitable for the students who have high creativity and Direct Instruction is suitable for the students who have low creativity.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the result of the data analysis, the research findings are as follows:

1. Two Stay Two Stray is more effective than Direct Instruction in teaching writing skill for the students of *STIKes Hamzar*. It is supported by the result of the finding in which the mean score of Two Stay Two Stray Model (73.92) is higher than the mean score of Direct Instruction Model (70.72). Furthermore, the result of Anova test between columns showed that there is significant difference in which  $F_t$  with the level of significance  $\alpha = 0.05$  (3.98) is lower than  $F_o$  (5.14).

2. The students having high creativity have better writing skill for the students of *STIKes Hamzar*. It is supported by the result of the finding in which the mean score of the students having high creativity (74.00) is higher

than students having low creativity (70.64). In addition, the result of Anova test between rows showed that there is significant difference in which  $F_t$  with level of significance  $\alpha = 0.05$  (3.98) is lower than  $F_o$  (5.69)

3. There is an interaction between teaching models and students' creativity in teaching writing skill for the students of *STIKes Hamzar*. It is supported by the finding of test that the mean score between students having high creativity taught using Two Stay Two Stray Model (79.56) is higher than the mean score of those taught using Direct Instruction Model (68.44); and the mean score of students having low creativity taught using Direct Instruction Model (73.00) is higher than the mean score of those taught by using Two Stay Two Stray Model (68.27). It means that the students who have high creativity are appropriate taught by using Two Stay Two Stray Model, while the students having low creativity are appropriate taught using Direct Instruction Model. In other words, the effectiveness of the models in teaching writing skill used in different classes depends on the degree of students' creativity.

Based on the research findings above, it can be concluded that Two Stay Two Stray Model is an effective teaching

model in teach writing skill for the students of *STIKes Hamzar* in the academic year of 2018/2019. Besides, there is an interaction between the teaching models used and the students' creativity in teaching writing skill.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abdul Kadir Bagis. 2012. *The Effectiveness of Cooperative Learning Two Stay Two Stray Model in Teaching Speaking Viewed from Students' Self-Esteem (An Experimental Research in the Third Semester Students of FPBSIKIP Mataram, NTB in the Academic Year of 2010/2011)*. Unpublished Thesis. Retrieved from <http://pasca.uns.ac.id>.
- Ardiana. 2013. *The Effectiveness of Two Stay Two Stray Technique to Teach Writing Viewed from Students' Self-efficacy (An Experimental Research at the English Education Study Program of IAIN Surakarta in the Academic Year of 2012/2013)*. Unpublished thesis. Retrieved from <http://pasca.uns.ac.id>
- August Lewaherilla. 2011. *Improving Students Reading Competence Through Two Stay Two Stray*

- Technique (A Classroom Action Research to the Students of Class VIII A of SMP YPPK Biak Numfor in the Academic Year of 2010/2011)*. Unpublished Thesis. Retrieved from <http://pasca.uns.ac.id>.
- Boden, Margaet. A. *The creative Mind Myths and Mechanism, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition*. London: Routledge
- Cohen, Marisa T. 2008. *The Effect of Direct Instruction versus Discovery Learning on the Understanding of Science Lessons by Second Grade Students*. NERA Conference Proceedings. Paper 30. Retrived from <http://digitalcommons.uconn.edu>.
- Crawford, A., Saul E. W., Mathews, S., & Makinster, J. 2005. *Teaching and Learning Strategies for the Thinking Classroom*. New York: The International Debate Education Association.
- Duran, E., and Carnine, D. 2003. *Systematic Instruction in Reading for Spanish-Speaking Students*. Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.
- Hammiddin, M. 2012. *Improving Students' Comprehension of Poems Using Two Stay Two Stray Strategy*. *Jurnal Vidya Karya I* Jilid 27 No. 01, Oktober 2012.
- Haycraft, John. 1986. *An Introduction to English Language Teaching*. Longman Group Ltd.
- Huitt, W., Monetti, D., & Hummel, J. 2009. *Designing Direct Instruction*. Retrived from <http://www.edpsycinteractive.org>.
- Hyland, Ken. 2003. *Second Language Writing*. New York. Cambridge University Press.
- Jolliffe, Wendy. 2007. *Cooperative Learning in the Classroom; Putting it into Practice*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Joyce, Bruce. Weil, Marshal and Calhoul, Emily. 2009. *Models of Teaching, 8<sup>th</sup> Edition*. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Kagan, S. 1994. *Cooperative Learning*. San Clemente, CA: Resources for Teachers, Inc. Retrieved from [www.KaganOnline.com](http://www.KaganOnline.com).
- Kagan. S. 2010. *It's All About Engagement. Kagan Professional Development*. Retrived from <http://www.kagan-uk.co.uk>
- Kagan. S and High. Julie. 2002. *Kagan Structures for English Language Learners*. Retrived from <http://www.kaganonline.com>.

- Kagan, S. and Kagan, M. *Staff Development and the Structural Approach to Cooperative Learning*. In Celeste M. Brody and Neil Davidson. 1998. Professional Development for Cooperative Learning : Issues and Approaches. State University of New York Press.
- Lie, Anita. 2008. *Cooperative Learning: Mempraktikkan Cooperative Learning Diruang-ruang Kelas*. Jakarta: PT. Grasindo
- Munandar, Utami. 2012. *Pengembangan Kreativitas Anak Berbakat*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Rockler, J. Michael. 1988. *Innovative Teaching Strategies*. Scottsdale: Gorsuch Scarisbrick Publisher.
- Roshenshine, Barack. 2008. *Five Meaning of Direct Instruction*. Synthesis Series: Academic Development Institute. Retrived from [www. centerii.org](http://www.centerii.org)



**UNIVERSITAS PENDIDIKAN MANDALIKA**  
**FAKULTAS ILMU PENDIDIKAN DAN PSIKOLOGI**  
**PROGRAM STUDI BIMBINGAN DAN KONSELING**

**Jurnal Realita**

Gedung Dwitiya Lt.3, Jln Pemuda 59A Mataram-NTB 83125 Tlp (0370) 638991  
e-mail: bk\_fip@ikipmataram.ac.id; web: ojs.ikipmataram.ac.id; fip.ikipmataram.ac.id.

---

**PEDOMAN PENULISAN**

1. Naskah merupakan hasil penelitian atau kajian kepustakaan di bidang pendidikan, pengajaran dan pembelajaran,
2. Naskah merupakan tulisan asli penulis dan belum pernah dipublikasikan sebelumnya dalam jurnal ilmiah lain,
3. Naskah dapat ditulis dalam Bahasa Indonesia atau Bahasa Inggris.
4. Penulisan naskah mengikuti ketentuan sebagai berikut:

Program	MS Word	Margin kiri	3.17 cm
Font	Times New Roman	Margin kanan	3.17 cm
Size	12	Margin atas	2.54 cm
Spasi	1.0	Margin bawah	2.54 cm
Ukuran kertas	A4	Maksimum	20 halaman

5. Naskah ditulis dengan **sistematika** sebagai berikut: Judul (huruf biasa dan dicetak tebal), nama-nama penulis (tanpa gelar akademis), instansi penulis (program studi, jurusan, universitas), email dan nomor telpon penulis, abstrak, kata kunci, pendahuluan (tanpa sub-judul), metode penelitian (tanpa sub-judul), hasil dan pembahasan, simpulan dan saran (tanpa sub-judul), dan daftar pustaka.

**Judul** secara ringkas dan jelas menggambarkan isi tulisan dan ditulis dalam huruf kapital. Keterangan tulisan berupa hasil penelitian dari sumber dana tertentu dapat dibuat dalam bentuk catatan kaki. Fotocopy halaman pengesahan laporan penelitian tersebut harus dilampirkan pada draf artikel.

**Nama-nama penulis** ditulis lengkap tanpa gelar akademis.

**Alamat instansi** penulis ditulis lengkap berupa nama sekolah atau program studi, nama jurusan dan nama perguruan tinggi. Penulis yang tidak berafiliasi pada sekolah atau perguruan tinggi dapat menyertakan alamat surat elektronik dan nomor telpon.

**Abstrak** ditulis dalam 2 (dua) bahasa: Bahasa Inggris dan Bahasa Indonesia. Naskah berbahasa Inggris didahului abstrak berbahasa Indonesia. Naskah berbahasa Indonesia didahului abstrak berbahasa Inggris. Panjang abstrak tidak lebih dari 200 kata. Jika diperlukan, tim redaksi dapat menyediakan bantuan penerjemahan abstrak kedalam bahasa Inggris.

**Kata kunci** (key words) dalam bahasa yang sesuai dengan bahasa yang dipergunakan dalam naskah tulisan dan berisi 3-5 kata yang benar-benar dipergunakan dalam naskah tulisan.

**Daftar Pustaka** ditulis dengan berpedoman pada Pedoman Penulisan Karya Ilmiah Universitas Pendidikan Mandalika.

<b>JURNAL REALITA</b>	<b>VOLUME 5</b>	<b>NOMOR 2</b>	<b>EDISI OKTOBER 2020</b>	<b>HALAMAN 1016 - 1153</b>	<b>P ISSN : 2503 - 1708 E ISSN : 2722 - 7340</b>
---------------------------	---------------------	--------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------	--



*Alamat Redaksi:*

Program Studi Bimbingan dan Konseling  
Fakultas Ilmu Pendidikan dan Psikologi  
Universitas Pendidikan Mandalika  
Gedung Dwitiya, Lt. 3 Jalan Pemuda No. 59A Mataram  
Telp. (0370) 638991  
Email : [bk\\_fip@ikipmataram.ac.id](mailto:bk_fip@ikipmataram.ac.id)  
Web : [ojs.ikipmataram.ac.id](http://ojs.ikipmataram.ac.id); [fip.ikipmataram.ac.id](http://fip.ikipmataram.ac.id)

