



ISSN: 0976-3376

Available Online at <http://www.journalajst.com>

ASIAN JOURNAL OF  
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Asian Journal of Science and Technology  
Vol. 5, Issue 9, pp. 600-605, September, 2014

## RESEARCH ARTICLE

### THE INFLUENCE OF LEARNING METHOD OF STUDENT TEAMS-ACHIEVEMENT DIVISIONS (STAD), INQUIRY BASED LEARNING (IBL), AND EXPOSITORY (CONVENTIONAL), AND READING INTERESTS TOWARD WRITING COMPETENCE

**\*Suhartono, \*\*Joko Nurkamto, \*\*St. Y. Slamet and \*\*Sarwiji Suwandi**

\*Student of Doctoral Program, Indonesian Language Education Sebelas Maret University, Surakarta, Indonesia

\*\* Professor of Sebelas Maret University, Surakarta, Indonesia

#### ARTICLE INFO

##### Article History:

Received 24<sup>th</sup> June, 2014  
Received in revised form  
25<sup>th</sup> July, 2014  
Accepted 30<sup>th</sup> August, 2014  
Published online 30<sup>th</sup> September, 2014

##### Key words:

STAD,  
IBL,  
Expository,  
Reading interest,  
Writing

#### ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study were: (1) to find out the difference of students' writing competence who studied with the method of Student Teams-Achievement Divisions (STAD), Inquiry Based Learning (IBL), and Expository; (2) to find out the difference of students' the writing competence who have a high interest in reading and students who have a low interest in reading; and (3) to find out the interaction between learning method and the reading interest to writing competence. This research is a quasi experimental / quasi (quasi-experiment) with 3 X 2 factorial design. Population of this study is all elementary school students in Kebumen regency. The research samples of this study are SDN 3 Sawangan Alian, SDN 1 Kebulusan Pejagoan, and SDN 5 Bumirejo Kebumen, while the sampling technique used was multistage random sampling. Data collection techniques used in this study were task test which is to measure students' writing competence and questionnaire to measure students' interest in reading. Analysis of the data using analysis of variance two lines (ANOVA AXB). The results showed that the average competence of the group of students who are learning to write with STAD method is 75.69; group of students who learn writing with IBL method is 73.25; group of students who studied with Expository method is 71.64; the average competence of students group of low reading interest is 72.26; and the average competence of students group of high reading interest is 74.93. Conclusions of this study are: First, there is a difference between writing competence of students who study with STAD method, IBL, and Expository. Writing competence of students who study with STAD method is better than students who studied with IBL method and students who studied with IBL method is better than the students who studied with Expository method. Second, there is a difference between writing competence of students who have a low interest in reading and students who have a high interest in reading. Students who have a high interest in reading have a better writing competence than students who have a low reading interest. Third, there is no interaction between learning method and the reading interest to the writing competence.

Copyright © 2014 Suhartono et al. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

#### INTRODUCTION

Writing as a productive language competence requires an adequate vocabulary. Vocabulary that owned by one obtained from listening and reading. The more or better someone in listening will be more additions to his vocabulary; the higher the person's interest in reading will also the richer in vocabulary. One's reading competence is closely related to reading interests. With the high interest in reading, the more often a person will read. High frequency reading will automatically enrich vocabulary. With a rich vocabulary or lot, someone will be good at producing writing. Interest is also closely related to the learning objectives. This is as stated by Bower & Hilgard (1981: 542) which states that learning can be fostered by good by way of paying attention in students'

interest towards learning. In learning writing, the selection of method will affect teachers in designing and implementing learning. Therefore, teachers need to determine a method that allows the development of student competence can be achieved to the fullest. Cooperative learning can improve student achievement, as well as other positive consequences that can develop intergroup relations, acceptance of classmates who are weak in the academic field, and improve self-esteem. Among the methods that implement cooperative learning is Student Teams-Achievement Divisions (STAD). STAD consists of five main components: classroom presentations, team, quiz, scores of individual progress, team recognition. STAD allows students to learn in a cooperative and collaborative. Inquiry Based Learning (IBL) Method directs individuals to learn independently, to develop the ability to think in accordance with their own thoughts. Self-learning will motivate themselves more effectively in those who learn. This is as stated by Hsu and Shiue (2005: 143) that self-learning is a

\*Corresponding author: *Suhartono, PGSD FKIP UNS Kampus Kebumen, Jalan Kepodang 67A, Kebumen, Jawa Tengah, Indonesia*

motivated desire to pursue the option of one's knowledge. Holil (2008) stated that inquiry learning is a learning that is designed to teach students how to investigate the problem or question the facts. Inquiry learning requires a classroom environment in which students feel free to work, have a notion, make inferences, and make educated guesses. The main characteristic of inquiry learning as revealed by Sanjaya (2008: 196-197) are: (1) emphasize the student activity optimally to seek and find; (2) all activities undertaken are directed students to seek and find the answers themselves of something that is questionable and is expected to foster self-confidence (self belief); (3) aims to develop the ability to think in a systematic, logical, and critical, or develop the intellectual capabilities as part of the mental process.

Expository learning is learning that emphasizes the process of delivering verbal material from a teacher to a group of students with the intention that students can master the subject matter optimally. The roles of the students in this study are listening to master the subject matter which is presented by teachers and it makes expository often associated with lecturing. This learning method is oriented to the teacher because the teacher holds a dominant role. Expository deemed effective if teachers teach to a group of students who on average have lower capabilities. Expository is also effective if the material to be taught is suitable for presentation. In addition, if a teacher wants to demonstrate something specific techniques or procedures for the practical activities then expository is the right choice. Lack of infrastructure required and the limited time available also allows expository more widely used. Based on the explanation above, it appears that cooperative learning can improve student achievement so that the results which are expected can be realized to the fullest. On the other hand, based on the main characteristic of inquiry learning, implied that the main priority is the process in addition to the learning outcomes. This can be achieved best when the average student has the will and cognitive ability is high. On students who lack the willingness and cognitive ability, this inquiry learning may be less successful. In contrast, the average student who has a low ability, expository teaching is considered more suitable for use.

Based on the background above can be formulated problems as follows: (1) Is there a difference of writing competence of students who studied with the method of Student Teams-Achievement Divisions (STAD), Inquiry Based Learning (IBL), and Expository (conventional)? If there is a difference, which one is best? (2) Is there any differences of writing competence between students who have a high interest in reading and students who have a low interest in reading? If there is a difference, which one is better? (3) Is there any interaction between learning method and the read reading interest to writing competence?

The purpose of this study were: (1) to find the difference between the writing competence of students who studied with the method of Student Teams-Achievement Divisions (STAD), Inquiry Based Learning (IBL), and Expository (conventional); (2) to find writing competence difference between students who have a high interest in reading and students who have a low interest in reading; and (3) to find out whether there is any interaction between learning method and the reading interest to writing competence.

Armstrong (1998) concluded that students who are taught by STAD method for seven weeks reached higher achievement than students who are taught the same material with the traditional method. Ghaith (2004) concluded that the interpretation of teacher beliefs, attitudes, and norms can be achieved in a teaching with STAD. Rahayu (2007) in her study concluded that STAD cooperative learning model with guided inquiry method is more influential than experimental method, high scientific attitude is more influential than low scientific attitude. Kiranawati (2007) concluded that teaching model cooperative learning STAD is very effectively used in writing. While Hartland (2006: 5) states that by using Inquiry Based Learning (IBL) the power to educative question and asking style is able to differentiate between students who gain a deeper understanding of the subjects that are factual.

According to Poteet (in Abdurrahman, 1999) writing is a visual depiction of the thoughts, feelings, and ideas using symbols of one's author language system for communication purposes or notes. Writing is a complex process that Allows writers to explore thoughts and ideas, and the make them visible and concrete. Writing encourages thinking and learning for it motivates communication and makes thought available for reflection. When thought is written down, the ideas can be Examined, Reconsidered, added to, rearranged, and changed (Ghaith (2002: 2).

An article (article) that can either be expressed as the incorporation of elements of writing in such a way that a reader can experience or grasp the meaning of that expected by the authors, to understand the basic premise of the author, and accept or reject the views of the author. It is as stated by Samra (2001: 1) "A well-written piece can be described as incorporating elements of writing in such a way that a reader can experience the writer's intended meaning, understand the writer's premise, and accept or reject the writer's point of view".

Frequency of writing exercises will make someone skilled in the field of writing. Writing is basically an activity that is productive and expressive. Writing competence is used to note, record, convince, report, inform, and influence the reader. Intent and purpose as it can only be achieved by learners who can construct and assemble way of thinking and bring it in writing with a clear, smooth, and communicative. Clarity depends on the mind, organization, usage and word choice, and sentence structure (McCrimmon, 1967: 122).

In connection with the stages of writing process, Tompkins (1990: 73) presents five stages, namely: (1) pre-writing, (2) drafting, (3) revising, (4) editing, and (5) sharing (sharing). Can also be concluded that the writing process includes the step of: (1) pre-writing / planning (set goals for directing writing), (2) write / realize (make draft / framework, writing in accordance with the plans and frameworks that have been made), and (3) post-writing (revising, editing, and sharing (sharing).

Cooperative learning is learning that embraces the philosophy of constructivism. Constructivism emphasizes that knowledge is the result of construction (formation) one's self (von Glaserfeld in Pannen, et al., 2005: 3). Slavin (2008: 4) states that cooperative learning can improve student achievement, as

well as other positive consequences that can develop intergroup relations, acceptance of classmates who are weak in the academic field, and improve self-esteem. Cooperative learning can improve the performance of which is not easily be achieved when done by self study. Achievements of individuals which is achieved can help the group's success. Because cooperative learning has a huge social dimension, typically developing and fun; improve academic achievement such as the ability to cooperate with others, self-confidence, self-understanding, and so on (McConnell, 1994: 15).

STAD is a cooperative learning method which consists of five major components, namely the class presentations, team, quiz, scores of individual advancement, and recognition team (Slavin, 2008: 143). First, the material introduced in class presentation conducted by the teacher. Second, team formation for study the activity sheet or other material. Third, students perform quiz on an individual basis. Fourth, award scores of individual progress. Each student was given initial scores obtained from the average of the previous performance of students in the same quiz. Students will then collect points for their team based on the rate of increase of their quiz scores compared to their baseline scores. Fifth, Recognizes Team. The team will get a certificate or other form of reward when their average score achieve certain criteria. Self-directed learning is a self-motivated desire to pursue one's choice of knowledge. Self-directed learning begins with a conscious or cognitive need to know, the which has also been described as a desire, a curiosity, an interest, a concern, a deficit, or even a wish. Each person manifests their inner "need to know" by choosing activities that satisfy, gratify, or pacify their needs (Hsu and Shiue, 2005)

The main characteristics of inquiry learning as revealed by Sanjaya (2008: 196-197) is as follows. First, emphasizing activities to students maximally on searching and finding, inquiry means placing students as a subject of study. Secondly, the whole activity of the student is directed to seek and find the answers themselves of something that is questionable and is expected to cultivate an attitude of self-confidence (self-belief). Third, the inquiry aims to develop the ability to think in a systematic, logical, and critical, or develop the intellectual capabilities as part of the mental process.

In general, Sanjaya (2008: 201) describes the process of inquiry learning with the steps: (1) orientation, which includes (a) describes the topic, objectives, and expected learning outcomes which can be achieved by students, (b) explain the main points of activity which must be performed by students on achieving goals, and (c) explain the importance of the topic and learning activities to provide student learning motivation; (2) Formulate the problem; (3) Applying the hypothesis; (4) Collect data; (5) Test the hypothesis; and (6) formulate conclusions

Expository method based on behaviorist learning ideology, which emphasizes more to notion that human behavior is basically related to the relationship between stimulus and response. Therefore, the role of the teacher as the giver of the stimulus is a very important factor. Sanjaya (2008: 179) states that expository learning emphasizes to process of material verbal delivery from a teacher to a group of students with the intention that students can master the subject matter optimally.

Learning expository would be effective if: (1) the teacher will deliver new materials and its relation to the material which will be and have to be learnt by students (overview); (2) teacher wants the students to have a certain style of intellectual models; (3) the material to be taught is suitable for presenting; (4) teacher wants to arouse students' curiosity about a particular topic; (5) teacher wants to demonstrate a particular technique or procedure for practical activities; (6) all students have the same level of difficulty so that, teachers need to explain to all students; (7) teacher will teach a group of students which have a lower ability on average; (8) environment is not conducive to use student-centered strategies; and (9) teachers do not have enough time remedy using student-centered approach (Sanjaya, 2008: 180).

Tampubolon (1991: 41) states that interest is a combination of desire and willingness which is able to develop if there is any motivation. Natawidjaja (1984/1985: 57) states that interest is a readiness that drives an individual to focus on an object person, object, agency, or activity. Kartono (1996: 112) states that interest is a moment of intensive directional trend to one object that is considered important. Interest is closely related to personality and always contains elements of affective / feeling, cognition, and volition. According to Bower & Hilgard (1981: 542) interest is closely related to learning objectives as stated that "... learning is the best fostered by capturing the learner's interest in the subject matter. Interest cover is a non analytic term for many factors, but it usually Refers either to the reinforcing nature of the material itself. "Therefore, the purpose and interest in learning have a very close connection. People who want to achieve optimal learning goals should have provision of high interest to the object studied.

Based on some of the above definitions, it can be concluded that the interest is a psychological phenomenon that a desire and willingness or high propensity of an individual that is concentrated or focused in full and settled relative to an object that is considered important / fun because of the motivation and emotion that help directing attention and behavior towards the objects that interest them to achieve the desired results.

The characteristics of those who are interested can be inferred based on the notion of interest described above, namely: (1) having an attention to the object interest; (2) having the pleasure / love; (3) willing to have the object of interest; (4) diligent; and (5) excited in facing the object of interest. From the opinion above, it seems that people who have an interest in reading will always pay attention to all activities or all things related to reading as the object of interest. A person who has an interest will strive always being near and possess the object of interest as possible. He also will strive diligently and vigorously to carry out an activity that is related to the object of interest at hand.

Reading is a physical and mental activity to obtain information and knowledge that is useful for life (Tampubolon, 1991: 41). Reading can also be interpreted as a complex activity by deploying a number of separate actions, including the use of understanding and fantasy, observing and remembering (Sudarmo, 1988: 4). Based on these opinions, it can be concluded that reading is an activity on viewing and understanding the contents of writing by uttering or only in silent to obtain useful information and knowledge for life.

Based on the above explanation, it can be presumed that writing competence of students who are taught by STAD method, Inquiry Based Learning, and Expository will be different. When it is viewed from three of the characteristics of the method, STAD method is better than Inquiry Based Learning method or even Expository method. High and low frequency of students in reading is determined by the level of interest of the students to read. Students who frequently read will have a lot of vocabulary / rich. Wealth vocabulary of students will support good product of writing. In other words, interest in reading can support writing competence. Thus, it can be presumed that the writing competence of students who have high reading interest would be better than a low student interest in reading.

## METHODS

This research was conducted in entire elementary school in Kebumen, with 2 schools as experimental class, and 1 school classroom control. The grade used for this research is grade V. The experiment was conducted during a ten-month in the academic year of 2011/2012. Method used in this study is an experimental research method. The design used in this experiment is the "posttest-only control-group design". The study population was all students in fifth grade elementary school in Kebumen regency as many as 793 school. The study sample consisted of three elementary schools namely, SDN 5 Bumirejo, SDN 1 Kebulusan, and SDN 3 Sawangan. The sampling technique used was multistage random sampling. Data collection techniques used in this study is in the form of tests and questionnaires. The test is used to collect data of students' capabilities / competencies in writing. Questionnaire was used to collect data of students' reading interests of. Test the validity of which will include: (1) content validity, (2) face validity, and (3) the empirical validity. The data analysis technique used is the analysis of variance of two lines (AXB ANOVA) with a significance level  $\alpha = 0.05$ .

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Before the data were analyzed, it is conducted a prerequisite test for normality and homogeneity in advance. Prerequisite test results shown in Table 1 and Table 2 as follows.

Table 1. Tests of normality

	Methods	Kolmogorov-Smirnov(a)			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Writing-Compt	STAD	,114	32	,200(*)	,974	32	,608
	IBL	,106	28	,200(*)	,950	28	,193
	Expository	,136	36	,091	,943	36	,065

Table 2. Test of homogeneity of variance

		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Writing-Compt	Based on Mean	2,490	2	93	,088
	Based on Median	2,407	2	93	,096
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	2,407	2	72,402	,097
	Based on trimmed mean	2,456	2	93	,091

From this analysis it is known that the P-value for Lilifors (Kolmogorov-Smirnov) normality test of writing competence STAD group = 0.200, IBL = 0.200, and Expository = 0.091; for the Shapiro-Wilk normality test group STAD = 0.608, IBL = 0.193, and Expository = 0.065. Since the P-value is greater than  $\alpha = 0.05$ , the three groups are included to normal distribution. Tests showed that the homogeneity of the distribution of P-value = 0.088 is greater than  $\alpha = 0.05$  then the variance of the three groups are homogeneous.

Furthermore, the results of the data analysis are summarized in Table 3, Table 4 and Table 5 as follows.

Based on Levene's test Test of Equality of Error Variance can be seen that the variance of the same groups ( $\alpha = 0.278$  greater than 0.05). Writing competence of students who are taught by STAD method has a different result with students who are taught by IBL method and Expository. STAD method is better than the method Expository in writing competence. The results of this study indicate that descriptively average value of writing competence of students who are taught by STAD method, IBL, and Expository respectively; 75.69, 73.25; and 71.64. Meanwhile, the standard deviation of the three groups respectively; 7.096, 4.881; and 4.655. The average value in the range 70's showed that the competences writing in the fifth grade of elementary school students in Kebumen regency well qualified. Viewed from the aspect of interest in reading, the average value of students who have low reading interest is 72.26 with a standard deviation of 5.481; besides, students who have high reading interest obtained average value of 74.93 with a standard deviation of 5.998.

The study findings suggest that interest in reading has a positive correlation with students' writing competence. Students who have a high interest in reading tend to have a strong purpose in mastering the content of reading. Mastery of reading contents is students' reading goals. This is consistent with the statement of Bower & Hilgard (1981: 542) that the interest is closely related to learning objectives. Good writing is based on the breadth of the author's knowledge and skills expressing ideas. Expressing ideas through writing skills requires a long process, as stated by Samra (2001: 2) that good writing does not happen by accident. What to watch as the implication of these findings is how schools can create conditions that can stimulate students to like reading without the burden of being sent out or get assignments from teachers. On the other hand, if the school library facility capable of providing adequate library materials, both in terms of number and type of collection of relevant literature so as to arouse students' interest in reading. In terms of the use of teaching methods, the results of this study indicate that the best method is STAD in supporting students' writing competence, while the lowest Expository method effect.

**Table 3. Tests of Between-Subjects Effects**  
Dependent Variable: Writing Competence

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Noncent. Parameter	Observed Power(a)
Corrected Model	521,528(b)	5	104,306	3,451	,007	17,255	,895
Intercept	505052,265	1	505052,265	16709,413	,000	16709,413	1,000
Methods	319,434	2	159,717	5,284	,007	10,568	,824
* Read-Interest	175,073	1	175,073	5,792	,018	5,792	,663
Methods * Read-Interest	63,324	2	31,662	1,048	,355	2,095	,228
Error	2720,305	90	30,226				
Total	521270,000	96					
Corrected Total	3241,833	95					

a Computed using alpha = ,05

b R Squared = ,161 (Adjusted R Squared = ,114)

**Table 4. Levene's Test of Equality of Error variances (a)**  
Dependent Variable: Writing Competence

F	df1	df2	Sig.
1,283	5	90	,278

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups.

a Design: Intercept+ Methods +\* Read-Interest + Methods \* \* Read-Interest

**Table 5. Multiple Comparisons**  
Dependent Variable: Writing Competence  
Scheffe

(I) Methods	(J) Methods	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
STAD	IBL	2,44	1,423	,236	-1,10	5,98
	Expository	4,05(*)	1,336	,013	,72	7,37
IBL	STAD	-2,44	1,423	,236	-5,98	1,10
	Expository	1,61	1,385	,511	-1,84	5,06
Expository	STAD	-4,05(*)	1,336	,013	-7,37	-,72
	IBL	-1,61	1,385	,511	-5,06	1,84

Based on observed means.

\* The mean difference is significant at the ,05 level.

Based on the results of the data analysis it is known that the F-test for factor method = 5.284 with 2 degrees of freedom and P-value = 0.007. Since the P-value of 0.007 is smaller than  $\alpha = 0.05$  then  $H_0$  is rejected. In conclusion, the three groups have different abilities. F-test for factor Interests Reading = 5.792 with 1 degree of freedom, and P-value = 0.018. Since the P-value of 0.018 is smaller than  $\alpha = 0.05$  then  $H_0$  is rejected. In conclusion, the two groups have different abilities. F-test for the interaction factor = 1.048 with 2 degrees of freedom and P-value = 0.355. Since the P-value of 0.355 is greater than  $\alpha = 0.05$  then  $H_0$  is accepted. In conclusion there is no interaction between method and interest in reading.

However, the three methods studied showed a good influence on students' writing competence. This is evidenced by the mean value of the range in the 70s. Competence write better with STAD method demonstrated student learning groups will yield better performance than learning on an individual basis. This is consistent with the statement Slavin (2008: 12) that the main idea of STAD is to motivate students in order to support each other and help each other in mastering the skills presented by the teacher. The implication is that teachers need to consider the selection of a method that allows students to work in groups to enable the collaboration and mutual support among students. STAD as cooperative and collaborative learning method seems to need to get the teacher's attention because of its philosophical foundation that is able to condition the optimal student achievement. Millis and Cottell (1998) suggested the philosophical framework are (1) to appreciate the different backgrounds of students; (2) believe all students have the potential for success; (3) the view that learning as a social process; and (4) believe that learning as an active and constructive process. Expository method turns out to affect the competence of student writing at least when compared with the STAD method and IBL. However this does not mean the method is considered less good. In many ways remains an effective method of Expository (Sanjaya, 2008: 180).

If teachers teach new material; material that will be taught suitable for presentation; all students have the same level of difficulty; students' average ability is low; environment does not support; limited time; the Expository method is the right choice. If the teacher wants to place students as learning subjects, the IBL is an alternative that should be taken into account because it is one of the characteristics of inquiry learning (Sanjaya, 2008: 196). As a subject of study, students will motivate themselves more effectively (Hsu and Shiue, 2005). On the other hand, inquiry is necessary to be used in a classroom environment in which students feel free to work, have a notion, make inferences, and make a presumption (Holil, 2008). The thing that is quite interesting to observe is the range of values on Expository and IBL methods are relatively similar, namely 17 and 16, with a maximum value of Expository and IBL is 82, the minimum value of Expository method is 65 and IBL method at 66; standard deviation of both methods are also not much different from that in Expository of 4.655 and 4.881 for the IBL. This suggests that both methods have the same relative effectiveness. Which is more important in this study is there is no any interaction found between method and interest in reading. The implication is that in any group of students, reading interests have an influence on students' writing competence. It is important to note for the teacher to always pay attention and develop students' interest

in reading. Schools need to seek the provision of facilities that support the reading interests.

## Conclusion

From the above explanation, it can be concluded that: (1) There is a difference between writing competence of students who are taught by the method of Student Teams-Achievement Divisions (STAD), Inquiry Based Learning (IBL), and Expository (Conventional); STAD method is better than the IBL and IBL better than Expository; (2) There is a difference between writing competence of students who have a high interest in reading and students who have a low interest in reading; Students who have a high interest in reading have a better writing competence than students who have a low interest in reading; (3) There is no any interaction between learning method and reading interest to writing competence: Students who have a high-interest in reading have a better writing competence than the low interest in reading when taught by these three methods.

## REFERENCES

- Abdurrahman, M. 1999. *Pendidikan bagi Anak Berkesulitan Belajar*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta
- Amstrong, S. 1998. "Students Teams Achievement Divisions (STAD) in a twelfth grade classroom: Effect on student achievement and attitude". *Journal of Social Studies Research*. Available at [http://findarticle.com/p/articles/mi\\_qa3823/is\\_199804/ai\\_n8783828](http://findarticle.com/p/articles/mi_qa3823/is_199804/ai_n8783828).
- Bower, G.H. & Hilgard, E.R. 1981. *Theories of Learning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Ghaith, G. 2002. *Writing*. American University of Beirut. Available at <http://nadabs.tripod.com/ghaith-writing.html>.
- Hartland, C. 2006. "Inquiry Based Learning: Why? Where? How?" *Reflecting Education*. Vol. 2. No. 1. July 2006, pp 5-18. Available at [http://www.reflectingeducation.net/index.php?journal=reflecting&page=article&op=viewFile&path\[\]=23&path\[\]=24](http://www.reflectingeducation.net/index.php?journal=reflecting&page=article&op=viewFile&path[]=23&path[]=24).
- Holil, A. 2008. *Hubungan Inkuiri dan Keterampilan Proses*. Available at <http://anwarholil.blogspot.com/2008/04/hubungan-inkuiri-dan-kompetensi.html>.
- Hsu, Y.C. & Shiue, Y.M. 2005. *The Effect of Self-Directed Learning Readiness on Achievement Comparing Face-to-Face and Two-Way Distance Learning Instruction*. *International Journal Media* 32.2. Available at <http://find.galegroup.com/itx/retrieve.do?contenstet=IAC>.
- Kiranawati. 2007. "Penerapan Model Mengajar Kooperatif Tipe Student Team Achievement Division (STAD) bagi Peningkatan Kemampuan Menulis"(Penelitian Tindakan Kelas pada Pembelajaran Menulis Siswa Kelas III SMPN 2 Jatinunggal Sumedang Tahun Pelajaran 2004/2005). Available at <http://ind.sps.upi.edu/?p=172>.
- McConnell, D., 1994. *What is Cooperative Learning, in in Implementing Computer Supported Cooperative Learning*. London: Kogan Page Limited. Available at [http://www.csd.uwa.edu.au/altmodes/to\\_delivery/collab\\_coop.html](http://www.csd.uwa.edu.au/altmodes/to_delivery/collab_coop.html).
- McCrimmon, J. M. 1967. *Writing With a Purpose*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Millis, B.J. & Cottell, P.G. 1998. *Cooperative Learning for Higher Education Faculty, American Council on Education, Series on Higher Education, Oryx Press*. Available at [http://www.csd.uwa.edu.au/altmodes/to\\_delivery/collab\\_coop.html](http://www.csd.uwa.edu.au/altmodes/to_delivery/collab_coop.html).
- Pannen, P., dkk. 2005. *Konstruktivisme dalam Pembelajaran*. Jakarta: Ditjen Dikti Depdiknas.
- Rahayu, S. 2007. "Pengaruh Model Pembelajaran Kooperatif Tipe STAD dengan Metode Inkuiri Terbimbing dan Eksperimen Ditinjau dari Sikap Ilmiah" Tesis Program Pascasarjana UNS Surakarta.
- Samra, N.A. 2001. *Teaching Writing-Approach & Activities*. American University of Beirut. Available at <http://nadabs.tripod.com/writing>.
- Sanjaya, W. 2008. *Strategi Pembelajaran Berorientasi Standar Proses Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Kencana.
- Slavin, R.E. 2008. *Cooperative Learning: Teori, Riset, dan Praktik*. Bandung: Nusa Media.
- Sudarso. 1988. *Sistem Membaca Cepat dan Efektif*. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- Tampubolon. 1991. *Mengembangkan Minat dan Kebiasaan Menulis pada Anak*. Bandung: Angkasa.
- Tompkins, G.E. 1990. *Teaching Writing Balancing Process and Product*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

\*\*\*\*\*