

The Effectiveness of Guided Reciprocal Peer Questioning (GRPQ) in Teaching Writing Viewed from Creativity

Furqon Edi Wibowo
IAIN Surakarta
Jl. Pandawa, Dusun IV, Pucangan, Kartasura,
Kabupaten Sukoharjo, Jawa Tengah 57168
furqon.wezt@iain-surakarta.ac.id

Received: 7th February 2019

Revised: 20th March 2019

Published: 30th April 2019

Abstract

The research method was experimental. The aims of this research are : (1) To know whether GRPQ is more effective than Free writing in teaching writing; (2) To know whether the students having high creativity have better writing ability than those having low creativity; (3) To know whether there is an interaction between teaching technique and creativity. The subject of the research is the second grade students of senior high school. The data were in the form of quantitative and they were taken from a test. They are the scores of students' writing test after having nine times treatment for each class. The researcher analyzed the data using ANOVA or analysis of variance and Tukey test. Based on the result of data analysis, the research findings are: (1) The GRPQ technique is more effective than Free Writing technique to teach writing for the second grade students of senior high school; (2) The writing skill achievement of the students having high creativity is better than that of those having low creativity; and (3) There is an interaction between teaching techniques and students' creativity. Based on these research findings, it can be concluded that GRPQ technique is an effective technique to improve the writing skill of the second grade students of senior high school.

Keywords: Guided Reciprocal Peer Questioning (GRPQ), Free Writing, Creativity

Introduction

In this study, the researcher focuses on the two teaching techniques, GRPQ and Free Writing technique. The Guided Reciprocal Peer Questioning (GRPQ) technique, which was developed and refined by King in the paper of Wai-ki Lock (2004), is a cognitive strategy instruction that has been shown to develop the greatest number of generic skills which include collaboration skills, communication skills, critical-thinking skills and problem-solving skills. While, free writing is a pre writing technique in which a person writes continuously for a set period of time without regard to spelling, grammar, or style. Besides the technique used by the teachers, another factor that plays an important role in teaching learning process is creativity. Craft, Jeffrey, and Leibling (2007: 19)



explain creativity is an active process of fashioning, shaping, molding, refining, and managing the creative idea or activity.

The researcher can identify many problems why the students' writing ability of the second grade students of senior high school is still low. They are as follows: (1) the students have difficulties to understand how to make a good sentence, a good essay and a good paragraph; (2) the students get a lot of problems in writing using English; (3) the students are not interested with the technique that is used in writing lesson; (4) there are some factors that contribute toward students' writing ability, such as creativity and given materials; (5) every student has different level of creativity that affects his or her learning achievement especially in writing; (6) depending on his or her level of creativity, every student has different response towards the technique in every teaching-learning process; (7) depending on the level of creativity, some students prefer learning by using techniques from either GRPQ or Free writing.

The success or failure of teaching learning process depends on the teaching strategy which is used. Therefore, the objective of the study is to find out whether or not (1) GRPQ is more effective than Free writing in teaching writing; (2) Whether or not the students high level of creativity have better writing ability than those with low level of creativity; (3) Whether or not there is an interaction between teaching techniques and students' creativity in teaching writing.

Writing is an integrative skill and an important, constructive, and complex process. It is an essential skill in foreign language learning in order to give learners opportunity to develop the proficiency they need to write personal letters, essays, research papers, and journals. In addition, writing skills enhance cognitive and linguistic awareness (Abu Jalil in Al Gomoul 2011: 1)

Wallace in Giyatno (2011: 16) stated that writing is the final product of several separate acts that are hugely challenging to learn simultaneously. Among these separable acts are note-taking, identifying a central idea, outlining, drafting, and editing. Further explanation is that both young and old people can encounter the discouraging 'writer's block' if they engage in more than one or two of these activities at once. It is difficult to start writing a report, for example, without a central idea and note to support it. Often, the more detail an outline, the easier is the writing. People frequently find that they can finish faster by writing a first draft quickly and then editing and revising this draft.

Based on the definitions above, it can be concluded that writing is an activity to record and communicate the writer's ideas, consisting of main idea and key details, to the readers by using letters, words, phrases, and clauses to form a series of related sentences with the purpose to make the readers think of something, or do something, or both.

To make the students to write the target language in the classroom is not easy. The difficulties of students to write may result from of some reasons such as students' reluctance, lack of motivation, uninteresting teaching technique, etc. In addition, the use of English for writing is not simple, because the writer should also master several elements which are important such as: grammar, vocabulary, spelling, content, and organization. Teachers are supposed to be creative in developing their teaching learning process to create good atmosphere, improve the students' writing skill, give the attention on the elements of writing, and make the English lesson more exciting.



There are some important factors influencing this fact to occur. Their insufficient vocabularies and provided materials seem to play important roles. Besides that, students have less ability to develop and organize ideas in such an appropriate way. So, their writings are uneasy to understand. Then, their weak comprehension and mastery of grammar also make their writings difficult to understand. As a result, many students fail to meet the given standards although they have been given enough exposures in writing lesson.

To solve the problems as mentioned above, the English teachers can use some techniques to teach writing such as using various pictures, contextual teaching and learning approach, using parallel writing technique, and etc. The researcher proposes the use of Guided Reciprocal Peer Questioning (GRPQ) in the teaching writing on the consideration that it can facilitate the teacher to monitor and guide the process of the students writing activities.

Guided Reciprocal Peer Questioning (GRPQ) is a cooperative learning instructional technique in which natural dialogue models and reveals learners' thinking processes about a shared learning experience. Teachers foster reciprocal teaching through their belief that collaborative construction of meaning between themselves and students leads to a higher quality of learning. Students take ownership of their roles in reciprocal teaching when they feel comfortable expressing their ideas and opinions in open dialogue (Allen in Nafik, 2014).

Guided Reciprocal Peer Questioning (GRPQ) is a formative assessment in which students question each other about the content they are learning using higher-order, open-ended question stems. The questions are used to promote thinking and generate focused discussions in small groups (Sima Lakdizaji, 2013).

When students ask questions of each other, they activate their own thinking, elicit ideas from others, and promote shared learning within their group. Asking higher-order questions in a mutually supportive peer environment allows students to articulate their thoughts and exchange ideas in ways that differ from their interactions with the teacher. The scaffolded approach to asking questions that they are interested in seeking answers to help them become better questioners. GRPQ supports metacognition as students must think about what they already know or need to know in order to frame their questions (Sima Lakdizaji, 2013).

Questioning is an essential strategy for monitoring student understanding. Typically, questions are asked by the teacher, and responses are used to inform instruction. In Guided Reciprocal Peer Questioning (GRPQ), the students ask the questions, which provide an additional layer of formative assessment information by allowing the teacher to circulate among groups and note the kinds of questions students ask each other and how they respond. Raising a question is an indication of a student's need to understand a concept better. Teachers can carefully listen to the questions asked to identify areas to target in their instruction as well as glean information on students' understanding by listening to their responses to the questions. As teachers circulate among the groups, they can provide feedback on students' responses, probe further, or redirect to focus on a particular insight, particularly when students in a group are having difficulty with a response or the potential for a misconception arises (Kathie Lasater in Researchgate Journal, 2013).



Guided Reciprocal Peer Questioning (GRPQ) is typically used after students have had an opportunity to learn about the concepts in question, drawing on their conceptual understanding developed through instruction: (1) The teacher provides students with a prompt directly related to the lessons or sequence of lessons the questions will target and gives them a few minutes to formulate questions using a list of question stems. Sample Question Stems for Guided Reciprocal Peer Questioning: (a) *What causes ___?*; (b) *How do we know that ___?*; (c) *What is the evidence that supports ___?*; etc; (2) Students work individually to write their own questions based on the material/topic/content area being covered. Students should use as many question stems as possible; (3) Students try to answer the questions they pose. This activity is designed to force students to think about ideas relevant to the content area; (4) Grouped into learning teams based on topic / content area that they choose. Each student offers a question for discussion, using the different stems; (5) Students work individually to write the topic or content area that they choose based on the question they pose.

Free writing is a pre-writing technique in which a person writes continuously for a set period of time without regard to spelling, grammar, or topic. It produces raw, often unusable material, but helps writers overcome blocks of apathy and self-criticism. It is used mainly by prose writers and writing (Robinson in Peter Bowl, 2014).

This statement is supported by Elbow in ELTS journal (2014), he states that the best way to improve our writing is to do free writing exercises routinely. It might do about three times a week for ten minutes later on perhaps fifteen or twenty. Related to this statement, the writer used free writing technique to be applied in teaching writing especially in writing descriptive paragraph. The writer concluded that the aim of this technique was to help the students to be easy to get ideas and to give motivation for students such as always practice even though it just spends several minutes. Through this technique, the writer expected the students to be able to have a new side of thinking about a simple way which might help them to write easily.

There are many definitions of creativity. Kaufman and Sternberg stated that "Creativity is the activity to convey something new. It involves thinking that is aimed at producing ideas or products that are relatively fiction and compelling. Creativity as a supporting element of learning plays an important role in teaching and learning process" (in Anni Fiani, 2012).

In line with that, Haeefe and Mednick (2012: 52) stated that creativity involved the ability to make new combinations. It means that creativity is the ability to make or think a new perspective in bringing something new to consciousness.

From the definitions above, it can be concluded that creativity is one's ability to bear something new in the form of ideas or real work having creative or affective thought. Creativity involves both mental and social processes in order to yield newly developed ideas to convey and share.

Method

The research method used for the research is experiemental study. According to Nazir (2005: 63) an experimental study is a study which is conducted by manipulating the research object. Moreover, Arikunto (2007 : 317) stated that the



experimental research attempts to investigate the influence of one or more variables to other variables. Experimental research has some characteristics as follows: (1) manipulation or treatment of an independent variables; (2) other extraneous variables are controlled; (3) effect is observed of the manipulation of the independent variable on the dependent variable.

By experimental study, the researcher found out the effect of at least one independent variable on one or more dependent variable. This study involved three kinds of variables. The first was independent variable which was including experimental or treatment variable. The independent variable was the teaching technique (X), and creativity, as the second independent variable. The second variable was writing skill as dependent variable (Y). The writer supposed that the relationship between X and Y was changed by the level of a third factor Z, or creativity.

The population of this research was the Second Grade Students at SMA N 1 Wonosari Klaten in the academic year of 2018/2019. There were seven classes for the second grade students of the school. They were divided into two specific subjects; science class and social class. Science class consisted of four classes and social class consisted of three classes. Each class contained 30 students. Therefore, the total number of the whole students was 210 students.

The subject of the research was the second grade students of science 1 and the second grade students of science 2. Each of them consisted of 30 students. The second grade students of science 2 were as experimental class who were taught using GRPQ technique and the second grade students of science 1 were as control class who were taught using Free Writing technique. In this study, the researcher, hence, intended to take random sampling in getting two classes.

The steps in cluster random sampling were: (1) step 1: the researcher determined the sample of this research; (2) step 2: there were two techniques used in this research. They were GRPQ and free writing. The research determined which class was used as an experimental class and control class. The researcher determined the samples into the experimental group and control group randomly; (3) step 3: each class was divided into two groups. Those groups were students who have high creativity and those having low creativity. One of those classes was taught by GRPQ and other class was taught by free writing.

The data were in the form of quantitative data and they were taken from a test. They were the scores of students' writing test after having nine times treatment for each class. The researcher analyzed the data using ANOVA or analysis of variance and Tukey test. In the following table, the design of multifactor analysis of variance is shown.



Table 1. The design of Multifactor Analysis of Variance

Technique	GRPQ (A1)	FREE WRITING (A2)	TOTAL
Creativity			
HIGH (B1)	(A1B1)	(A2B1)	B1
LOW (B2)	(A1B2)	(A2B2)	B2
	A1	A2	

Definition:

- A₁B₁ : The mean score of students having high creativity who are taught by using GRPQ.
- A₁B₂ : The mean score of students having low creativity who are taught by using GRPQ.
- A₂B₁ : The mean score of students having high creativity who are taught by free writing.
- A₂B₂ : The mean score of students having low creativity who are taught by using free writing.
- B₁ : The mean score of the students who are categorized as high creativity students.
- B₂ : The mean score of the students who are categorized as low creativity students.
- A₁ : The mean score of experimental group who is taught by using GRPQ.
- A₂ : The mean score of control group who is taught by using free writing.

Findings and discussion

Research data are taken from the writing posttest. The data are analyzed to get the clear conclusion. The steps that are taken can be classified as the following steps: (1) Data description; (2) Data analysis; and (3) Discussion. These four steps can be classified chronologically and explained clearly as follows:

1. Data Description

The posttest scores are classified into 6 categories: (1) The scores of the students who are taught using GRPQ technique (A₁); (2) the scores of those who are taught using Free Writing technique (A₂); (3) the scores of those having high creativity who are taught using GRPQ (A₁B₁); (4) the scores of those having low creativity who are taught using GRPQ (A₁B₂); (5) the scores of those having high creativity who are taught using Free Writing (A₂B₁); (6) the scores of those having low creativity who are taught using Free Writing (A₂B₂). The followings are the detail descriptions of students' scores in each category.



- a. The scores of the students in the experimental class who are taught using GRPQ technique (A_1)
The data description shows that the range of the scores is 41. The mean is 75.4. The mode is 83. The median is 77.5. And the standard deviation is 12,88.
- b. The scores of the students in the control class who are taught using Free Writing technique (A_2)
The data description shows that the range of the scores is 35. The mean is 70.7. The mode is 71.2. The median is 70. And the standard deviation is 9,35.
- c. The scores of the students having high creativity who are taught using GRPQ technique (A_1B_1)
The data description shows that the range of the scores is 21. The mean is 85.7. The mode is 89.2. The median is 86. And the standard deviation is 6,49.
- d. The scores of the students having low creativity who are taught using GRPQ technique (A_1B_2)
The data description shows that the range of the scores is 22. The mean is 65.1. The mode is 57,5. The median is 65. And the standard deviation is 8,80.
- e. The scores of the students having high creativity who are taught using Free writing technique (A_2B_1)
The data description shows that the range of the scores is 30. The mean is 67.4. The mode is 70,9. The median is 70. And the standard deviation is 9,37.
- f. The scores of the students having low creativity who are taught using Free Writing technique (A_2B_2)
The data description shows that the range of the scores is 27. The mean is 74.1. The mode is 65,5. The median is 75. And the standard deviation is 8.16.

2. Data Analysis

a. Normality

Before analyzing the data for testing the hypotheses, the researcher analyzes the normality and the homogeneity of the data. Based on the data, the reseacher found that the data is normal. It means that the data is ready to distribute.

b. Homogeneity

After analyzing the normality of the sample distribution, the researcher analyzes the homogeneity of the data. Based on the data, the researcher found that the data is homogeneous. It means that the data is ready to be tested by using ANOVA and Tukey test.

They are meant to answer the problems:(1) Is GRPQ technique more effective than Free Writing technique in teaching writing; (2) Is the achievement of the students having high creativity better than those having



low creativity in learning English writing skill?; and (3) Is there an interaction between teaching techniques and students' creativity?

c. ANOVA test (Multifactor Analysis of Variance)

Before the data are analyzed using ANOVA test, the data are divided into eight groups, they are: (1) A_1 which is the data of the students who are taught using GRPQ technique; (2) A_2 which is the data of the students who are taught using Free Writing technique; (3) B_1 which is the data of the students having high creativity; (4) B_2 which is the data of the students having low creativity; (5) A_1B_1 which is the data of the students having high creativity taught using GRPQ technique; (6) A_1B_2 which is the data of the students having low creativity taught using GRPQ technique; (7) A_2B_1 which is the data of the students having high creativity taught using Free Writing technique; and (8) A_2B_2 which is the data of the students having low creativity taught using Free Writing technique.

Table 2. Result of Multifactor Analysis of Variance

Technique	<i>GRPQ</i> (A1)	<i>FREE WRITING</i> (A2)	TOTAL
Creativity			
	$\sum X = 1286$	$\sum X = 1011$	$\sum r_1 = 2297$
HIGH (B1)	$X = 85.7$	$X = 67.4$	$Xr_1 = 76.6$
	(A ₁ B ₁)	(A ₂ B ₁)	B1
	$\sum X = 976$	$\sum X = 1111$	$\sum r_2 = 2087$
LOW (B2)	$X = 65.1$	$X = 74.1$	$Xr_2 = 69.6$
	(A ₁ B ₂)	(A ₂ B ₂)	B2
	$\sum c_1 = 2262$	$\sum c_2 = 2122$	$\sum Xt = 4384$
	$Xc_1 = 75.4$	$Xc_2 = 70.7$	$Xt = 73.1$
	A1	A2	$\sum Xt^2 = 32990$

Based on the result of the table above, it can be concluded that the mean score of experimental group who is taught by using GRPQ (A_1) = 75.4 was higher than the mean score of control group who is taught by using free writing (A_2) = 70.7. It can be concluded that the students who are taught by using GRPQ have better writing skill than students who are taught by using free writing.



Based on the result of the table above, it can be concluded that the mean score of the students who are categorized as high creativity students (B1) = 76.6 was higher than the mean score of the students who are categorized as low creativity students (B2) = 69.6. It can be concluded that the students who have high level of creativity have better writing skill than the students who have low level of creativity.

Table 3. The summary of a 2 x 2 multifactor analysis of variance

Source of Variance	SS	df	MS	Fo	Ft (.05)
Between Columns (Teaching Techniques)	326.6	1	326.6	4.85	4.00
Between Rows (Creativity)	734.9	1	734.9	10.90	4.00
Columns by Rows (Interaction)	2801.9	1	2801.9	41.57	4.00
Between groups	3863.4	3	1287.8		
Within Groups	3776.3	56	67.4		
Total	7639.7	59			

d. Tukey test

After using multifactor analysis of variance, the researcher analyzes the data using Tukey test. The following is the analysis of the data using Tukey test.

- 1) Between A₁ – A₂ or columns (GRPQ compared with Free Writing)

$$q = \frac{\bar{X}_{c1} - \bar{X}_{c2}}{\sqrt{\text{Error variance}/n}}$$

$$q = \frac{75.4 - 70.7}{\sqrt{67.4/30}} = \frac{4.5}{1.4} = \mathbf{3.21}$$

The computation illustrates that q_o (**3.21**) is higher than q_t (2.89)

- 2) Between B₁ – B₂ or rows (Student having high creativity compared with the students having low creativity)

$$q = \frac{\bar{X}_{c1} - \bar{X}_{c2}}{\sqrt{\text{Error variance}/n}}$$

$$q = \frac{76.6 - 69.6}{\sqrt{67.4/30}} = \frac{7}{1.4} = \mathbf{5.00}$$

The computation illustrates that q_o (**5.00**) is higher than q_t (2.89)

- 3) Between A₁B₁ – A₂B₁ (Experimental group compared with control group for students having high creativity)

$$q = \frac{\bar{X}_{c1r1} - \bar{X}_{c2r1}}{\sqrt{\text{Error variance}/n}}$$

$$q = \frac{85.7 - 67.4}{\sqrt{67.4/15}} = \frac{18.3}{4.5} = \mathbf{4.07}$$



The computation illustrates that q_0 (**4.07**) is higher than q_t (3.01)

- 4) Between $A_1B_2 - A_2B_2$ (Experimental group compared with control group for students having low creativity)

$$q = \frac{\bar{X}_{c_1r_2} - \bar{X}_{c_2r_2}}{\sqrt{\text{Error variance}/n}}$$

$$q = \frac{74.1 - 65.1}{\sqrt{67.4/15}} = \frac{9}{4.5} = \mathbf{2.00}$$

The computation illustrates that q_0 (**2.00**) is higher than q_t (3.01)

Based on the result above, there is an interaction effect between two variables (teaching techniques and creativity) on the ability to write. This is showed by the F_0 between columns by rows (**41.57**) is higher than $F_t(.05)$ (4.08). It can be concluded that there is an interaction effect between the two variables, the teaching techniques and students' creativity.

3. Discussion

Based on the summary of a 2 x 2 Multifactor Analysis of Variance, it can be concluded that:

- a. F_0 between columns (**4.85**) is higher than $F_t(.05)$ (4.00), so the difference between columns is significant. It means that the null hypothesis (H_0) which states that there is no significant difference in writing skill between the students who are taught by using GRPQ and students who are taught by using free writing is rejected. It can be concluded that teaching writing using GRPQ technique to the second grade students at SMA N 1 Wonosari is significantly different from the one using Free Writing technique. The mean score of students taught using GRPQ technique (75.4) is higher than the one of those taught using Free Writing technique (70.7). It means that teaching writing using GRPQ technique to the second grade students of SMA N 1 Wonosari is more effective than the one using Free Writing technique.
- b. F_0 between rows (**10.90**) is higher than $F_t(.05)$ (4.00), so the difference between rows is significant. It means that the null hypothesis (H_0) which states that there is no significant difference in writing skill between the students who have high level of creativity and students who have low level of creativity is rejected. It can be concluded that students having high creativity demonstrate a significantly different result in their learning from the ones having low creativity. The mean score of students having high creativity (76.6) is higher than the one of those having low creativity (69.6). It means that the achievement of teaching writing to the students having high creativity is better than the one to the students having low creativity.
- c. F_0 between columns by rows (**41.57**) is higher than $F_t(.05)$ (4.00), so it can be concluded that there is an interaction effect between the two variables, the teaching techniques and students' creativity. It means that the null



hypothesis (H_0) which states that there is no interaction between teaching techniques and students' creativity in writing is rejected. It also means that the effect of teaching techniques on the student's writing skill depends on the student's creativity level. In this case, GRPQ technique is more suitable for students with high creativity while Free Writing technique is more suitable for students with low creativity.

Based on the summary of Tukey test, it can be concluded that:

- a. q_0 between columns (**3.21**) is higher than q_t (2.89), so the difference between columns is significant. It can be concluded that teaching writing using GRPQ technique to the second grade students at SMA N 1 Wonosari is significantly different from the one using Free Writing technique. The mean score of students taught using GRPQ technique (75.4) is higher than the one of those taught using Free Writing technique (70.7). It means that teaching writing using GRPQ technique to the second grade students at SMA N 1 Wonosari is more effective than the one using Free Writing technique.
- b. q_0 between rows (**5.00**) is higher than q_t (2.89), so the difference between rows is significant. It can be concluded the students who have high creativity are significantly different in writing skill achievement from the students who have low creativity. The mean score of students having high creativity (76.6) is higher than the one of those who having low creativity (69.6), so the students who have high creativity have a better writing skill achievement than the students who have low creativity.
- c. q_0 between columns for students with high creativity (**4.07**) is higher than q_t (3.01), so the difference between columns for students with high creativity is significant. It can be concluded that teaching writing using GRPQ technique to the second grade students having high creativity is significantly different from the one using Free Writing technique. The mean score of students having high creativity taught using GRPQ technique (85.7) is higher than the one of those taught using Free Writing technique (67.4). It means that teaching writing using GRPQ technique to the second grade students having high creativity is more effective than the one using free writing technique.
- d. q_0 (**2.00**) is lower than q_t (3.01), so the difference between columns for students with low creativity is not significant. It can be concluded that teaching writing using GRPQ technique to the second grade students having low creativity is not significantly different from the one using Free Writing technique. It means that students with low creativity will end up or will "almost" the same result when they taught using both techniques, GRPQ and Free Writing.



Based on the result of Tukey test at point c and d above, it can be concluded that there is an interaction between teaching techniques and creativity. It means that teaching writing using GRPQ technique to the second grade students having high creativity is more effective than the one using free writing technique. While, in this case, students with low creativity will end up or will “almost” the same result when they are taught using both techniques, GRPQ and Free Writing

Conclusion

Based on the discussion, the research findings are as follows: (1) GRPQ technique is more effective than Free Writing technique to teach writing for the second grade students of senior high school. The result of the study shows F_o between columns (**4.85**) is higher than $F_t(.05)$ (4.08). It indicates that the difference between writing skill of the students taught by using GRPQ technique and those who taught by using Free Writing technique is significant. It is also supported by the result of Tukey test. q_o between columns (**3.21**) is higher than q_t (2.89), so the difference between columns is significant. It can be concluded that teaching writing using GRPQ technique to the second grade students at SMA N 1 Wonosari is significantly different from the one using Free Writing technique. The mean score of students taught using GRPQ technique (75.4) is higher than the one of those taught using Free Writing technique (70.9). It means that teaching writing using GRPQ technique to the second grade students at SMA N 1 Wonosari is more effective than the one using Free Writing technique.; (2) the writing achievement of the second grade students of senior high school having high creativity is better than those having low creativity. From the data analysis, F_o between rows (**10.90**) is higher than $F_t(.05)$ (4.08), so the difference between rows is significant. It can be concluded that students having high creativity demonstrate a significantly different result in their learning from the ones having low creativity. It is shown that students with high creativity are able to show better competence in expressing their ideas in hortatory exposition essay. The Tukey test also shows that the q_o between rows (**5.00**) is higher than q_t (2.89), so the difference between rows is significant. It can be concluded the students who have high creativity are significantly different in writing skill achievement from the students who have low creativity. The mean score of students having high creativity (76.6) is higher than the one of those who having low creativity (69.6), so the students who have high creativity have a better writing skill achievement than the students who have low creativity.; (3) there is an interaction between teaching techniques and students' creativity in teaching writing for the second grade students of senior high school. This is showed by the F_o between columns by rows (**41.57**) is higher than $F_t(.05)$ (4.08). It can be concluded that there is an interaction effect between the two variables, the teaching techniques and students' creativity. GRPQ technique is clearly more suitable for students with high creativity while Free Writing is suitable for students with low creativity.

Based on the research findings, the conclusion is that the GRPQ technique is an effective teaching technique for teaching writing to the second grade students of senior high school. Since GRPQ technique is simple, fun, and arousing students' creativity in generating, organizing and developing their ideas, students



are getting more active and more encouraged to study writing and improve their writing skills. As a result, the students' writing achievement will improve optimally. The result of this study shows that the technique of GRPQ is better than Free Writing in English writing skill. It implies that the GRPQ is appropriately applied in teaching writing, particularly to the second grade students of Senior High School.

It implies that the use of GRPQ technique in teaching writing is more effective, meaningful, communicative, and integrated than the technique of Free Writing. From that result, ideally, this technique has to be implemented in the class in order to achieve optimal result. By applying this technique, the teacher has some roles. They are monitoring, motivating, guiding, and helping the group when their students are sharing ideas about specific topic. It can be applied by the teacher to improve their creativity and thinking skill. Here are steps for implementing GRPQ. At least there are five steps in this process : (1) write questions based on the topic or content area; (2) answer all of the questions; (3) make groups based on the topic or content area; (4) share the ideas with others; (5) reflect them on a piece of paper.

Besides, the result of the study also shows that high creativity students have a better result of writing than low creativity students. It is not only for getting good scores but also for achieving good writing skill that is useful for their future. It means that the technique of GRPQ is more suitable for high creativity students in improving their writing skill.

References

- Allen. S. (2014). *Teaching Writing using Guided Reciprocal Peer Questioning*. California, USA: Thomson Learning Inc.
- Arikunto, S. (2007). *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Yogyakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Bowl, P. (2014). *Writing Without Teachers* (2nd Ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Craft, A., Jeffrey, B., & Leibling, M. (2007). *Creativity in Education* (3rd Ed.). Great Britain: Continuum Intl Pub Group.
- Elbow, P. (2014). *Writing with Power* (5th Ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gamoul, A & Suleiman, M.D. (2011). Students and investigating teachers' and students' attitudes towards writing practice. *Teaching and Assessing Writing Strategies for Secondary School Journals Ins J Edu Sci, Volume 3 (1)* : pp 25-36



- Haefele, S.A., & Mednick, S.C. (2012). *Encyclopedia of Creativity*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Kaufman, J.C., & Sternberg, R.J. (2010). *The Cambridge Handbook of Creativity*. New York, America: Cambridge University Press.
- King, A., Millis, B.J., & Cottell, P.G. (2004). *From Sage on the Stage to Guide on the Side*. New York, America: College Teaching Press.
- Lakdizaji, S & Lasater, K. (2013). Impact of Guided Reciprocal Peer Questioning on the Disposition of Critical Thinking. *Thrita Journal of Medical Science, Volume 2 (3); p 10-14*
- Nazir, M. (2005). *Metode Penelitian*. Bogor: Ghalia Indonesia.
- Wallace, J. (2011). *Using Questioning and Facebook Media in Writing*. Great Britain: The Bath Press.

