COMPARATIVE STUDY BETWEEN SCAFFOLDING TECHNIQUE AND GUIDED WRITING TO IMPROVE STUDENTS' WRITING ABILITY AT NINTH GRADE OF SMPN 5 TOLITOLI

Andriana
Students of English Education Study Program
Email: annaandri21@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The objective of this research was to find out the significant difference between scaffolding technique and guided writing improving students' writing ability at the ninth grade of SMPN 5 Tolitoli. It was a true-experimental research. It was conducted at ninth grade of SMP Negeri 5 Tolitoli. The researcher gave a pre-test to measure the students' previous ability in writing. After gave treatment scaffolding technique and guided writing, the researcher gave post-test to the students. In analyze the data collection the researcher use SPSS 21 program. Based on data analysis showed that, there was significant effect of scaffolding technique and guided writing in students' writing ability. The mean score of post test in scaffolding technique (84,05) was higher than the mean score of pre-test (52,00). And the mean score of post-test in guided writing (86,60) was higher than the mean score of pre-test (52,05). Although, the improvement in guided writing was higher than scaffolding technique but the testing of hypothesis showed that the value of t_{count} was lower than t_{table} (-0,755≤2.024). Hence, there was no a significance difference of students' achievement score between who were thought scaffolding technique and guided writing at ninth the grade of SMPN 5 Tolitoli.
Keywords: Comparative, scaffolding technique, guided writing, writing ability.

ABSTRAK

Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah mencari signifikan dari tehnik scaffolding dan guided writing terhadap kemampuan menulis siswa kelas sembilan SMPN 5 Tolitoli. Desain penelitian ini adalah True-experimental. Dilaksanakan pada kelas sembilan SMPN 5 Tolitoli. Peneliti memberikan pretest untuk memastikan kemampuan menulis siswa sebelumya. Setelah memberikan teknik scaffolding dan guided writing, peneliti memberikan post test kepada siswa. Dalam analisi pengumpulan data, peneliti mengunakan program SPSS 2. Berdasarkan data analisi menunjukan bahwa ada efek yang signifikan dari tehnik scaffolding dan guided writing terhadap kemampuan menulis siswa. Nilai rata-rata post test pada tehnik scaffolding (84,05) lebih tinggi dari pada nilai rata-rata pre test (52,00). Dan nilai rata-rata post test pada guided writing (86,60) lebih tinggi dari pada nilai rata-rata pre test (52,05). Walaupun, peningkatan dalam guided writing lebih efektif dari pada tehnik scaffolding tetapi tes dari hipotesis menunjukkan nilai dari t-hitung lebih rendah dari pada nilai t-tabel ((-0,755≤2.024). Karenanya, disana tidak ada perbedaan signifikan dari skor pencapaian siswa antara yang mengunakan tehnik scaffolding dan guided writing pada tingkat 9 dari SMPN 5 Tolitoli.

***Kata kunci:** Perbandingan, tehnik scaffolding, guided writing, kemampuan menulis.*

1.Introduction

In English writing is one of important skill which the student must be learnt. According to the Zemach and Rumisek (2005: 54), there are three reason of writing is important: First, when teacher has been working within the class, writing can reinforce vocabulary, idiom and grammatical structure. Second, students can express their idea with the language. Third, the students can involve with their self, language and the readers.

Krisbiantoro (2015:156) statet that writing is a mental and physical act of communicating words to reader for a specific purpose productively and systematically. Peha (2010: 58) states that writing is a form of communication with audience. Therefore, writing as a activity in arrange ideas or word into a sentence.

Yulia Vonna (2015) divides two complementary roles of writing. First, in this skill to accomplish a variety of goals, such as writing report or expressing an opinion with the support of evidence have to use several strategies such as planning, evaluating, and revising text. Second, writing can be as a tool for learning a subject matter so students' knowledge can extending and deepening.

Writing can as a efficient tool in reinforce other language skills such as vocabulary, grammar, and reading skills. Graham and Hebert (2010: 9) define that writing can develop other skills especially reading. It is can help students to understand their writing. Teacher must

In writing, there are several aspect of writing that student have to know. Both of them are organize and grammar. The students have to be able to organize their ideas and can use correct grammar in their writing. Because of that, in this research the researcher use two techniques to help students in organize ideas and using of grammar. There are scaffolding techniques and guided writing.

Scaffolding is a technique to help, solve students problem and make students become independent learner with give several example and act. Vygotsky (1996) said that scaffolding is a process that did by an expert to a subject in process of learning in Zone of Proximal Development. It can from friends, tutor or teacher. Teacher as a facilitator help the students to understand material in learning process. Suyono and Hariyanto (2014: 113). Other word, scaffolding is to provide help or assistance for the learners in learning something. The assistance allows the students to be independent learners.

According to Angela Lui (2012) there are advantages of scaffolding technique for students and teachers.

     a. For Students:
1. Challenging but reasonable tasks that can stimulate of thinking and motivate the students to efforts for learn.
2. Meaningful instruction and feedback that helps the students to development in appropriate pace.
3. A learning environment where they are valued as individuals, group, and a class.
4. Students can develop their creativity.

    b. For Teachers:

1. Teacher can know the strength and the weakness of individual or group of students.
2. Encourage the students to interaction in social.
3. Teacher can set of students' learning process in a small or large group. .
4. Teacher can know to solve the problem of each student.

The disadvantages of scaffolding is the teacher need many time in apply this technique. Classroom with many students would be challenging the teacher in implementation of scaffolds.

Teachers should prepare methods that support students' skills with an approach that suits their needs (Malik, A.R 2020; Malik, 2019; Asnur dkk, 2019, Darwis, 2020, T. Jacub 2020, Burhan & Saugadi 2017). Handayani (2013) told guided writing is a technique that use by the teacher in a process of teaching and based on students need. Teacher guided the students from how to begin until finish the writing. Dyan (2010) added that guided writing is a process which the teacher give exercise, question, structure sentence, grammar, vocabulary building and reading comprehension to build students' writing skill.

Whereas Frase (2008) mentions the advantages and disadvantages of guided writing.

a. The advantages of guided writing
   1. Teacher teach based on the need of the groups;
   2. Teacher can observe and respond to individuals' needs;
   3. Teacher encourages students to discuss writing;
   4. Teacher builds students' confidence.
b. The disadvantages of guided writing
   1. The model text given by the teacher might be too limiting the student creative thoughts about content of the writing.
   2. In teaching and learning process the teachers spend many times.
   3. Classes with many learners will need teachers in providing tutoring.

In teaching writing the researcher found many problems about students' writing ability. The problems are organization and grammar. The students cannot arrange a good idea (organize) and make many grammatical mistakes. Thus, to overcome the problem the researcher decides to use two techniques. The techniques are scaffolding technique and guided writing. These techniques can improve students' writing ability especially can help students in using right grammar and organize their ideas for their writing. Based on the explanation above the researcher would like to compare scaffolding technique and guided writing to know which both of the technique can give more improving of students writing ability.

2. Method of the Research

True experimental design was used by the researcher in this research. This research involved of pre test, treatment and post test. Firstly, pretest was given by the researcher to know students previous ability. The researcher gave post test after conducted scaffolding technique and guided writing to find out the significance.

The researcher focused on two classes as the sample they are IX A and IX B. The treatment gave to experiment classes in four meeting. Total number of sample 40 students.

3. Findings and Discussion
3.1 The Result of Pretest in Scaffolding Technique

Pre-test was given before treatment. This step to measure students' writing ability in procedure text, there were 20 students as the sample who was given time to write down how to make something (food/drink). The pre test score of experiment class in scaffolding technique as follow:

No	Initial	Organization	Language Use	Acquired	Total score	Criteria
1	AGG	2	2	4	50	failed
2	ANM	3	2	5	63	failed
3	MFN	2	2	4	50	failed
4	MID	2	3	5	63	failed
5	MSN	2	2	4	50	failed
6	MRT	2	2	4	50	failed
7	MFA	1	1	2	25	failed
8	MKB	2	2	4	50	failed
9	HDS	2	2	4	50	failed
10	KJM	2	2	4	50	failed
11	RHS	2	2	4	50	failed
12	NBZ	3	2	5	63	failed
13	NSF	3	2	5	63	failed
14	ADS	2	2	4	50	failed
15	NRZ	2	2	4	50	failed
16	NDN	2	2	4	50	failed
17	SRM	3	2	5	63	failed
18	NZA	2	2	4	50	failed
19	WHD	2	2	4	50	failed
20	NFL	2	2	4	50	failed
TOTAL		43	40	83	1040	

3.2 The Result of Pretest in Guided Writing

No	Initial	Organization	Language use	Acquired	Total Score	Criteria
1	FRA	2	2	4	50	Failed
2	VRF	3	2	5	63	Failed
3	MLN	2	2	4	50	Failed
4	VRK	2	2	4	50	Failed
5	ELD	3	2	5	63	Failed

6	DVN	2	2	4	50	Failed
7	INM	3	2	5	63	Failed
8	DRA	2	2	4	50	Failed
9	ERV	2	2	4	50	Failed
10	MLD	2	2	4	50	Failed
11	MHR	2	2	4	50	Failed
12	SRD	2	2	4	50	Failed
13	MHS	2	1	3	38	Failed
14	HRD	2	2	4	50	Failed
15	GSD	3	2	5	63	Failed
16	SFR	2	2	4	50	Failed
17	JVF	3	2	5	63	Failed
18	ADP	1	1	2	25	Failed
19	WYN	2	2	4	50	Failed
20	MHF	3	2	5	63	Failed
TOTAL		45	38	83	1041	

3.3 The Result of Posttest in Scaffolding Technique

No	Initial	Organization	Language use	Acquired	Total Score	Criteria
1	AGG	3	4	7	88	successful
2	ANM	4	3	7	88	successful
3	MFN	4	3	7	88	successful
4	MID	4	3	7	88	successful
5	MSN	2	3	5	63	Failed
6	MRT	4	4	8	100	successful
7	MFA	3	3	6	75	successful
8	MKB	4	3	7	88	successful
9	HDS	4	4	8	100	successful
10	KJM	4	4	8	100	successful
11	RHS	4	3	7	88	successful
12	NBZ	4	3	7	88	successful
13	NSF	4	3	7	88	successful
14	ADS	2	3	5	63	Failed
15	NRZ	3	3	6	75	successful
16	NDN	3	2	5	63	Failed

17	SRM	4	3	7	88	successful
18	NZA	3	3	6	75	successful
19	WHD	3	3	6	75	successful
20	NFL	4	4	8	100	successful
TOTAL		70	64	134	1681	

3.4 The Result of Posttest in Guided Writing

No	Initial	Organization	Language use	Acquired	Total Score	Criteria
1	FRA	4	4	8	100	successful
2	VRF	4	3	7	88	successful
3	MLN	3	3	6	75	successful
4	VRK	4	3	7	88	successful
5	ELD	4	3	7	88	successful
6	DVN	3	3	6	75	successful
7	INM	4	4	8	100	successful
8	DRA	4	3	7	88	successful
9	ERV	4	3	7	88	successful
10	MLD	4	4	8	100	successful
11	MHR	4	3	7	88	successful
12	SRD	4	3	7	88	successful
13	MHS	2	3	5	63	failed
14	HRD	4	3	7	88	successful
15	GSD	4	3	7	88	successful
16	SFR	4	3	7	88	successful
17	JVF	4	3	7	88	successful
18	ADP	4	3	7	88	successful
19	WYN	3	3	6	75	successful
20	MHF	4	3	7	88	successful
TOTAL		75	63	138	1732	

4. Discussion
4.1 The Result of Observation

The researcher discussed the procedure of applied in classroom and the result of the data analysis. The discussion was intended to know whether using scaffolding technique and guided writing can improve students' writing ability at the ninth grade of SMPN 5 Tolitoli or not.

The first step of this research was conducted the pretest. Pre-test was conducted at the first meeting to both of experiment class. Pre-test is aimed to measure the students' writing ability at the first time. In conducting pre-test on the experimental class IX A there were 20 students as a sample who were must be writing. After getting students' result of the pre-test, the researcher analyzed students' score statistically used formula where the obtained score times 100 and divided maximum score. Then, The score of pre-test was found in experimental class were 20 students (100%) got poor score.

The researcher concluded that the IX A class of SMPN 5 Tolitoli still poor in writing. In the same step also conducted at IX B class. After pre-test was given, the researcher computed the students' individual and arranged the students from the highest to lowest to know the position of student. From 20 students of IX B all of the students got poor score (100%).

Homogeneity test is the second step in this research. Test of homogeneity was done to know whether sample in the research came from population that had some variance or not. To know the homogeneity of test, the researcher compares the result of pre-test (f_{score}) with (f_{table}). Hence, H_o was accepted if the obtained score (f_{score}) was lower than the f_{table} or equal. The result of homogeneity in pretest, the obtained sig = 0,211>0,05 and the result of homogeneity in posttest, the obtained sig = 0,735>0,05. It meant that the variance score between classes was homogeneous. After homogeneity test was done, the researcher continued to the step was treatment. Treatment was given to both of the experimental class with scaffolding technique and guided writing. The researcher used four meetings in the treatment steps.

In scaffolding technique the treatments as followed:

a. The first meeting was conducted on August 2nd 2019. Firstly, the researcher told about the scaffolding technique, including definition and the advantages to the students. After that, the researcher explained about definition, structure, and feature language of procedure text. Then, the researcher gave to students an example of procedure text with the title "how to make nasi uduk". Then, the students read the example and the researcher explained the part of structure text and feature language in the example. Next, the researcher divided students into four groups, each group consist five of students. And then, the researcher gave group of students a task about procedure text, the form of task is illustrative form and also researcher showed to the students the real object that related with the task. Then, the students discussed and worked together to finish the task and also the researcher help the students when work their task. After students finished the task, the researcher asked to the group of students to

explain their result of discuss about the task with represent by one of member of group. Then, the researcher responded and checked students' task. After that, the researcher gave evaluation to each student to make a procedure text. And the last, students collected their procedure text that they made.

b. The second meeting, the researcher was conducted on August 8th 2019. In this treatment, the researcher asked the students about material that was explained in the first treatment to make students remember about the material. Then, the students were given a procedure text with the title "How to make a cup of coffee". Then, the students read the example and the researcher explained the part of structure text and feature language in the example. Next, the researcher asked the students to work with group that was divided by the researcher in the first treatment. And then, the researcher gave the students a task about procedure text and also researcher showed to the students the real object that related with the task. Then, the students worked and discussed with their friends to finish the task and also the researcher help the students. After students finished the task, the researcher asked to the group of students to explain their result of discuss about the task with represent by one of member of group. Then, the researcher responded and checked students' task. Next, the researcher gave evaluation to each student to make a procedure text. After the students made their procedure text, they collected their evaluation to the researcher.

c. The third meeting, the researcher was conducted on August 16th 2019. In this treatment, the researcher asked the students about material that was explained by the researcher. After that, the students were given an example of procedure text with the title "How to make pan cake" by the researcher. Then, the students read the example and the researcher explained the part of sructure text and feature language in the example. Next, the students were asked to work together with their friend in the group. And then, the researcher gave the students a task about procedure text and showed to the students the real object that related with the task. Then, the students discussed and worked together to finish the task and also the researcher help the students. After students finished the task, the students explained their result of discuss about the task with represent by one of member of group. Then, the researcher responded and checked students' task. After that, the researcher gave evaluation again to each student to make a procedure text. Then, students collected their procedure text.

d. The last meeting, the researcher was conducted on August 2²th 2019. In last treatment, the researcher gave an example of procedure text with the title "How to make ice cream". Then, the students read the example and the researcher explained the part of structure text and feature language in the example. Next, the students were asked to work together with their friend in the group. And then, the researcher gave the students a task about procedure text. Then, the students discussed and worked together to finish the task and also the researcher help the students when work their

task. After students finished the task, the students explained their result of discuss about the task with represent by one of member of group. Then, the researcher responded and checked students' task. After that, the researcher gave evaluation to each student to make a procedure text. The last, students collected their procedure text.

In guided writing treatment as followed:

a. The first meeting, the researcher was conducted on August 1st 2019. The researcher explained to the students about guided writing and the advantages. Then, the researcher explained about definition, structure and feature language of procedure text. After that, the researcher gave worksheet or an example of procedure text to students with title "how to make nasi uduk", and then the researcher asked the students to read and understand the text. Next, the researcher helps the students in identification of structure and language feature of the procedure text. The researcher showed to students the part of structure and feature language that there in the example. In the worksheet that was given by the researcher, there are several questions that related with the procedure text. Then, to make students more understand the researcher asked the students to answer the questions. The students wrote the answer in a paper and the researcher read the question and asked the students to direct answer, there are several students answered the questions. After that, the researcher divided students into four groups, in each group consist of five students. Then, the students were given exercise about procedure text and the form of task is transformation form or students have to rearrange the random word into a good sentence. After that, the students discussed with their friends in work the task. Then, the researcher asked the students to collect their exercise and checked or assed students' task. After that, the researcher gave individual assignment to students, the assignment is the students have to make a procedure text. The students were given several questions to guided and help them when they wrote the procedure text. As long as worked the assignment the students answered each questions before wrote the text. The last, the researcher asked to students to collect their procedure text.

b. The second meeting, the researcher was conducted on August 7th 2019. In this treatment, the researcher asked the students about material that was explained in the first treatment to make students remember about the material. After that, the researcher gave worksheet or an example of procedure text to students with title "How to make a cup of coffee", and then the students read and understand the text. After read the text the students was help by researcher to identification the structure and language feature of the procedure text. The researcher showed to students the part of structure and feature language that there in the example. The students also were given several questions and then the students answered the questions. After that, the researcher asked the students to work with their group that was divided by the researcher. Then, the students were given exercise about procedure text and the form of task still same with in the first treatment. Next, the students discussed with   their friend to finish

the task. After finished the task, the researcher checked or assed the result task of students. After that, the researcher gave individual assignment to the students to make a procedure text and also was given several questions to guide and help them when made their procedure text. Before wrote their text the students answered each questions. The last, the researcher asked to students to collect their text.

c. The third meeting, the researcher was conducted on August 8th 2019. In this treatment, the researcher asked the students about material was explained by researcher. After that, the students were given a procedure text with title "How to make pan cake", and then the students read and understand the text. Next, the students were helped by researcher to identification the structure and language feature of the procedure text and also showed to students the part of structure and feature language that there in the example. Then, the students were given several questions and then the students answered the questions. After that, the students work with their groups. And then, the researcher gave exercise about procedure text to students. Next, the students discussed with their friend to finish the task. After finished the task, the researcher gave assed for students result task of. Next, the researcher gave assignment to write about procedure text to students and also several questions to guided and help them when made their procedure text. Next, the students answered the questions and after that wrote their text. The last, the researcher asked to students to collect their text.

d. The last meeting, the researcher was conducted on August 15th 2019. In last treatment, the researcher gave an example of procedure text with the title "How to make ice cream". After that, the students read and understand the text. The researcher help and showed to students the part of structure and feature language that there in the example. Then, the students were given several questions and then answered the questions. After that, the students work with their groups. And then, the researcher gave exercise about procedure text to students. Next, the students discussed with their friend to finish the task. Then, the researcher gave assed for students result task after students finished their task. Next, the researcher gave assignment to write about procedure text to students and also several questions to guided and help them when made their procedure text. Next, the students answered the questions and after that wrote their text. The last, the researcher asked to students to collect their text.

After all of the treatment conducted in this research, the researcher conducted the posttest. The post-test was given to scaffolding technique class (IX A) aimed to measuring the students' improvement on the score of experimental class or not. In the post-test, the researcher gave a worksheet to the students and asked them to write a procedure text. After getting students' score of post-test, the researcher analyzed students' score statistically used formula where the obtained score times 100 and divided by maximum score. The researcher found that the most of students got success score. Total of the students who got successful score was 20 students. The percentage was 15% with 3 student and classified into poor

grade, the percentages was 20% with 4 student and classified into fair grade, the percentages was 45% with 9 students and classified into very good grade, and the last percentage was 20% with 4 students and classified into excellent grade. The researcher concluded that the students of scaffolding technique (IX A) were improved students' writing ability.

The same step also conducted in guided writing class (IX B), after post-test was given the researcher computed the students' individual score and average the students from the highest to the lowest in order to know the position of the students. Total of the students who got successful score was 20 students. The percentages was 5% with 1 students and classified into poor grade, the percentages was 15% with 3 students and classified into fair grade, the percentages was 65% with 13 students and classified into very good grade, and the last percentage was 15% with 3 students and classified into excellent grade. The researcher concluded that the students of guided writing class (IX B) were improved students' writing ability.

After post-test was done, the researcher used Normality test. Test normality was used to find out whether data of IX A (scaffolding technique class) and IX B (guided writing class) which had been collected from the research came from normal distribution or not. The result computation was used one-sample kolmogorov-smirnov formula, if the test was higher than 0,05 (sign>α) meant that the data spared of research result distribute normally. The researcher found the result of normality test of pretest and posttest that was significance. There was sign>α or 0,063 >0,05 in pre-test and there was sign>α or 0,270 >0,05 in post-test. In conclusion, the data of pre-test and post-test both of class IX A and IX B as distributed normally.

The last step of this research was t-test. After finish count standard deviation and variance, it could be concluded that both group had no differences in the test of similarity between two variance in post-test score. So, to differentiate if the students result of both of experiment class after getting treatments were significant or not, the researcher used t-test to test the hypothesis where $H_a = t_c > t_t$, $H_o = t_c < t_t$. To saw the difference between both of experiment class the researcher used SPSS 21.0 program (independent-sample T test) to analyze the data collection.

After the researcher got the result of t-test. Then, it would be consulted to the critical score or t_t to check whether the difference is significant or not. It was found that $t_c = - 0,755$. Furthermore, t_{count} score was compared with t_{table} score with df = 38 on the standard of significant 0,05 so it was found that $t_t = 2.024$. Because of $t_c = - 0,755 < t_t = 2.024$ so it could be concluded that "H_o = There was no significant difference between the teaching writing ability through Scaffolding technique and guided writing technique" was **accepted** and "H_a = There was significant difference between the teaching writing ability through scaffolding technique and guided writing" was **rejected**.

The result of t-score was lower than the critical score on the table, because of that there was no a significance difference in writing ability score between students were scaffolding technique and guided writing for the ninth grade students of SMPN 5 Tolitoli.

4.2 Result of Homogeneity Test

Test of homogeneity was done to know whether sample in the research come from population that had same variance or no. To know the homogeneity of test, the researcher compares the result of pre-test (f_{score}) with (f_{table}). Hence, H_o was accepted if the obtained score (f_{score}) was lower than the f_{table} or equal. Base on homogeneity test result of pre test, obtained sig = 0,211>0,05 and also the homogeneity test result of post test, obtained sig = 0,735>0,05. It meant that the variance score between classes was homogeneous.

4.3 Result of Normality Test

Test of normality used to find out the data of experiment classes which had been collected come from normal distribution or not. To analyze the test the researcher use one-sample kolmogorov-smirnov-test. Based on the result of pre test, it can be seen that there was sign>α or 0,063 was higher than 0.05 and also the result of post test, there was sign>α or 0,270 was higher than 0.05. Thus, it can be concluded that the data of pre test and post test of both experimental class was distributed normally.

4.4 Result of T-test

The researcher used t-test to test the hypothesis where $h_a=t_c>t_t$ $h_0=t_c<t_t$. to see the difference between the experimental and control group, the researcher used SPSS 21.0 program (independent sample test) to analyze the data collection. It was found that that t_c =- 0,755Futhermore, t_{count} score was compared with t_{table} score with df = 38 on the standard of significant 0,05, so it was found that t_t = 2,024. Because of t_c = - 0,755. $<t_t$ = 2,024 so it could be concluded that "H_o = There was no significant difference between the teaching writing ability through Scaffolding technique and guided writing technique" was **accepted** and "H_a = There was significant difference between the teaching writing ability through scaffolding technique and guided writing" was **rejected**.

5. Conclusion

Based on the findings and discussion in previous chapter, it could be concluded that through scaffolding technique and guided writing could improve students' writing ability. The result of the data analysis showed that the average score of IX A (the students who were through scaffolding technique) was for the 52,00 pre-test and 84,05 for the post-test. The average score of IX B (the students who were through guided writing) was 52,05 for the pre-test and 86,60 for the post-test.

Scaffolding technique and guided writing was effective to improve students' writing ability at the ninth grade of SMPN 5 Tolitoli in academic year of 2019/2020. Although, both of the technique could improve students' writing ability but just guided writing is more effective. The obtained score of t-test showed that t-score - 0,755was lower than t-table 2.024. It meant that Ho was accepted and Ha was rejected. Since, the *tcount* was lower than *ttable*, there was

no significance difference in the achievement students in class IX A who were thought scaffolding technique and students in class IX B who were thought guided writing.

References

Asnur, M. N. A., Adhima, F., Ayuwijayanti, M., & Marsuki, R. R. (2019). Karaketristik Pembelajaran Kolaboratif Bahasa Asing dalam Google Classroom. In *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Literasi Bahasa Dan Sastra Ke-4 Pembelajaran Bahasa Asing Di Era Digital.*

Burhan, B., & Saugadi, S. (2017). Peranan Guru Terhadap Mutu Pendidikan. *Visipena Journal*, *8*(1)

Darwis, A. (2020). IMPROVING SOCIAL SCIENCE LEARNING OUTCOMES BY USING THE LEARNING MODEL THINK PAIR SHARE VIIB CLASS STUDENTS SMP 4 TOLITOLI. *Jurnal Madako Education*, *6*(1).

Dyan, V. L. (2010). *Improving writing skill through guided writing (a classroom action research at the third year of SMU Negeri I Karanganyar in the Academic Year of 2009/2010).* Undergraduate Thesis, English Department, Sebelas Maret University.

Frase, L. (2008). *Effective Teaching Solution: Guided Writing.* Retrieved from effective teaching solutions.com /guidedwriting.pdf> (2019/02/12)

Graham, s. and Hebert, M.A. (2010). *Writing to read: Evidence for how writing can improve reading. A Carnegie Corporation Time to Act Report.* Washington, DC: Alliance for Excssellent Education.

Handayani, A. A. K., Nyoman, D., Ni Made, R. (2013). *The Effect of Guided Writing Strategy and Students" Achievement Motivation on Students" Writing Competency.* Language Education Department Post Graduate Program Ganesha University of Education Journal. Retrieved from http://ejournal.undiksha.ac.id/ > (2019/02/12)

Jacub, T. A., Marto, H., & Darwis, A. (2020). MODEL PEMBELAJARAN PROBLEM BASED LEARNING DALAM PENINGKATAN HASIL BELAJAR IPS (STUDI PENELITIAN TINDAKAN KELAS DI SMP NEGERI 2 TOLITOLI). *Tolis Ilmiah: Jurnal Penelitian*, *2*(2).

Krisbiantoro, Dadari. (2015). *Proceeding International Conference of Teaching English as a Foreign Language*, Purwokerto: Faculty of Letters University of Muhammadiyah Purwokerto.

Lui, Angela. (2012). *An Introduction to Working within the Zone of ProximalnDevelopment (ZPD) to Drive Effective Early Childhood Instruction.* children' progress.

Malik, A. R., & Asnur, M. N. A. (2019). USING SOCIAL MEDIA AS A LEARNING MEDIA OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE STUDENTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION. *Bahtera: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra*, *18*(2), 166-75.

Malik, A. R., Emzir, E., & Sumarni, S. (2020). PENGARUH STRATEGI PEMBELAJARAN MOBILE LEARNING DAN GAYA BELAJAR VISUAL TERHADAP PENGUASAAN KOSAKATA BAHASA JERMAN SISWA SMA NEGERI 1 MAROS. *Visipena*, *11*(1), 194-207.

Malik, A. R. (2019, August). THE INFLUENCE OF INSTAGRAM AND AUDITORY LEARNING STYLE ON GERMAN LANGUAGE MASTERY IN STUDENTS OF SMAN 1 MAROS. In *International Conference on Cultural Studies* (Vol. 2, pp. 279-283).

Malik, A. R., & Fatimah, S. (2017). ANALISIS KESALAHAN MORFOLOGI DALAM KARANGAN SEDERHANA BAHASA JERMAN SISWA KELAS XI SMAN 2 MAKASSAR. *Eralingua: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Asing dan Sastra*, *1*(1)

Suyono dan Harianto. (2014). *Belajar dan Pembelajaran*. Bandung: Remaja Rosda Karya.

Peha Steve. 2010. *Writing Teacher's Strategy Guide*.

Vonna, Yulia., Mukminatien, Nur and Laksmi, E. D. (2015). *The Effect of Scaffolding Techniques on Students' Writing Achievement. Skripsi*, Malang:Universitas Negeri Malang.

Zemach, Dorothy E. and Rumisek, Lisa A. 2005. *Academic Writing: from paragraph to essay*.Oxford: Macmillan