

Journal website header for "dharma pendidikan" (Journal of Education and Learning). The header includes the journal title, ISSN numbers (P-ISSN: 1907-2813, E-ISSN: 2829-0267), and navigation links (HOME, TERKINI, ARSIP, PENGUMUMAN, TENTANG KAMI). The main content area is titled "Tentang Jurnal Ini" (About This Journal) and describes the journal's focus on education and its scope, which includes teaching and learning, classroom instruction, curriculum development, and educational technology. The right sidebar features a "Main Menu", "Indexed by:" section with the Google Scholar logo, and a "Journal Template:" section with a "DOCX" button and a "Journal Template" label.

Journal website header for "dharma pendidikan" (Journal of Education and Learning). The header includes the journal title, ISSN numbers (P-ISSN: 1907-2813, E-ISSN: 2829-0267), and navigation links (HOME, TERKINI, ARSIP, PENGUMUMAN, TENTANG KAMI). The main content area is titled "Dewan Editor" (Editorial Board) and lists the following members:


Editor in Chief	: Dr. Vera Septi Andrini, MM	STKIP PGRI Nganjuk
Manager Editor	: Dr. Haryono, MM	STKIP PGRI Nganjuk
Editorial Boards	: Addin Zuhrotul 'Aini, M.Pd	STKIP PGRI Nganjuk
	: Sujono, SS., MPd.	STKIP PGRI Nganjuk
	: Jatmiko, MPd.	Universitas Nusantara PGRI Kediri
Copy Editing	: Bambang Triyono, MPd.	STKIP PGRI Nganjuk

The right sidebar features a "Main Menu", "Indexed by:" section with the Google Scholar logo, and a "Journal Template:" section with a "DOCX" button and a "Journal Template" label.

journal.stkipnganjuk.ac.id/index.php/jdp/about/editorialTeam

Editor in Chief	: Dr. Vera Septi Andriani, MM	STKIP PGRI Nganjuk
Manager Editor	: Dr. Haryono, MM	STKIP PGRI Nganjuk
Editorial Boards	: Addin Zuhrotul 'Aini, M.Pd	STKIP PGRI Nganjuk
	: Sujono, SS., MPd.	STKIP PGRI Nganjuk
	: Jatmiko, MPd.	Universitas Nusantara PGRI Kediri
Copy Editing	: Bambang Triyono, MPd.	STKIP PGRI Nganjuk
Reviewer	: Prof. Dr. Munasir, S.Si., M.Si.	Universitas Negeri Surabaya
	: Dr. M. Muchson, SE., MM.	Universitas Nusantara PGRI Kediri
	: Dr. Sulistiono, M.Si	Universitas Nusantara PGRI Kediri
	: Dr. Suharto, M.Kes	STKIP PGRI Nganjuk
	: Dr. Umi Hidayati, MM	STKIP PGRI Nganjuk
	: Callira Rosiana, M.Pd.	STKIP PGRI Nganjuk
	: Imega Syahlita Dewi, M.Pd	STKIP PGRI Nganjuk

Journal Template :



ISSN :
P-ISSN: 1907-2813
E-ISSN: 2829-0267

BAHASA
Bahasa Indonesia
English

1309 13/04/2023

journal.stkipnganjuk.ac.id/index.php/jdp/issue/view/4



dharma pendidikan

Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran

P-ISSN : 1907 - 2813 P-ISSN : 2829-0267



[Daftar](#) [Login](#)

HOME TERKINI ARSIP PENGUMUMAN TENTANG KAMI
CARI

BERANDA ARSIP Vol 13 No 1 (2018): Dharma Pendidikan

Vol 13 No 1 (2018): Dharma Pendidikan



DITERBITKAN: 2021-10-05

Main Menu

Indexed by :



Journal Template :



1318 13/04/2023

(8) WhatsApp x DATA REPOSITORY - Google D x Erdyna Dwi Etika, 0718019001 x READY FOR JAJA 2020 - Gooc x PKP Vol 13 No 1 (2018); Dharna Pi x

journal.stkipnganjuk.ac.id/index.php/jdp/issue/view/4

F-ISSN: 1907-2813
E-ISSN: 2829-0267

ARTIKEL

On-Going Morphosyntax Supplementary Material
Caltira Rosiana 35-47
[PDF](#)

Kesantunan Berbahasa Mahasiswa Dalam Komunikasi Melalui Media Sosial Whatsapp Sebagai Upaya Penggunaan Bahasa Indonesia Yang Baik
Achmad Tantowi Azis 1-10
[PDF](#)

Upaya Meningkatkan Hasil Belajar Matematika Pada Kompetensi Dasar Menentukan Himpunan Penyelesaian Persamaan Dan Pertidaksamaan Linier Melalui Model Pembelajaran Langsung (Direct Instruction) Bagi Siswa Kelas XI TKJ 2 SMK Negeri 1 Lengkon Nganjuk Tahun Pelajaran 2017/2018
Yatini Yatini 119 - 130
[PDF](#)

BAHASA
Bahasa Indonesia
English

https://journal.stkipnganjuk.ac.id/index.php/jdp/article/view/103

1318
13/04/2023

(8) WhatsApp x DATA REPOSITORY - Google D x Erdyna Dwi Etika, 0718019001 x READY FOR JAJA 2020 - Gooc x PKP Vol 13 No 1 (2018); Dharna Pi x

journal.stkipnganjuk.ac.id/index.php/jdp/issue/view/4

Implementasi Pendidikan Karakter Pada Model Project Based Learning Melalui Sumber Belajar Smartphone
TW Maduretno, VS Andriani 96-104
[PDF](#)

Efektivitas Model Pembelajaran Means-Ends Analysis Berbantu Modul Pembelajaran Terhadap Critical Thinking Skill Mahasiswa
Yulia Dewi Puspitasari 131-143
[PDF](#)

Enhancing English Education Program Students' Skill In Writing Essay Through Clustering Technique
Rina Puji Utami 77-95
[PDF](#)

Pengembangan Soal Multi Representative Berbasis Contextual Problem Dalam Konsep Geometri
Erdyna Dwi Etika 48-59
[PDF](#)

1319
13/04/2023



THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SCAFFOLDED WRITING STRATEGY ON STUDENTS' WRITING SKILL VIEWED FROM STUDENTS' CRITICAL THINKING

Anita Budi Rahayu
STKIP PGRI Nganjuk
anitabudi@stkipnganjuk.ac.id

Abstract: This research is aimed at finding out: (1) whether in general Scaffolded Writing Strategy is more effective than conventional writing for teaching writing; (2) which ones students who have highcritical thinking have better writing skill than those having low critical thinking; and (3) whether or not there is an interaction between teaching techniques and students' critical thinking. The experimental class was taught by using Scaffolded Writing Strategy whereas the control classwas taught by conventional Writing Strategy. Each class was divided into two groups in whicheach consists of students having high critical thinking and those having low criticalthinking. To gain the data, two instruments were used namely writing test and criticalthinking test. The data were analyzed by using Multifactor Analysis of Variance ANOVA 2x2and Tukey test. Before conducting the ANOVA test, pre-requisite test namely normality andhomogeneity test were conducted. The findings of this research are: (1) Scaffolded Writing Strategy is moreeffective than coventional Writing Strategy to teach writing; (2) The students having highcritical thinking have better writing skill than those having low critical thinking; and (3)There is an interaction between teaching strategies and students' critical thinking inteaching writing. Therefore, it is recommended for English teachers to implement Scaffolded Writing Strategy inteaching writing because this strategy helps the students to improve writing skill andencourages them to be active learners.

Keywords : Scaffolded Writing Strategy, writing skill, critical thinking

Introduction

Writing is a way to communicate with other people by expressing the ideas and thought in the written form. In writing the writer has to be able to convey the ideas and thought in a good written form so that the readers understand the information from the text. Therefore, it assumes as the difficult skill to be mastered by the students. This is supported by Heaton (1975: 138) that writing skill is complex and sometimes difficult to teach, requiring mastery not only of grammatical and rhetorical devices but also of conceptual and judgmental element.

Writing, of course, is not only about transcribing language into written symbols, but also what is written by the writer should be able to understand by the readers. The students should be able to generate and organize the ideas and make it meaningful and readable for the readers. According to Weigle (2002: 1) writing has become an essential tool for students in today's global community. It insists them to understand how to make a good process and product in writing. From the explanation of the previous paragraph, it can be said that writing seems as the difficult skill to learn by the students. They easily get bored because of the difficulties in writing.

Therefore, the teacher has to consider the teaching strategy in teaching writing. One of the strategy that used by the teacher is Scaffolded Writing Strategy. Scaffolded Writing Strategy is based on Vygotskian concept about the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). Based on this strategy, learning is developed when a novice learner is assisted by another learner who has special training and/or advanced skills (Schwieter, 2010: 32). Therefore, in this strategy, the students will be guided by the teacher during the teaching learning process. The procedure of teaching writing by using Scaffolded Writing Strategy are: (1) preparing writing plan, (2) reconstructing the author text, (3) generating new text using text patterning, (4) providing constructive feedback.

This strategy is a part of collaborative writing which encourages social interaction among writers and their peers through activities such as peer response (Ferris and Hedgcock, 2005). In this strategy, the students with high proficiency will be paired up with the students with low proficiency. Then, the students work together in teaching learning activity and help each other. The procedures of teaching writing by using PALS are: (1) getting the ideas, (2) making a draft, (3) reading the draft, (4) editing the draft, (5) getting the final draft, (6) teacher evaluation.

Writing needs the learners' higher thinking in order to develop the concepts and ideas, and to use right grammatical pattern. Therefore, some experts considered writing as a thinking process. Brown (2001: 336) states that writing is a

thinking process, a writer produces a final written product based on their thinking after the writer goes through the thinking process. It means that, writing skills need learners' critical thinking to develop and organize the ideas into a good composition. Scriven and Paul (2009: 1) say that critical thinking is the intellectually disciplined process of actively and skillfully conceptualizing, applying, synthesizing, and/or evaluating information gathered from, or generated by, observation, experience, reflection, reasoning, or communication, as a guide to belief and action. According to Chance (1986: 6) critical thinking refers to the ability to analyze facts, generate and organize ideas, defend opinions, make comparisons, draw inferences, evaluate arguments, and solve problems. The learners who think critically can ask appropriate questions, gather relevant information, efficiently and creatively sort through information. They also make logical reasons from this information, and come to reliable and trustworthy conclusions about the world that enable them to live and act successfully in it.

In addition, Fisher (2001:10) says that critical thinking is skilled and active interpretation and evaluation of observations, communications, information, and argumentation. The aim of critical thinking on writing is effectively gather question, organize, and evaluate the students' and their peers' comments, annotations, and errors. Ennis (1996: 45) emphasizes critical thinking as the decision-making about belief and action, the process of reflection and the rationality of the reason. Critical thinking helps people to decide what to believe and how to solve various problems. Since writing is a thinking process, the students have to think about the topic before they produce a draft and a final text. Beside that, the students have to think about the message which should be delivered to the readers. Therefore, in the process of thinking, the students need critical thinking to develop the ideas in order to make a good writing. Critical thinking is the mode of thinking about any subject, content, or problem in which the thinker improves the quality of his or her thinking by skillfully taking charge of the structures inherent in thinking and imposing intellectual standards upon them.

To infer the explanation of previously discussed, the researcher formulates the hypotheses as follows: (1) Scaffolded strategy is more effective than conventional Writing Strategy in teaching writing ; (2) Student with high level of critical thinking have better writing skills than those with low level of critical thinking; and (3) There is an interaction between teaching strategies and students' critical thinking in teaching writing.

Research Method

This research was conducted at the XI grade students of SMK NU Pace Nganjuk. This research was conducted from July 2017 until December 2017. The research method used in this research is experimental research. The researcher used quasi-experimental design because the sample was taken from two classes that already exist at that school. The design of this research was factorial design. The two classes divided into two, experimental class and control class. The experimental class was taught by using Scaffolded Writing Strategy, while the control class was taught by using conventional Writing Strategy. At the end of treatment, the experimental class and control class were given a post test in the form of writing test. The result was analyzed by comparing the post-test scores of both groups by using ANOVA and then by using Tukey test.

In this research, the population is the students of SMK NU Pace Nganjuk in the academic year of 2017/2018. There are four classes in the population divided into two programs, two classes of TKJ program and two classes of social program. Each class consists of 28 students. The total number of the population is 140 students. The researcher used cluster-random sampling and took two classes from four classes to be the sample of this research. The first class is experimental group and the second is control group.

In this research, the researcher used two instruments of collecting data. There were writing test to know students' writing skill and critical thinking test to know the level of students' critical thinking. These two tests were assessed by using readability of the test instruction which informs whether the test instructions are appropriately readable for students and whether the instruction of writing and

critical thinking test can be understood by the students. The result of the questionnaire showed that more than 80% of students answered “Yes” for each item in the instruction. It can be concluded that writing and critical thinking test in this research is readable since 80% students could understand the instruction of the test. Besides that, the instrument of critical thinking test should be valid and reliable. From the result of validity and reliability test, the researcher took 30 valid questions to be the instrument of the critical thinking test and the instrument was reliable since the value of $r = 0.702$.

The techniques used in analyzing the data were descriptive analysis and inferential analysis. Descriptive analysis was used to know the mean, median, mode and standard deviation of the scores of the writing test. To know the normality and the homogeneity of the data, the researcher used normality and homogeneity test. The normality and homogeneity tests were done before testing the hypothesis. Inferential analysis used was multifactor analysis of variance 2x2. It was used to test the hypotheses. H_0 is rejected if F_o is higher than F_t . If H_0 is rejected, the analysis was continued to know which group is better by using Tukey test.

Research Findings and Discussion

To test the hypothesis of this research, the researcher was using Multifactor Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) 2x2. Before ANOVA and Tukey test were two kinds of test. Those are normality test and homogeneity test. The result of the tests was used as the requirement before ANOVA test and Tukey test.

The post-test data are classified into eight categories as follows: (1) The data of the writing test of the students who were taught by using Scaffolded Writing Strategy (A1); (2) The data of the writing test of the students who are taught by using conventional Writing Strategy (A2); (3) The data of the writing test of the students having high critical thinking (B1); (4) The data of the writing test of the students having low critical thinking (B2); (5) The data of the writing test of the students having high critical thinking who are taught by using

Scaffolded Writing Strategy (A1B1); (6) The data of the writing test of the students having low critical Thinking who are taught by using Scaffolded Writing Strategy (A1B2); (7) The data of the writing test of the students having high critical thinking who are taught by using conventional Writing Strategy (A2B1); and (8) The data of the writing test of the students having low critical Thinking who are taught by using conventional Writing Strategy (A2B2).

The result of normality test for the eight groups are: (1) The data of the writing test of the students who were taught by using Scaffolded Writing Strategy (A1) shows that the highest value of L_o is 0.0738 with L_t is 0.1641; (2) The data of the writing test of the students who are taught by using conventional Writing Strategy (A2) shows that the highest value of L_o is 0.0974 with L_t is 0.1641 ; (3) The data of the writing test of the students having high critical thinking (B1) shows that the highest value of L_o is 0.1069 with L_t is 0.1641 ; (4) The data of the writing test of the students having low critical thinking (B2)) shows that the highest value of L_o is 0.1052 with L_t is 0.1641; (5) The data of the writing test of the students having high critical thinking who are taught by using Scaffolded Writing Strategy (A1B1) shows that the highest value of L_o is 0.0901 with L_t is 0.2257; (6) The data of the writing test of the students having low critical thinking who are taught by using Scaffolded Writing Strategy (A1B2) shows that the highest value of L_o is 0.0895 with L_t is 0.2257; (7) The data of the writing test of the students having high critical thinking who are taught by using conventional Writing Strategy (A2B1)) shows that the highest value of L_o is 0.135 with L_t is 0.2257; and (8) The data of the writing test of the students having low critical thinking who are taught by using conventional Writing Strategy (A2B2) shows that the highest value of L_o is 0.1146 with L_t is 0.2257. The data can be said as normal data if L_o ($L_{obtained}$) is lower than L_t (L_{table}) at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$. From the result, it can be concluded that all the data of writing scores for the eight groups are in normal distribution because L_o of the entire data are lower than L_t ($L_o < L_t$) at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$.

The result of homogeneity test is 2.04. The data are homogeneous if χ_0^2 (χ_{obtained}) is lower than χ^2 (χ_{table}) at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$. Because χ_0^2 (2.04) is lower than χ^2 (7.81), it can be said that the data are homogeneous. It means that the data of this research are obtained from homogeneous sample.

After the data are normal and homogeneous, then the data are analyzed by using Multifactor Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) 2x2. This test is used to know the effects of the independent variables and attributive variable toward the dependent variable. In addition, it functions to check if there is an interaction among those variables. The hypothesis is rejected if F_0 is higher than F_t ($F_0 > F_t$). The mean scores and summary of the data is presented in table 1 and 2.

Table 1. The mean scores

Critical Thinking (B)	PALS (A1)	Scaffolded Writing Strategy (A2)	Total
High Critical Thinking (B1)	79.07	63.92	71.50
Low Critical Thinking (B2)	65.79	70.71	68.25
Total	72.43	67.32	69.88

Table 2. The summary of ANOVA 2x2

Source of variance	SS	df	MS	F_0	$F_t(0,05)$
Between columns	365.15	1	365.15	13.29	4.00
Between rows	147.87	1	147.87	5.38	
Columns by rows (interaction)	1410.02	1	1410.02	51.31	
Between Group	1923.04	3	641.01		
Within group	1429.08	52	27.48		
Total	5275.16	55			

Because F_0 between columns (13.29) is higher than F_t at the level significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (4.00), H_0 is rejected and the difference between columns is significant. Because the mean of A1 (72.43) is higher than that of A2 (67.32), it can be concluded that Scaffolded Writing Strategy is more effective than

conventional Writing Strategy to teachwriting.

Because F_o between rows (5.38) is higher than F_t at the level significance $\alpha = 0.05(4.00)$, H_o is rejected and the difference between rows is significant. It can be concluded that the writing skill of students who have high critical thinking and those who have low critical thinking are significantly different. Then, because the mean of B1 (71.50) is higher than that of B2 (68.25), it can be concluded that the students having high critical thinking have better writing skill than those having low critical thinking.

Because F_o columns by rows (51.31) is higher than F_t at the level significance $\alpha = 0.05 (4.00)$, H_o is rejected and there is an interaction between teaching strategies and students' critical thinking to teach writing. Thus, it can be concluded that the effectiveness of teaching strategies is influenced by the levels of students' critical thinking. Scaffolded Writing Strategy is appropriate for students who have high critical thinking and conventional Writing Strategy is appropriate for students who have low critical thinking.

After knowing the effects and the interaction of independent variables toward the dependent variable, it is also necessary to compare the mean of every treatment with the other means using Tukey test. This test is used to identify which means are significantly different from the other. The summary of the data is presented in table 3

Table 3. The summary of Tukey test

No	Data	Sampel	q_o	q_t	α	Status
1	A ₁ and A ₂	28	5.16	2.89	0.05	Significant
2	B ₁ and B ₂	28	3.28	2.89	0.05	Significant
3	A ₁ B ₁ and A ₂ B ₂	14	10.81	3.03	0.05	Significant
4	A ₁ B ₂ and A ₂ B ₂	14	3.51	3.03	0.05	Significant

Because q_o between columns (A₁-A₂) (5.16) is higher than q_t at the level significance $\alpha = 0.05 (2.92)$, applying Scaffolded Writing Strategy is significantly different from conventional Writing Strategy to teach writing. Because the mean of A₁ (72.43) is higher than that of A₂ (67.32), it can be concluded Scaffolded Writing Strategy is more effective than convention Writing Strategy to teach writing

Because q_0 between columns (B1-B2) (3.28) is higher than q_t at the level significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (2.92), it can be said that the students who have high critical thinking and those who have low critical thinking are significantly different in their writing skill. Because the mean of B1 (71.50) is higher than that of B2 (68.25), it can be concluded that the students having high critical thinking have better writing skill than those having low critical thinking concluded that the students having high critical thinking have better writing skill than those having low critical thinking.

Because q_0 between cells (A1B1-A2B1) (10.81) is higher than q_t at the level significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (3.03), applying Scaffolded Writing Strategy is significantly different from conventional Writing Strategy for students who have high critical thinking. Because the mean of A1B1 (79.07) is higher than that of A2B1 (63.92), it can be concluded that Scaffolded Writing Strategy is appropriate for students who have high critical thinking and conventional Writing Strategy is appropriate for students who have low critical thinking.

Because q_0 between cells (A1B2-A2B2) (3.51) is higher than q_t at the level significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (3.03), the difference between columns for students having low critical thinking is significant. It means that conventional Writing Strategy is more effective than Scaffolded Writing Strategy to teach writing for students having low critical thinking.

The following section discusses findings of this research by considering the result of data analysis above:

- a. The Difference between Scaffolded Writing Strategy and conventional Writing Strategy The findings of this research reveal that there is a significant difference between teaching writing using Scaffolded Writing Strategy and teaching writing using conventional Writing Strategy. Therefore, it can be concluded that Scaffolded Writing Strategy is more effective than conventional Writing Strategy to teach writing. The mean score of the students who are taught by using Scaffolded Writing Strategy is higher than students who are taught by conventional Writing

Strategy.

Scaffolded Writing Strategy is one of the strategies which is used by the teacher to teach language skills, including writing. In this strategy, the students are paired up by the teacher to do some activities. The students with high proficiency are paired up with the students' low proficiency. Then, the students will work together on an activity and give help from each other. This strategy makes the student comfortable and appreciated toward their writing, so that they will be motivated to write better.

In the other hand, conventional Writing Strategy is teacher-centred classroom. In this strategy, the teacher dominates all of learning activities. The teacher guides the students in all steps of writing process. Based on this strategy, learning is best developed when a novice learner is assisted by another learner who has special training and/or advanced skills (Schwieter, 2010: 32). It means that the teacher should be always involved in teaching learning activity.

As known that writing process requires the students for being active and not depending to the teacher to show their ideas in the product of writing, therefore conventional Writing Strategy will not gain best result if it is applied to teach writing. Therefore, it can be concluded that Scaffolded Writing Strategy is more effective than conventional Writing Strategy to teach writing.

b. The Difference between Students Having High Critical Thinking and Students Having Low Critical Thinking

The findings of this research reveal that students having high critical thinking have better writing skill than those having low critical thinking. The mean score of students having high critical thinking is higher than those having low critical thinking.

As known that writing is a complex activity because it requires students' comprehensive abilities in order to make a good text. The

students have to be able to express their ideas and opinions in a good written form, so that the readers can understand well. It will be easier for the students who have high critical thinking to do the task in writing because they tend to think logically, state ideas clearly, organize and express the ideas, give reasonable arguments, and try to solve the problems which are closely related to critical thinking. The students with high critical thinking are also able to analyze and evaluate someone's argument. They have confidence to write their own arguments and their own thinking accurately and logically. Critical thinking is an ability to present arguments and reasons rationally which is supported by the data and evidence as a guide to belief and action. Writing needs the learners' critical thinking in order to develop the concepts and ideas, and to use right grammatical pattern. Therefore, some experts considered writing as a thinking process. It is stated in Brown (2001: 336) that writing is a thinking process, a writer produces a final written product based on their thinking after the writer goes through the thinking process. It means that, writing skills need learners' critical thinking to develop and organize the ideas into a good composition.

The students with high critical thinking tend to ask question, think logically, state ideas clearly, support the ideas by giving argument, and try to solve the problems. In line with Ferrett (1997: 13) some characteristics of the students having high critical thinking are having a sense of curiosity, assessing statements and arguments, interested in finding new solutions, and listening carefully to others and are able to give feedback.

On the contrary, the students who have low critical thinking tend to receive information naturally. They are passive learners and they are less giving reason to some ideas. The low critical thinking students also have a monotonous idea because they believe in their own point of view or opinion. They are less in paying attention to others' point of view or opinion. They also lack of the ability of making logical judgments of some

problems. Besides that, the students with low critical thinking tend to state unclear ideas or statements and take their own perspective as the only sensible one. Facione (1998: 9) that poor critical thinkers are not able to suggest new ideas and alternatives, unable to communicate with others when dealing with complex issues, they lack in the dispositions and cognitive skills, they are disorganized and overly simplistic, spotty about getting the facts, easily distracted, ready to give up at the least hint of difficulty, and intent on a solution that is more detailed than is possible or being satisfied with an overly generalized and uselessly vague response.

In writing, the students have to organize the ideas, then give reasonable arguments and draw conclusions of the problems so that they can produce a good text. Facione (1998:9) states that poor critical thinkers are not able to suggest new ideas and alternatives, unable to communicate with others when dealing with complex issues, they lack in the dispositions and cognitive skills, they are disorganized and overly simplistic, spotty about getting the facts, easily distracted, ready to give up at the least hint of difficulty, and intent on a solution that is more detailed than is possible or being satisfied with an overly generalized and uselessly vague response.

These are some of the reasons why students having low critical thinking writing scores are less than those having high critical thinking. Their low critical thinking makes them unable to express their ideas better. It can be concluded that the students with high critical thinking have better writing skill than the students with low critical thinking.

c. Interaction between Teaching Strategies and Students' Critical Thinking to Teach Students' Writing Skill

The findings of the research reveal that there is an interaction between teaching strategies and students' critical thinking on the students' writing skills. The data show that Scaffolded Writing Strategy is significantly difference from conventional Writing Strategy to teach

writing for the student who have high critical thinking and conventional Writing Strategy is significantly different from Scaffolded Writing Strategy to teach writing to those who have low critical thinking.

Scaffolded Writing Strategy is more effective to teach writing to the students having high critical thinking because this strategy forces the students to learn independently, to comment, to evaluate and to give feedback to their friends' work which is really suitable with the characteristic of high critical thinking students in learning. This strategy is a part of collaborative writing which encourages social interaction among writers and their peers through activities such as peer response (Ferris and Hedgcock, 2005). Some characteristics of the students having high creativity are having a sense of curiosity, assessing statements and arguments, interested in finding new solutions, and listening carefully to others and are able to give feedback (Ferrett, 1997: 13).

Moreover, the students who have high critical thinking tend to state their ideas clearly, use reasoning and facts to support ideas and present well-organized arguments. It is supported by Paul and Elder (2008) who say that critical thinking is self-guided, self-disciplined thinking which attempts to reason at the highest level of quality in a fair-minded way. People who think critically consistently attempt to live rationally, reasonably, and emphatically. Fisher (2001: 13) describes critical thinking as a kind of evaluated thinking-which involves both criticism and creative thinking and which is particularly concerned with the quality of reasoning and argument which is presented in supporting of a belief or a course of action. Therefore, the implementation of Scaffolded Writing Strategy involving peer learning in its process really suits their characteristic.

Students with high critical thinking will be enthusiastically to follow every step in this strategy. Scaffolded Writing Strategy can make the students become active in writing through the ability for exploring

knowledge to get the ideas and correcting other's writing. They will also be glad to explore the ideas together with their peer and to correct their peer's writing since it suits their characteristics. As stated by Willingham (2008: 1) a person who thinks critically can ask appropriate questions, gather relevant information, efficiently and creatively sort through this information, reason logically from this information, and come to reliable and trustworthy conclusions about the world that enable one to live and act successfully in it. Therefore, Scaffolded Writing Strategy is more effective to teach writing to the students having high critical thinking.

On the contrary, conventional Writing Strategy is more effective to the students having low critical thinking. According to this strategy, learning is best developed when a novice learner is assisted by another learner who has special training and/or advanced skills (Schwieter, 2010: 32). Therefore, in this strategy, the students are guided by the teacher during the teaching learning process. Students having low critical thinking have different characteristics with high critical thinking students. Students who have low critical thinking tend to have less self confidence to correct and to give suggestion to other's writing. They also believe in their own point of view or opinion. It is supported by Facione (1998: 9) that poor critical thinkers are notable to suggest new ideas and alternatives, unable to communicate with others when dealing with complex issues, they lack in the dispositions and cognitive skills, they are disorganized and overly simplistic, spotty about getting the facts, easily distracted, ready to give up at the least hint of difficulty, and intent on a solution that is more detailed than is possible or being satisfied with an overly generalized and uselessly vague response. The activity in conventional Writing Strategy are very effective for them because the students with low critical thinking are guided by the teacher for developing the ideas in order to make a good text. Therefore, conventional Writing Strategy is more effective to teach writing to the students having low critical thinking.

Based on the elaboration of the two teaching strategies and high and low critical thinking above, it can be concluded that Scaffolded Writing Strategy is more effective to teach writing to students having high critical thinking. On the other hand, conventional Writing Strategy is more effective to teach writing to students having low critical thinking

Conclusion and Suggestions

There are some research findings that can be taken: (1) Scaffolded Writing Strategy is more effective than conventional Writing Strategy to teach writing to eleventh grade students of SMK NU Pace in the academic year of 2017/2018; (2) The students who have high critical thinking have better writing skill than the students who have low critical thinking for the eleventh grade students of SMK NU Pace in the academic year of 2017/2018; (3) There is an interaction between teaching strategies and students' critical thinking in teaching writing to the eleventh grade students of SMK NU Pace in the academic year of 2017/2018. In this case, Scaffolded Writing Strategy is appropriate for students who have high critical thinking and conventional Writing Strategy is appropriate for students who have low critical thinking. From the research findings, it can be suggested that: (1) In order to improve students' writing skill, English teachers are suggested to implement Scaffolded Writing Strategy in teaching writing. The teacher should consider an interesting teaching materials and teaching media so that the class atmosphere is not boring. It is important to make an effective teaching learning process.; (2) Students are suggested to use Scaffolded Writing Strategy which encourage them to become an independent learners. It is important for students to be active involved in the learning activities in the classroom, be creative, and perform hard effort to gain the goal of learning; (3) Other researchers can do further research related to the implementation of Scaffolded Writing Strategy since the number of the research related to these matters I still limited. They can apply some other variables involving students' interest, creativity motivation, and many others. The result of this research can be used as an additional reference for a similar research with different variables or different population characteristics.

References

- Axford, Beverley. (2009). *Scaffolding literacy*. Australia: Acer Press.
- Brown, H.D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy 2nd edition*. Longman.
- Chance, P. (1986). *Thinking in the classroom: A survey of programs*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Daraz, Craig. (2001). Ucl Centre for the Advancement of Learning and Teaching. Retrieved from <http://www.ucl.ac.uk/calt/pal/>
- Ennis, R.H. (1996). *Critical thinking*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Facione, P.A. (1998). *Critical thinking: What it is and why it counts*. California: California Academic Press.
- Ferris, D.R., & Hedgcock, J.S. (2005). *Teaching ESL composition: purpose, process and practice (2nd ed.)*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Fisher, Alec. (2001). *Critical thinking: An introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heaton, B.J. (1975). *Writing english language test new edition*. Longman: London and New York.
- Paul, R., & Elder, L. (2008). *The miniature guide to critical thinking: Concepts and tools*. Dillon Beach, Calif: Foundation for Critical Thinking.
- Schwieter, John W., and Laurier, W. (2010). Developing second language writing through scaffolding in the ZPD: A Magazine Project For an Authentic Audience. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning World Journal of Education* Vol. 7, No. 10; October 2017. Retrieved from <http://journals.cluteonline.com/index.php/TLC/>
- Scriven, M., and Paul, R. (2009). *Defining critical thinking*. Foundation for Critical Thinking: Critical Thinking Community Press.
- Weigle, S.C. (2000). *Assessing Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Willingham, D.T. (2008). Critical thinking: Why is it so hard to teach?. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 109, 21-29.