

Learning Multicultural Content Exposition Text Writing Using CIRC and TTW Models Based on Personality Types of X Graders

Shofiah^{1✉} & Ida Zulaeha²

¹ Public Madrasah Aliyah 1 Kudus, Jawa Tengah, Indonesia

² Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Article Info

History Articles

Received:

October 2017

Accepted:

November 2017

Published:

April 2018

Keywords:

exposition text writing skills,

extrovert introvert,

integrated reading and

composition,

models cooperative,

models think talk write

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to explain the effectiveness of learning skills of expository writing of multicultural exposition with CIRC model and TTW model based on personality type of student class X as well as explaining the interaction of learning writing exposition text in multicultural expression with CIRC model and TTW model based on personality type of student class X. This research uses a quasi-experimental factorial design. In this design, there are two experimental groups namely cooperative integrated reading and composition class and think talk write experiment class. The results of the study are (1) the CIRC model was effectively used in teaching expository writing for introverted students, (2) the TTW model was effectively used in teaching expository texts for extroverted learners, and (3) The CIRC model is more effective than the TTW model. The average value of both is $88.73 > 84.64$. It shows that between CIRC class and TTW class there is a significant difference.

DOI

<https://doi.org/10.15294/seloka.v7i1.18874>

[/seloka.v7i1.18874](https://doi.org/10.15294/seloka.v7i1.18874)

© 2018 Universitas Negeri Semarang

✉ Correspondence address:

Conge, Ngembal Rejo, Kudus, Jawa Tengah, 59322

E-mail: 9999ofik@gmail.com

[p-ISSN 2301-6744](#)

[e-ISSN 2502-4493](#)

INTRODUCTION

One of writing skills taught in X grade is writing exposition text. Exposition text based on Suparno & Yunus (2006) is discourse variety to explain, deliver or elaborate something to broad and enrich knowledge and readers' point of views. The target is to inform without manipulating thoughts, feelings and the attitudes of readers. The text usually contains specific issue or problem about specific topic in which the expressed questions by the writer shows his position in facing the issue (Priyatni, 2014). Finoza (2009) states the text is a discourse with purpose to tell, review, elaborate, or explain something. Thus, it can be concluded the text is paragraphs containing information and knowledge presented briefly, dense, and accurate. Exposition paragraphs is scientific or non-fictional.

Some students are still having difficulties in understanding the text. It is also stated by Rosyid (2008) in his research. The findings show the writing skill of the students in the level of Senior High School is still limited. They still have difficulties to differ argumentative and exposition texts.

The activity of expressing ideas, notions, thoughts or feelings become a writing is main activity in writing. Beside, writing is an activity or arranging words mastered into meaningful writing. The essence of writing according to Semi (1990) is transferring thoughts or feelings into symbols of language. While writing, someone expresses notions, thoughts, and feelings. He also selects appropriate words to represent notions, thoughts, and feelings (Zulaeha, 2016). The same argument is delivered by Nurudin (2010) stating that writing is the whole activity of someone to express notions and deliver it through written language to readers.

While writing something, someone will need idea or notion put into topic. Through this topic, someone's writing will be more focused. A writer can write something easily if he understands what he writes. The understanding toward the problem written will ease him to put the notions. The problems written tend to be related with the writer's personal experiences.

Recently, many conflicts existing in Indonesian's society are described into unstructured matters due to diversity. It revives our awareness, if this continues, it will disintegrate our nation. The diversity of ethnics, language, cultures and religions we have are like a double edge (2006). Therefore, the diversity can be a system in learning. The content of diversity has potency to develop better appreciation through cultural competence existing in the students. The knowledge of diversity will be needed in education. Even, it can be said that educational process is a process of culturalize with purpose to create multicultural society (Zulaeha, 2016).

The learning of multicultural is basically a program of national education to make cultural community participating in creating ideal democracy living for the nations (Banks, 2010). Multiculturalism is a concept of community in national context to acknowledge diversity, differences, and pluralism of cultures both races, tribes, ethnics, religions, and so forth (Mahfud, 2010). Salimudin (2016) states through education, ethnic and culture diversity acknowledgement, multicultural values must be developed. It means the process of education, included the materials taught, must be supported by multicultural aspects. Zulaeha (2013) in her research found multicultural can be a topic of Indonesian language learning.

The problems of multicultures can be used by the students to gain idea in learning Indonesian language, especially on its writing skills. The problems can be adjusted by multicultural values. The values are proposed as learning themes, such as: (1) peace; (2) acknowledgement; (3) tolerance; (4) responsibility; (5) happiness; (6) cooperation; (7) honesty; (8) low profile; (9) love; (10) simplicity; (11) liberty; and (12) unity. The values are universal, however there is language, ethnic, and culture diversity differently. Therefore, the values must be taken as the themes in learning. By using the themes is expected to find diversity as the basic toward unity (Zulaeha, 2016).

In learning writing needs innovative, interesting, various learning models to improve the students' interests. One of struggles to do is using *Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition* (CIRC). It is chosen because the model fits on learning writing exposition text. Plus, CIRC model is one of strategies to learn cooperatively and improve enthusiasm and responsibility of the students during learning process (Kan, 2011). In learning through the model, the students plan, revise, and edit their writing by collaborating with their teammates (Slavin, 2010). CIRC emphasizes on reading skills to create a writing. Reading has positive correlation equals to the achievement of reading understanding (Zare, 2013). The use of CIRC model is proven can improve the ability of the students in learning skill to write (Susilo, Zulaeha, & Subyantoro, 2016).

The second model used in this research is *Think Talk Write* (TTW). TTW is a model to facilitate oral speaking exercise and writing to be fluent. The learning model fosters thought, reflection, and organization of ideas, then the idea test before the learners are expected to write (Hunker & Laughlin, 1996). Wirawan (2016) argues TTW can trigger social interaction and foster conceptual understanding. The model is proven effective to use in learning (Trisnanti, 2012).

CIRC and TTW models are cooperative learning models. Cooperative learning model becomes popular learning model and investigated since 1988. The curriculum developers in many countries also use the learning model to identify (Akdemir & Arslan, 2012).

In learning, every student has different character. Eysenck in Suryabrata (2003) states the personal structures are composed by actions, dispositions which organized into hierarchal structures based on generalization and purposes, and these purposes are sourced from necessities. The differences of learners' characteristics are categorized into two types: extrovert and introvert. It really affects many ways in someone's life. One of them is to react toward a certain problem (Mihaila, 2011).

The different characteristics of learners trigger different treatments in learning. By knowing the personality can be used to differ someone with the others (Khan, 2016). The types of different characteristic in learning writing need different teaching ways to effectively learn (Elvina, 2015). The types of characteristics of the students need to be considered. In Aggarwal findings (2016) prove creativity of the students are also different in every characteristic or personality. It proves teachers should pay attention on personality types.

To determine whether someone has *extrovert* or *introvert* personality, the researcher uses personality inventory, modified *Eysenck's Personality Inventory* (EPI). This modified test instrument by Hans J. Eysenck initially presents 210 items into 57 items. To know the respondents are introvert or extrovert, the use of nominal category scoring from extraversion (*extrovert-introvert*). The standardization of EPI test, based on Hula, has been arranged as clinical and experimental tasks, more than 12000 men and women, adults, children, normal, neurotic, and criminal people tested. Beside that, more than 2000 couples of twins are tested using this test (Fatimah, 2011).

METHODS

The method used in the research is experimental method. The design used in the research is quasi-factorial experiment because of consideration the possibility of moderating variable affecting the treatment of independent variable toward dependent variable (Sugiyono 2011). The population in the research in writing exposition text of the X graders. The sample of the research is exposition writing skill of X MIPA 4 and MIPA 5 students of MAN 1 Kudus and X MIPA 1 and MIPA 2 students of MA AL Irsyad Gajah Demak. The technique of collecting data used is *purposive sampling* to take sample based on consideration and specific necessity (Arikunto, 2010).

The variables are divided into three models: CIRC and TTW as independent variable, writing skill of exposition text as dependent

variable, and personality types as moderator variable.

The instruments of the research are test of writing skills of exposition test for X graders and non-test instruments in the form of EPI questionnaire to determine personality types, observation guidance to score the attitudes and photograph documentation. The instruments of the test are important steps in developing instrument process because from the trial test can be known the quality of the used instruments. The analysis of the instruments used are validity and reliability test. The validity aspects in this research is used as test showing whether the test can measure. The ways of doing the test are testing writing skill outside of the chosen sample. Then validity test is counted by using *product moment* formula in every aspect. To test the reliability is used internal consistency test by using *Alpha Crombach* formula.

Technique of analyzing data used in the research is descriptive comparative. The analysis done in the research covers requirement analysis test and hypothesis test. The requirement test consists of (1) normality test using *kolmogrov smirnov* technique, (2) homogeneity variety using *levene statistics* technique, and (3) linearity interrelationship using *variety analysis* technique.

The hypothesis test are statistic analysis done in the research by using *Statistical package for social Sciences (SPSS) 16.0 for Windows*. To test first and second hypotheses, the researcher uses comparative test of two independent samples whose not related (*Independet t-test*) because in the research two groups in one learning session. Sukestiyarno (2012) states the existence group are free and the numbers of the members do not always equal. In third hypothesis, the researcher uses two path comparative analysis or *F-test*. The test is to know the differences of the effectiveness from two models of learning based on two personality types.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings are (1) the effectiveness of exposition writing skills learning with CIRC model based on the personality types, (2) the

effectiveness of the learning with TTW model based on the personality types, (3) the effectiveness of interaction of the learning with the models based on the personality types.

The learning process in first experiment class lasts classically to prevent discrimination among participants with different personalities. The number of the first experiment class is 76 students with 36 X MIPA 5 of MAN 01 Kudus and 40 X MIPA 2 of MA Al Irsyad gajah Demak with these personality details:

Table 1. The Category of Personality Types of First Experiment Class

Types of personalities	Amounts
Ekstrovert	31
Introvert	45
Total	76

Based on the table, the students of the class are categorized into 31 extrovert students and 45 introvert students. Class with CIRC model is more dominated by introvert students.

Table 2. The Average Score Comparison of Pretest and Posttest of Skill Aspect in First Experiment Class

Test	Scores				Average			
	Highest		Lowest		Pretest		Posttest	
	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I
Pretest	85	85	55	50	69.52	69.56	84.94	88.73
Posttest	94	97	76	78				

Based on table 2 pretest aof the first experiment class given CIRC model gains highest score, 85 on extrovert students and 85 of introvert students. The lowest score on extrovert students is 55 meanwhile the introvert students 50.

The average of initial test of the extrovert students is 69.52 meanwhile introvert 69.56. Therefore the average of them in initial test is still under Minimum Standardized Score, 75.

On the posttest is gained highest score of extrovert students, 94. Meanwhile the lowest score of them is 76. The highest score of introvert is 97 meanwhile the lowest is 78. The average of post-test of extrovert is 84.94 and introvert 88.73. Therefore the average of those personality types on post-test passes Minimum Standardized Score, 75.

The learning in second experiment class lasts classically to prevent discrimination among students with different personalities. The numbers of the studetns are 76 with details: 35 X graders of MIPA 5 MAN 01 Kudus and 41 X MIPA 2 of MA A1 Irsyad Gajah Demak with these personality details.

Table 3. The Category of Personality Types of Second Experiment Class

Types of personalities	Amounts
Ekstrovert	50
Introvert	26
Total	76

Based on table 3 is seen the number of the students in the class consisting 50 extrovert students and 26 introvert students. TTW model is dominated by extrovert learners. The comparison between the two tests of skill aspects is presented below.

Table 4. The Average Comparisson of Pretest and Posttest of Skill Aspect of Second Experiment Class

Testing	Scores				Average			
	Highest		Lowest		Pretest		Posttest	
	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I
Pretest	85	85	50	50	70.8	66.54	84.64	83.73
Posttest	97	97	75	76				

Based on the table is seen the initial test given TTW model gains highest score 85 for extrovert students and 85 for introvert students. The lowest score of extrovert studetns is 50 and introvert 50.

Table 5. The Achievement Scores of Extrovert Students

Eks_CIRC	Test value = 75					
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean difference	95% Confidence interval of the difference	
					Lower	Upper
Eks_CIRC	6.429	30	.000	8.484	5.79	11.18

The minimum test for extrovert students uses one-side party (right party) with hypothesis $H_0: \bar{x} < 75$ or $H_1: \bar{x} > 75$. Through SPSS, then H_0 is denied if $t_{value} > t_{table}$. Based on the test, it gains $t_{value} = 6.429$ dan $t_{table} = 1.697$ $df = 30$, sig 5% (1 tailed) = 1.697. Because $t_{value} > t_{table}$ (6.429 >

1.697), then H_0 is denied and H_1 accepted. It means the improvements of the extrovert learners are mostly above 75 from the expected. Meanwhile H_0 states the success of the students are mostly under 75 is denied.

		Eks_CIRC
N		31
Normal parameters ^a	Mean	83.48
	Std. deviation	7.348
Most extreme differences	Absolute	.166
	Positive	.166
	Negative	-.124
Kolmogorov-smirnov Z		.925
Asymp. sig. (2-tailed)		.359

a. Test distribution is Normal

Table 6. The Achievement Score of Introvert Students in First Experiment Class

Int_CIRC	Test value = 75				95% Confidence interval of the difference	
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean difference	Lower	Upper
Int_CIRC	7.409	44	.000	9.111	6.63	11.59

		Int_CIRC
N		45
Normal parameters ^a	Mean	84.11
	Std. deviation	8.250
Most extreme differences	Absolute	.172
	Positive	.172
	Negative	-.135
Kolmogorov-smirnov Z		1.154
Asymp. sig. (2-tailed)		.139

a. Test distribution is Normal

The achievement test of introvert students uses one-side party (right party) with hypothesis $H_0: \bar{x} < 75$ atau $H_1: \bar{x} > 75$. By using SPSS then H_0 is denied if $t_{value} > t_{table}$. Accrpdomng tp the test os gaomed $t_{value} = 7.409$ and t_{table} is gained with $df = 44$, sig 5% (1 tailed) = 1.680. Because $t_{value} > t_{table}$ (7.409 > 1.680), then H_0 is denied and H_1 accepted. It means the success of introvert students are mostly above 75 and expected to be accepted. Meanwhile H_0 states the success of them is under 75 is denied.

After having *ones sample* texting, then comparative test of two samples is done. The hypothesis of one way is $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu_3$ or $H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2 \neq \mu_3$

one of different average. Table 7 shows the explanation about the test.

Table 7. The Comparative Test of CIRC Model

Group statistics					
	Gpr	N	Mean	Std. deviation	Std. error mean
CIRC	1	31	84.94	6.038	1.085
	2	45	88.73	6.173	.920

Independent samples test

		Levene's test for equality of variances		t-Test for equality of means							
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean difference	Std. error difference	95% Confidence interval of the difference		
										Lower	Upper
TTW	Equal variances assumed	.001	.972	3.261	74	.002	5.219	1.600	2.031	8.408	
	Equal variances not assumed			3.241	63.198	.002	5.219	1.611	2.001	8.438	

Based on the test shows the data of CIRC experiment class with extrovert and introverts are homogeneous. The analysis can be seen in third coloumn, that $\text{sig} = 0.634 = 63.4\% > 5\%$ then two groups have same variants. Due to those similarities, then the next test is done or comparative t-test. On two lines of the latest outpu, it is written *Equal variances assumed and Equal variances not assumed*. Based on the decision of the test then the one used in t-test must use *Equal variances assumed* numbers. The analysis of the test states that t-score with $\text{sig} = 0.010 = 0.1\% < 5\%$ then H_0 is denied or H_1 accepted. Thus the average of CIRC class with extrovert personality differs with the introvert one. The introvert CIRC class is more effective compared to the extrovert one.

Independent sample t-test to answer the second hypothesis are stated in table 8 and 9, showing the achievement of each type of personality in second experiment class.

Table 8. The Minimum Achievement Score of Extrovert Students in Second Experiment Class

Test value = 75						
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean difference	95% Confidence interval of the difference	
					Lower	Upper
Eks_TTW	7.864	49	.000	7.320	5.45	9.19

Eks_TTW		
N		50
Normal parameters ^a	Mean	82.32
	Std. deviation	6.582
Most extreme differences	Absolute	.159
	Positive	.159
	Negative	-.133
Kolmogorov-smirnov Z		1.126
Asymp. sig. (2-tailed)		.158

a. Test distribution is Normal

The achievement scores of extrovert students uses one-side party with hypothesis $H_0 : \bar{x} < 75$ atau $H_1 : \bar{x} > 75$. Through SPSS then H_0 is denied if $t_{\text{calculated}} > t_{\text{table}}$. Based on the test then is gained $t_{\text{calculated}}$ equals to 7,864 and t_{table} is gained with $df = 49$, $\text{sig} 5\%$ (1 tailed) = 1,677. Because $t_{\text{value}} > t_{\text{table}}$ (7,864 > 1,677), then H_0 is denied and H_1 accepted. It means the success of visual typed students are above 75 from the expected. Meanwhile, H_0 states the success of the students lower than 75 is denied.

Table 9. The Minimum Achievement of Introvert Students in Second Experiment Class

Test value = 75						
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean difference	95% Confidence interval of the difference	
					Lower	Upper
Int_TTW	4.240	25	.000	5.462	2.81	8.11

		Int_TTW
N		26
Normal parameters ^a	Mean	80.46
	Std. deviation	6.568
Most extreme differences	Absolute	.259
	Positive	.259
	Negative	-.203
Kolmogorov-smirnov Z		1.319
Asymp. sig. (2-tailed)		.062

a. Test distribution is Normal

The test on introvert with hypothesis $H_0: \bar{x} < 75$ atau $H_1: \bar{x} > 75$. Through SPSS then H_0 is denied if $t_{value} > t_{table}$. Based on the test result then

it is gained $t_{value} = 4.240$ and t_{table} is gained with $df = 25$, sig 5% (1 tailed) = 1,708. Because $t_{value} > t_{table}$ ($4.240 > 1.708$), then H_0 is denied and H_1 accepted. The success of introvert students are mostly above 75 and expected to be accepted. Meanwhile, H_0 stating the success is lower than 75 is denied.

After doing ones sample test, then independent sample t-test is conducted. The hypothesis is $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu_3$ atau H_1 : one of the average is different. See the table showing the explanation of the test.

Table 10. Comparative Test of Two Samples of TTW

Group statistics					
	Gpr	N	Mean	Std. deviation	Std. error mean
TTW	1	31	87.42	6.994	1.256
	2	45	82.20	6.761	1.008

Independent samples test

		Levene's test for equality of variances		t-Test for equality of means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean difference	Std. error difference	95% Confidence interval of the difference	
									Lower	Upper
TTW	Equal variances assumed	.001	.972	3.261	74	.002	5.219	1.600	2.031	8.408
	Equal variances not assumed			3.241	63.198	.002	5.219	1.611	2.001	8.438

Based on the test states that in TTW experimental class with extrovert and introvert are homogenous. The analysis can be seen in third coloumn, that sig = 0.972 = 97.2% > 5% then those two groups have similar variances. Due to the condition, then t-test is conducted. On the last two lines of output, it is written *Equal variances assumed* and *Equal variances not assumed*. Based on the decision of the test used in t-test must use *Equal variances assumed*. The analysis of *Independent-sample t-test* states that the score of t with sig = 0.002 = 0.02% < 5% then H_0 is denied or H_1 accepted. Thus the average of TTW class with extrovert differs to the introvert. TTW class is more effective with extroverts than introvert.

Two way ANOVA is used to answer three hypotheses are: to know the interaction result in learning writing the text with CIRC and TTW models based on the types of personalities. Table 11 and 12 show the brief explanation of F test.

Table 11. The Result of *Two Way Anava*

F	df ₁	df ₂	Sig.
.824	3	148	.483

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

Design: Intercept + Model + Tipe_p + Model * Tipe_p

Based on the test shows the data of CIRC experiment class and TTW experiment class with extrovert and introvert are homogenous. The analysis can be seen that sig = 0.483 = 48.3% > 5% then those groups have same variant.

The test uses two way ANOVA. The result answers partial hypothesis of the research. Based on the summary of the test, on the first test is inter-row test, inter-coloumn test, and interaction between row and coloumn.

On the table shows the inter-row test is learning model with $H_0 : \eta_1 = \eta_2$ (similar average of both learning model) or $H_1 : \eta_1 \neq \eta_2$ (differemt average of both learning models). The analysis result based on the table is seen significant score on sig = 0.021 = 2.1% < 5% then H_0 is denied or H_1 accepted. Thus, the average of both learning models in both classes are different.

Table 12. F Test

Source	Type III sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Corrected model	588.687 ^a	3	196.229	4.312	.006
Intercept	1035852.559	1	1035852.559	2.276E4	.000
Model	248.529	1	248.529	5.461	.021
Tipe_p	73.880	1	73.880	1.623	.205
Model * Tipe_p	196.177	1	196.177	4.311	.040
Error	6735.306	148	45.509		
Total	1125161.000	152			
Corrected Total	7323.993	151			

a. R squared = .080 (Adjusted R squared = .062)

Inter-coloums test is personality with hypothesis of the coloumn test $H_0 : \mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu_3 \dots \mu_i$ (similar average of all sample) or $H_1 : \mu_i$ one of them is different. The analysis resultis based on table, it is seen significant improvement on coloumn sig = 0.205 = 20.5% > 5% then H_0 is denied or H_1 accepted.

After the test then interaction between rows and coloumns is done. The hypothesis is H_0 : both coloumns and rows are free or H_1 : both of coloumns and rows are related. Based on the table is seen the part of model*type_p, the significant improvement on the interaction model and personalities is sig 0.040 = 4% < 5%, then H_0 is denied H_1 is accepted. So the rows and coloumns are related.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings and discussion, the conclusions are as flows.

Leraning writing of the text with CIRC model and the personalities is effectively done in first experiment class. Before giving the treatment, the average score of skill aspect is 69.52 meanwhile after the treatment increasing into 84.94. The introvert stduents gain 69.56 and

after treatment increasing into 88.73. There is a positive changing behavior. It can be seen from the improvement from 71.45 into 82.30 after the treatment. Thus, learning writing the text using CIRC is effective for introvert students.

Learning writing the text using TTW model and three personalities is done in second experiment class. On apsect of skill of extrovert students before the treatement is about 70.8 and 84.64 after treatment. For introvert student before the treatment is 66.54. Meanwhile after treatment is 83.73. There is also positive changing behavior. It can be seen from the score of attitudes before treatment 72.76 into 80.2 after treatment. Thus, learning writing the text using TTW is effective for extrovert students.

Learning writing the text in written activity of X graders using CIRC model is more effective to TTW model. Based on the calculation of two way ANOVA test shows interactional hypothesis between learning model and the personalities is interrelated. Due to the condition, then based on output of descriptive result shows that the highest average is on CIRC class with introvert type students and TTW's highest average score possessed by extrovert students. The average of both of them is 88.73 > 84.64. It shows between CIRC and TTW is significantly different.

Hopefully the information stated in this articles gives contributions. Thanks to Dr.Haryadi, M.Pd to guide this research.

REFERENCES

- Aggarwal, V. & Sachar, G. (2016). A Study of Creativity in Relation to Personality types among Secondary School Students. *International Journal Of Innovative Research & Development*, 5(14), 126-129.
<http://www.ijird.com/index.php/ijird/article/view/108607>
- Akdemir, E. & Arslan, A. (2012). From Past to Present: Trend Analysis of Cooperative Learning Studies. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 55, 212-217.
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042812039584>
- Arikunto, S. (2010). *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

- Banks, James. A. & Banks, C. A. M. (2010). *Multicultural Education. Seventh edition. Issues and Perspectives*. Amerika: Wiley.
- Elvina, Subyantoro, & Haryadi. (2015). Perbedaan Peningkatan Keterampilan Menulis Puisi dengan Model Sinektik dan Project Based Learning Berdasarkan Tipe Kepribadian Peserta Didik Kelas V Sekolah Dasar. *Journal of Primary Education*, 4(2), 112-116.
<https://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/jpe/article/view/10253>
- Fatimah, S. (2011). *Basic Function of Facebook Usage Frequency Difference in Relation to Extrovert and Introvert Personality Type on Faculty of Psychology UIN Suska Riau Student*.
http://repository.uin-suska.ac.id/1184/1/2011_201131.pdf
- Finoza, L. (2009). *Komposisi Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Diksi Insan Mulia.
- Kan. (2011). Cooperative Learning Environment with The Web 2.0 Tool E-Portofolio. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education (TOJDE)*, 12(3).
http://tojde.anadolu.edu.tr/makale_goster.php?id=693
- Khan, A. Shafee Ahmed. (2016). Jung's Personality Types and Shakespeare's Tragic Heroes' Problems. *International Journal of English Language, Literature and Translation Studies (IJLER)*, 3(1), 348-353.
<http://www.ijelr.in/3.1.16b/348-353%20a.shafee%20ahmed%20khan.pdf>
- Mahfud, C. (2011). *Pendidikan Multikultural*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Mihaila, V. B. T. (2011). Significant Differences Between *Introvert* and *Extrovert* People's Simple Reaction Time in Conflict Situations. *Romanian Journal of Experimental Applied Psychology*, 2(3), 18-24.
<http://www.rjeap.ro/issue-3-2011/rjeap/volume-2-issue-3-2011/3-significant-differences-between-introvert-and-extrovert-people-s-simple-reaction-time-in-conflict-situations-vlad-burtaverde-teodor-mihaila>
- Semi, M. A. (2007). *Dasar-Dasar Keterampilan Menulis*. Bandung: Angkasa.
- Slavin, R. E. (2010). *Cooperative Learning Teori, Riset dan Praktik*. Bandung: Nusa Media.
- Sugiyono. (2011). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatif dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Suparno & Yunus, M. (2006). *Keterampilan Dasar Menulis*. Jakarta: Universitas Terbuka.
- Suryabrata, S. (2003). *Psikologi Kepribadian*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Susilo, B., Zulaeha, I. & Subyantoro. (2016). Pembelajaran Meringkas Isi Buku dengan Model CIRC dan Latihan Penelitian Berdasar Kreativitas Verbal Peserta Didik Sekolah Dasar. *Journal of Primary Education*, 5(1), 28-36.
<https://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/jpe/article/view/12889>
- Wirawan, I. K. (2016). *Model Pembelajaran Kooperatif TTW untuk Meningkatkan Interaksi Sosial dan Pemahaman Konsep Fisika Siswa*.
http://www.academia.edu/26128902/Model_Pembelajaran_Kooperatif_TTW_Cooperative_TTW_Learning_Model
- Zare, P. (2013). Exploring Reading Strategy Use and Reading Comprehension Success among EFL Learners. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 22(11), 1566-1571.
http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol_3_No_13_July_2013/22.pdf
- Zulaeha, I. (2013). Innovation Models of Indonesian Learning in Multicultural Society. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences. 13th International Educational Technology Conference*. (103), 506-514.
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/journal/procedia-social-and-behavioral-sciences/vol/103>
- Zulaeha, I. (2016). *Teori, Model, dan Implementasi Pembelajaran Menulis Kreatif*. Semarang: Unnes Press.