Jurnal Guru Dikmen dan Diksus
Volume 8 Number 1, 2025. Page 71-82
p-ISSN: 2655-481x, e-ISSN: 2723-6404

The Tunglanta Model for Enhancing Creativity in Poetry Writing

Lalu Mungguh
SMA Negeri 1 Gunungsari, West Lombok, West Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia

Email: miqungguhdowe@gmail.com

(Received: June 10, 2022; Accepted: October 25, 2022; Published: June 30, 2025)

ABSTRACT

Poetry writing is a form of creative literacy that requires students to transform experience, vocabulary, imagination, diction, figurative language, and imagery into aesthetically meaningful texts. This classroom action research examined the implementation of the Bunglanta model (Sambung Silang Kata, or cross-linking words) and its contribution to students' engagement and creativity in poetry writing. The study was conducted in Class X IPA-2 of SMA Negeri 1 Gunungsari during the second semester of the 2021/2022 academic year. The action consisted of two cycles, each comprising planning, action, observation, and reflection, with two face-to-face meetings per cycle. Data were obtained from classroom observations, students' poems, and documentation and were analyzed descriptively and qualitatively. Cycle I focused on students' understanding of the physical and inner structures of poetry. Cycle II implemented Bunglanta through modeling, word collection, theme selection, diction selection, collaborative composition, individual poetry writing, presentation, evaluation, and appreciation. Comparison of pre-action and post-action poems indicated qualitative development in four assessed dimensions: novelty of theme and meaning, strength of imagination, diction and word combination, and use of figurative language and imagery. Classroom observations also indicated broader student participation during the second cycle. The findings suggest that Bunglanta can serve as a structured lexical-combinational scaffold for poetry writing; however, because the original study did not report numerical pretest-posttest scores or a comparison group, the improvement should be interpreted as descriptive classroom evidence rather than a quantified causal effect.

Keywords: Bunglanta model; creativity; poetry writing; creative writing; classroom action research

INTRODUCTION

Creativity is a central educational outcome because learners increasingly need to generate, evaluate, and communicate ideas rather than reproduce information. Contemporary research treats creativity as both a domain-sensitive capacity and a learnable process that can be supported through explicit instruction, opportunities for exploration, formative feedback, and psychologically safe participation (Beghetto, 2019; Glăveanu, 2020; Henriksen et al., 2021; Lucas, 2021; OECD, 2024). In language and literature classrooms, creative writing offers a particularly relevant space for developing originality, voice, imagination, and linguistic sensitivity (Cremin & Oliver, 2017; Dymoke & McGuinn, 2021; Mardiningrum & Adriyanthi, 2023; Kusmana et al., 2025).

Poetry writing is demanding because students must coordinate idea generation with condensed expression, diction, imagery, figurative language, rhythm, and revision. Novice writers may rely on familiar themes and cliché expressions when they lack vocabulary, models, or strategies for transforming experience into poetic language (Sulastri & Pujasari, 2019; Puspasari & Setyaningsih, 2020; Asteria et al., 2021; Tasrifah et al., 2022; Garim et al., 2024). Research on writing instruction more broadly also shows that planning, modeling, collaborative talk, feedback, and revision can improve students' writing processes and products (Graham, 2019; Graham et al., 2022; Limpo & Alves, 2018; MacArthur et al., 2016; Graham & Harris, 2018).

The initial classroom condition in Class X IPA-2 at SMA Negeri 1 Gunungsari showed a similar problem. Students' pre-action poems tended to use ordinary themes, direct meanings, predictable imagery, common diction, and limited figurative language. The teacher therefore required an instructional alternative that could make lexical exploration visible and manageable. Bunglanta—an acronym for Sambung Silang Kata (cross-linking words)—was designed as a word-combination model in which students collect words from different semantic or grammatical categories and deliberately connect them to form unusual poetic phrases and lines. The underlying pedagogical assumption is consistent with associative views of creativity: new ideas can emerge when familiar elements are recombined in unfamiliar but meaningful ways (Mednick, 1962; Beaty et al., 2018; Kenett, 2019; Benedek et al., 2020).

Accordingly, this study aimed to describe how the Bunglanta model was implemented in poetry-writing instruction, examine qualitative changes in students' creati vity and classroom participation, and offer an alternative instructional model for teachers of Indonesian language and literature. The analysis retains the classroom action research evidence reported in the original study and does not infer numerical effect sizes that were not collected.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Creativity and the Creative Writing Process

Creativity is commonly associated with the production of ideas or products that are both original and appropriate within a particular sociocultural context (Runco & Jaeger, 2012; Kaufman & Beghetto, 2009; Glăveanu, 2020). Educationally, creativity can be supported by tasks that permit divergent exploration while also providing criteria, constraints, and feedback (Beghetto, 2019; Lucas, 2021; Henriksen et al., 2021). Creative writing embodies this dual requirement: writers generate possibilities but continually select, reshape, and revise language to achieve communicative and aesthetic purposes (Kellogg, 2008; Graham, 2019; MacArthur et al., 2016).

Poetry Writing, Diction, Imagery, and Modeling

Poetry intensifies the relationship between linguistic form and meaning. Effective classroom instruction therefore needs to help students notice how diction, figurative language, imagery, sound, and lineation shape interpretation. Modeling can externalize otherwise tacit composing decisions, while reading and discussing model poems can enlarge students' repertoire of textual possibilities (Asteria et al., 2021; Dymoke & McGuinn, 2021; Mardiningrum & Adriyanthi, 2023). Studies of poetry instruction have also reported benefits from imagination-based strategies, contextual experience, creative-process materials, and structured inquiry (Puspasari & Setyaningsih, 2020; Tasrifah et al., 2022; Garim et al., 2024; Kusmana et al., 2025; Tambak et al., 2025).

Associative Combination as a Scaffold for Creative Expression

Bunglanta operationalizes creativity through lexical recombination. Associative theories propose that creative thought involves forming remote or uncommon connections among concepts (Mednick, 1962; Kenett, 2019). Neuroscientific and cognitive studies likewise connect creative idea generation with flexible semantic search, associative richness, and the interaction of spontaneous and controlled processes (Beaty et al., 2018; Benedek et al., 2020; Kenett & Faust, 2019). In a classroom, a structured word pool can reduce the blank-page problem while preserving student choice. Collaborative word collection can additionally provide social resources for idea generation, after which individual composition supports ownership and personal voice (Sawyer, 2017; Dobson & Stephenson, 2020; Mercer et al., 2019).

Classroom Action Research and Formative Feedback

Classroom action research is appropriate when teachers systematically plan, implement, observe, and refine an instructional intervention in their own setting (Kemmis et al., 2014; Burns, 2010). Its strength is ecological relevance and iterative improvement rather than statistical causal inference. In writing classrooms, observation of participation and analysis of student texts can be combined with formative feedback to guide subsequent action (Black & Wiliam, 2009; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Wisniewski et al., 2020; Panadero et al., 2018). This orientation aligns with the two-cycle design used in the present study.

METHODS

Research Design and Setting

The study employed classroom action research in Class X IPA-2 at SMA Negeri 1 Gunungsari, West Lombok, West Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia, in February 2022. The study was conducted in the second semester of the 2021/2022 academic year. Two action cycles were implemented. Each cycle followed four stages: planning, action, observation, and reflection. The original manuscript reports two face-to-face meetings per cycle and describes the instructional allocation as three lesson hours per cycle.

Data Sources and Success Indicators

Data were drawn from classroom observations, students' poetry products, and documentation. Student engagement was examined through observed participation during discussion, group work, word collection, composition, presentation, and appreciation activities. Creativity in poetry writing was examined through four dimensions adapted from the assessment rubric used in the original study: (1) novelty of theme and meaning, (2) strength of imagination, (3) appropriateness and creativity of diction or word combination, and (4) use of figurative language and imagery. The analysis was descriptive and qualitative; the source manuscript did not report numerical rubric scores for the pre-action and post-action poems.

Table 1. Qualitative Indicators for Assessing Poetry-Writing Creativity

Dimension	Focus of Assessment	Evidence of Development
Novelty of theme and meaning	Variety and freshness of themes; less literal or commonplace meaning	Themes and meanings become more varied and less conventional
Imagination	Evocative and non-predictable images or associations	Imagery moves beyond direct, ordinary description
Diction and word combination	Precision, connotation, and creative lexical combination	Words are selected and combined into more distinctive poetic lines
Figurative language and imagery	Use of tropes and sensory/imagistic expression	Lines display richer figurative and imagistic effects

Note. The table restates the four qualitative dimensions explicitly described in the source manuscript; it does not introduce new numerical scores.

Bunglanta Instructional Procedure

Cycle I established students' understanding of poetry and its physical and inner structures through explanation, model-text analysis, group discussion, and presentation. Reflection showed that participation was not yet evenly distributed, students needed more time to analyze poetic structure, and some had difficulty presenting group work. Cycle II therefore emphasized diction, figurative language, creative process, and the Bunglanta procedure. The intervention proceeded through nine stages: modeling; collecting and pooling words; determining a theme; selecting words or diction; collaborative poetry composition; individual poetry composition; presentation; evaluation; and appreciation.

Table 2. Stages of the Bunglanta Model in Poetry-Writing Instruction

1. Modeling	**2. Word collection**	**3. Theme selection**
4. Diction selection	**5. Group composition**	**6. Individual writing**
7. Presentation	**8. Evaluation**	**9. Appreciation**

Note. Reconstructed from the sequence described in the original article to improve readability in the journal template.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Pre-Action Condition

The pre-action poems indicated four recurring limitations. First, themes and meanings were generally familiar and literal, including topics such as mothers, friends, teachers, rain, and romantic relationships. Second, imagery was simple and predictable. Third, diction tended to rely on common words rather than deliberate connotative or associative choices. Fourth, figurative language and imagery were limited. These observations provided the basis for the instructional action rather than a quantified baseline score.

Cycle I: Building Conceptual Understanding of Poetry

Cycle I focused on students' understanding of poetry, including physical and inner structures, diction, and figurative language. Classroom observations indicated that students were generally interested and the class was conducive to discussion, but participation was uneven. Some students were still passive, required

more time to analyze the model poem, and experienced difficulty presenting group analyses. The reflection therefore recommended closer teacher assistance, explicit modeling of poetry analysis and presentation, stronger attention to diction and figurative language, and explanation of the creative writing process. These refinements illustrate the iterative function of classroom action research (Kemmis et al., 2014; Burns, 2010).

Cycle II: Implementation of the Bunglanta Model

In Cycle II, students moved from analysis to structured production. The modeling stage introduced a poem and made its diction and figurative choices visible. During word collection, the teacher and students generated a large lexical pool from different grammatical and semantic categories. Students then selected themes and words, crossed or combined words into poetic phrases and lines, composed poems collaboratively, and finally wrote poems independently. Presentation, evaluation, and appreciation completed the cycle. This progression is pedagogically plausible because models, brainstorming, collaborative talk, drafting, and revision can scaffold complex writing processes (Asteria et al., 2021; Graham, 2019; Graham et al., 2022; Mercer et al., 2019).

Observation during Cycle II suggested broader participation across the stages of modeling, word collection, theme determination, diction selection, composition, presentation, and appreciation. The original observation categories were qualitative—"all students active," "most students active," "some students active," and "no students active"—and the manuscript reports that most stages were followed by most or all students. Because frequencies were not reported, the finding is best interpreted as descriptive evidence of increased classroom engagement rather than a numerical participation gain.

Qualitative Development in Students' Poetry

The strongest evidence of change came from comparison of students' pre-action and post-action texts. Before the intervention, many lines were direct and expository. After Bunglanta, the manuscript reports more unusual lexical combinations, less reliance on cliché, and more visible use of imagery and figurative expression. Across the four assessment dimensions, themes and meanings became more varied, imagination was less predictable, diction and word combinations became more distinctive, and figurative language and imagery became more prominent. These changes are consistent with the idea that constrained lexical recombination can stimulate remote associations while still giving writers a manageable starting point (Mednick, 1962; Kenett, 2019; Beaty et al., 2018; Benedek et al., 2020).

Table 3. Descriptive Change from Pre-Action to Cycle II

Dimension	Pre-Action Description	Cycle II Description
Theme and meaning	Common themes and literal meanings	More varied themes and less conventional meanings
Imagination	Simple, predictable images	More developed and less predictable imaginative associations
Diction	Common word choices	More deliberate and unusual word combinations
Figurative language and imagery	Limited figurative and imagistic effects	More visible figurative language and imagery

Note. The descriptions are qualitative syntheses of the pretest/posttest comparisons reported in the source article; no numerical rubric scores were provided.

Pedagogical Interpretation

Bunglanta appears to function as a lexical and associative scaffold. Instead of asking students to create a poem from an empty page, it supplies a sequence of manageable decisions: encounter a model, expand a word pool, choose a theme, select words, combine them, test combinations collaboratively, and then write independently. This can reduce idea-generation pressure while encouraging linguistic experimentation. Comparable research in poetry and creative-writing pedagogy has emphasized modeling, contextual experience, structured creative processes, and explicit support for imagination and diction (Dymoke & McGuinn, 2021; Tasrifah et al., 2022; Mardiningrum & Adriyanthi, 2023; Garim et al., 2024; Kusmana et al., 2025).

The collaborative stages may also matter. Dialogue exposes students to alternative vocabulary and interpretations, while presentation and appreciation provide an authentic audience. Research on dialogic and collaborative learning indicates that productive classroom talk can support reasoning, idea development, and shared knowledge construction (Mercer et al., 2019; Howe et al., 2019; Dobson & Stephenson, 2020). At the same time, the transition to individual writing is important because creativity must ultimately be visible in each student's own text rather than only in a group product.

Limitations

Several limitations should constrain interpretation. The study involved a single class in one school and used a classroom action research design without a comparison group. Although the manuscript refers to pretest and posttest poems, it does not report numerical rubric scores, student sample size, inter-rater reliability, or statistical analysis of change. Engagement was also reported through broad qualitative categories rather than frequencies. Consequently, the findings support the practical feasibility and descriptive promise of Bunglanta, but they do not establish a quantified causal effect. Future research should report the number of participants explicitly, use a validated analytic rubric with multiple raters, provide pretest-posttest scores, estimate inter-rater agreement, and, where feasible, compare Bunglanta with another instructional approach.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The two-cycle classroom action research indicates that the Bunglanta model can be implemented as a structured approach to poetry-writing instruction. Cycle I strengthened students' understanding of poetry and identified participation and analysis difficulties. Cycle II used modeling, word collection, theme and diction selection, collaborative and individual composition, presentation, evaluation, and appreciation. The qualitative comparison of students' poems showed development in novelty of theme and meaning, imagination, diction and word combination, and figurative language and imagery, while classroom observations suggested broader participation. Bunglanta may therefore be useful as an alternative scaffold for helping secondary-school students move beyond conventional expressions and experiment with poetic language. Teachers are encouraged to combine the model with sustained reading, vocabulary enrichment, peer feedback, revision, and publication or performance opportunities. Further studies should test the model with more rigorous quantitative and comparative designs and examine its transfer to other genres such as pantun, short stories, and prose.

REFERENCES

Asteria, P. V., Susanti, A., & Utami, R. R. (2021). Fostering students' creativity through modelling as teaching-learning process to write poetry for international students in university level. Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, 618. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.211223.013

Beaty, R. E., Kenett, Y. N., Christensen, A. P., Rosenberg, M. D., Benedek, M., Chen, Q., Fink, A., Qiu, J., Kwapil, T. R., Kane, M. J., & Silvia, P. J. (2018). Robust prediction of individual creative ability

from brain functional connectivity. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 115(5), 1087–1092. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1713532115

Beghetto, R. A. (2019). Structured uncertainty: How creativity thrives under constraints and uncertainty. In C. Mullen (Ed.), Creativity under duress in education? Springer.

Benedek, M., Christensen, A. P., Fink, A., & Beaty, R. E. (2020). Creativity assessment in neuroscience research. Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts, 14(2), 218–226.

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2009). Developing the theory of formative assessment. Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, 21, 5–31. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-008-9068-5

Burns, A. (2010). Doing action research in English language teaching: A guide for practitioners. Routledge.

Cremin, T., & Oliver, L. (2017). Teachers as writers: A systematic review. Research Papers in Education, 32(3), 269–295. https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2016.1187664

Dobson, T., & Stephenson, L. (2020). Challenging boundaries to cross: Primary teachers exploring drama pedagogy for creative writing with theatre educators in the landscape of performativity. Professional Development in Education, 46(2), 245–255.

Dymoke, S., & McGuinn, N. (2021). Being allowed: Negotiating space for poetry writing with literature examination students. Changing English, 28(4), 440–451. https://doi.org/10.1080/1358684X.2021.1891257

Garim, I., Salija, K., Amaliah, S., & Neyarasmi, F. (2024). Contextual approach in poetry writing training for students. Tamaddun, 23(2). https://doi.org/10.33096/tamaddun.v23i2.799

Glăveanu, V. P. (2020). A sociocultural theory of creativity: Bridging the social, the material, and the psychological. Review of General Psychology, 24(4), 335–354.

Graham, S. (2019). Changing how writing is taught. Review of Research in Education, 43(1), 277–303. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X18821125

Graham, S., & Harris, K. R. (2018). Evidence-based writing practices: A meta-analysis of existing meta-analyses. In R. Fidalgo et al. (Eds.), Design principles for teaching effective writing. Brill.

Graham, S., Kim, Y.-S. G., Cao, Y., Lee, W., Tate, T., Collins, P., Cho, M., Moon, Y., Chung, H. Q., & Olson, C. B. (2022). A meta-analysis of writing treatments for students in grades 6–12. Journal of Educational Psychology, 114(5), 1004–1027.

Graham, S., McKeown, D., Kiuhara, S., & Harris, K. R. (2012). A meta-analysis of writing instruction for students in the elementary grades. Journal of Educational Psychology, 104(4), 879–896. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029185

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. Review of Educational Research, 77(1), 81–112. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487

Henriksen, D., Creely, E., & Henderson, M. (2021). Folk pedagogies for teacher creativity: Approaches to teaching and learning in the creative classroom. Thinking Skills and Creativity, 40, 100811.

Howe, C., Hennessy, S., Mercer, N., Vrikki, M., & Wheatley, L. (2019). Teacher–student dialogue during classroom teaching: Does it really impact on student outcomes? Journal of the Learning Sciences, 28(4–5), 462–512.

Kaufman, J. C., & Beghetto, R. A. (2009). Beyond big and little: The four C model of creativity. Review of General Psychology, 13(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013688

Kellogg, R. T. (2008). Training writing skills: A cognitive developmental perspective. Journal of Writing Research, 1(1), 1–26. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2008.01.01.1

Kemmis, S., McTaggart, R., & Nixon, R. (2014). The action research planner: Doing critical participatory action research. Springer.

Kenett, Y. N. (2019). What can quantitative measures of semantic distance tell us about creativity? Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences, 27, 11–16.

Kenett, Y. N., & Faust, M. (2019). A semantic network cartography of the creative mind. Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 23(4), 271–274.

Kusmana, S., Susilo, J., & Nuryanti, M. (2025). Creative process-based digital teaching materials to increase poetry writing creativity of high school students. KEMBARA: Jurnal Keilmuan Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya, 11(1). https://doi.org/10.22219/kembara.v11i1.37272

Limpo, T., & Alves, R. A. (2018). Tailoring multicomponent writing interventions: Effects of coupling self-regulation and transcription training. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 51(4), 381–398.

Lucas, B. (2021). Creative thinking in schools: A leadership playbook. Crown House Publishing.

MacArthur, C. A., Graham, S., & Fitzgerald, J. (Eds.). (2016). Handbook of writing research (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.

Mardiningrum, A., & Adriyanthi, N. (2023). Poetry for EFL classroom: Students' self-expression and the creative process behind its creation. Journal on English as a Foreign Language, 13(2). https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v13i2.6448

Mednick, S. A. (1962). The associative basis of the creative process. Psychological Review, 69(3), 220–232. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0048850

Mercer, N., Hennessy, S., & Warwick, P. (2019). Dialogue, thinking together and digital technology in the classroom: Some educational implications of a continuing line of inquiry. International Journal of Educational Research, 97, 187–199.

OECD. (2024). PISA 2022 results (Volume III): Creative minds, creative schools. OECD Publishing.

Panadero, E., Andrade, H., & Brookhart, S. M. (2018). Fusing self-regulated learning and formative assessment: A roadmap of where we are, how we got here, and where we are going. The Australian Educational Researcher, 45, 13–31.

Puspasari, Q. K., & Setyaningsih, N. H. (2020). Keefektifan model pembelajaran picture and picture dan model sugesti imajinasi dalam pembelajaran menulis puisi pada siswa kelas VIII SMP. Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia, 9(1). https://doi.org/10.15294/jpbsi.v9i1.27572

Runco, M. A., & Jaeger, G. J. (2012). The standard definition of creativity. Creativity Research Journal, 24(1), 92–96. https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2012.650092

Sawyer, R. K. (2017). Group genius: The creative power of collaboration (2nd ed.). Basic Books.

Sulastri, F., & Pujasari, R. S. (2019). How do I write poetry? Investigating students' creativity in writing poetry. Jurnal Basis, 6(1). https://doi.org/10.33884/basisupb.v6i1.1002

Tasrifah, T., Subyantoro, S., & Haryadi, H. (2022). Development of enrichment book on poetry text writing oriented to creative thinking skill with divine values. Seloka: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia, 11(3), 314–322. https://doi.org/10.15294/seloka.v11i3.65518

Wisniewski, B., Zierer, K., & Hattie, J. (2020). The power of feedback revisited: A meta-analysis of educational feedback research. Frontiers in Psychology, 10, 3087. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.03087

Nurgiyantoro, B. (2012). Penilaian pembelajaran bahasa berbasis kompetensi. BPFE.

Nurgiyantoro, B. (2013). Sastra anak. Gadjah Mada University Press.

Pradopo, R. D. (2014). Pengkajian puisi. Gadjah Mada University Press.

Sayuti, S. A. (2002). Perkenalan dengan puisi. Gama Media.

Siswanto, W. (2008). Pengantar teori sastra. Grasindo.

Wardoyo, S. M. (2013). Teknik menulis puisi. Graha Ilmu.

Wicaksono, H., & Hasanah, M. (2018). Pengembangan media permainan imajinasi dalam pembelajaran menulis puisi bagi siswa kelas X. Jurnal Pendidikan, 3, 223–228.

Wilujeng, T. (2022). Keefektifan pemanfaatan suggestion relaxation dalam peningkatan keterampilan menulis puisi pada siswa di MAN 3 Kediri. Bapala, 9(8), 301–310.

Zainurrahman. (2013). Menulis: Dari teori hingga praktik. Alfabeta.

Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1987). The psychology of written composition. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. College Composition and Communication, 32(4), 365–387. https://doi.org/10.2307/356600

Hayes, J. R. (2012). Modeling and remodeling writing. Written Communication, 29(3), 369–388. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088312451260