

Gallery Walk and Think-Pair-Share Techniques for Teaching Writing Descriptive Text to Students with High and Low Motivation

ArsiantiDewiKilasSinarNurani[✉], DwiRukmini

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Article Info

Article History:

Received 10 August 2017

Accepted 19 October 2017

Published 01 December 2017

Keywords:

Gallery Walk Technique, Think-Pair-Share Technique, Descriptive Writing

Abstract

This study investigates the effectiveness of gallery walk and think-pair-share techniques to teach writing descriptive text to students with high and low motivation. A quantitative approach is used in this study by applying 2x2 factorial design in the form of pre-test and post-test. 72 students from the tenth grade of State Senior High School 1 SimoBoyolali who take English subject in the academic year of 2016/2017 are participated in this study. The motivational questionnaire and writing test are used as the instruments of the study. This study reveals several findings: gallery walk technique is effective to teach writing descriptive text to students with high and low motivation, think-pair-share technique is effective to teach writing descriptive text to students with high and low motivation, there is no significant difference on the effect of gallery walk technique and think par-share technique towards writing descriptive text achievement of students with high and low motivation, gallery walk technique is more effective to be used to teach writing descriptive text to students with high and low motivation compared to think-pair-share technique, the ANOVA test reveals that there is no effective interaction among students' motivation, teaching technique, and students' writing achievement. To conclude, gallery walk technique is more effective compared to think-pair-share technique for teaching writing descriptive text to students with high and low motivation, and there is no effective interaction among students' motivation, teaching technique and students' writing achievement. In sum, it can be said that students' writing achievement is not influenced by motivation; it is influenced by the implementation of teaching techniques.

© 2017 Universitas Negeri Semarang

[✉]Correspondence Address:
Kampus Pascasarjana Unnes, Jalan Kelud Utara III Semarang 50237
E-mail: arsiantid@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

The most important purpose in learning language is using it as a means of communication (Brown, 2000). Through language, people can communicate with others. Mastering a language means mastering all of the language skills including listening, speaking, reading, and writing. All of those skills are important. However, writing skill is considered as the most important yet it is difficult to learn.

The importance of writing raises the awareness of improving students' writing skill. As the highest skill to be achieved in learning a language, writing deals with several stages to accomplish such as planning, editing (reflecting and revising), and final revision or draft (Harmer, 2004). Bruning and Horn also argue that to be successful in writing, a complex and effortful activity is needed (as cited in Lam & Law, 2007). Moreover, to be able to acquire writing skill, students need to develop knowledge of writing process and genre (Harris et al., 2013). Due to the complexity and effortful activity in writing, it can be concluded that writing is a difficult skill to acquire.

In some cases, students tend to be regarded as reluctant writers when they are not motivated in writing activities. Pierce et al. (1997) argue that there are several causes of reluctant writers dealing with writing mechanism, lack of motivation and confidence. Thus, lack of motivation and problems that underlie students' reason for becoming reluctant writers might influence their writing achievement. In addition, the dimension of students' motivation can influence their writing achievement.

Therefore, it is likely that motivation is related to students' writing. The notion that motivation relates to learning should be taken into consideration regarding the teaching and learning process in the classroom. Slavin (1996) argues that motivation serves as an important factor in driving cognitive and learning process. Moreover, Sweet and Guthrie (1996) suggest that motivational climates and teaching instruction should be matched.

Several approaches and methods have been established to support the implementation of teaching and learning process in the classroom. One of the approaches in teaching that involves various activities is called the cooperative learning. "Cooperative learning is an approach to teaching that makes maximum use of cooperative activities involving pairs and small groups of learners in the classroom" (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p. 192). Based Richards and Rodgers' (2001) definition of cooperative learning, it can be concluded that cooperative learning promotes the activities that enables students to build good interaction and communication with others during their learning process in the classroom. Therefore, based on the complexity of writing, the nature of English learners, the importance of motivation in learning especially writing and the characteristic of the teaching techniques in cooperative learning approach, I am interested in conducting this study. This study is aimed to explain the effectiveness of two techniques namely gallery walk and think-pair-share techniques to teach writing descriptive text to students with high and low motivation.

Teaching writing in EFL Context

Teaching writing is challenging since it is a staged process. Writing is more than only putting ideas in the right order (Hyland, 2003). It also relates to several aspects such as grammar, spelling, punctuation, content, organization, and flow of the ideas. Thus, writing deals much with steps and stages. Probably, this is the reason that makes writing seems very difficult. Writing is difficult for English as Foreign Language learners (Thuy, 2009; Huy, 2015, Zhang&Guo, 2013). Writing in second language is different from writing in first language (Hinkel, 2004). Thus, the nature of teaching writing and instructions given for students in native language setting, second, and first language setting will be different.

Assessing students' writing is one of the stages in determining students' learning outcome. Teachers should not solely regard

students' writing as the final products to be judged, but as the sequence of revision processes to get the final writing completed (Zamel, 1985). Besides, Butturff and Summers also claim that teacher's response towards students writing in L1 and L2 are different (as cited in Zamel, 1985). Thus, teachers should be wise enough in assessing their students' writing since students' writing in L1 and L2 is different in nature.

Considering the facts that teaching and learning writing is complex, especially in English as a Foreign Language context, several approaches are introduced as alternatives to teach writing. One of the approaches proposed by Richards and Rodgers (2001) is cooperative learning approach which involves the use of pairs and groups activity. Under the umbrella of an approach, there is a method, and technique. Technique is the smallest part which defines as the classroom activity (Celce-Murcia, 2001). The use of certain techniques in teaching depends on language skill to be learned and students' need.

Motivation

As people deal with activities with various reasons and interest, there will be motivations as the rationale for those activities. Between one person and another, there will be different motivations in doing something. Given the definition of motivation as reasons for doing something and relation with certain types of activities, it leads to the differentiation of motivation's types. As for some people, reason and interest might come from inside and outside. Thus, there are two types of motivation namely intrinsic and extrinsic.

Intrinsic motivation relates to personal interest and feeling in doing something has to do with several reasons underlying the activity such as involvement, challenge, curiosity, and social interaction (Sweet & Guthrie, 1996). The positive thing related intrinsic motivation is that intrinsic motivation contributes to long-term literacy learning and support sustained thinking (Sweet & Guthrie, 1996). As the intrinsic motivation comes from students' internal interest, the impacts are quite positive and last long.

Compared to intrinsic motivation, the extrinsic one tends to be more conditional. It relates to interest that comes from the outside aspect. Thus, extrinsic motivation in writing seems like the motivation that lead students write in order to achieve certain goals. In other words, it can be stated that student who write in order to get good grade, get praise from the teacher, impress their friends, and even pass the exam can be considered having the extrinsic motivation in writing.

Gallery Walk Technique

As one of the teaching techniques in cooperative learning approach, gallery walk has its characteristics. Hammontree (2005) claims that gallery walk engages students with the opportunity of showing their project. In this case, gallery walk deals with showing students' product. In line with Hammontree's claim, Kolodner (2002) argues that gallery walk deals with product publicly. Therefore, gallery walk relates to an activity that provides opportunity for students to show their product. The unique implementation of gallery walk in classroom promotes students' engagement and participation.

It is worth noting that gallery walk has several positive impacts for students' learning. It is an engaging activity especially for writing and drawing since students will have opportunity to take a look at their friends' work and give comments (Townsend, 2009). The implementation of gallery walk in writing encourages students to deal with writing a piece of text and tape it on the classroom wall (Bowman, 2015). Therefore, students will have the opportunity to get into the activity and walk around the classroom.

Think-Pair-Share Technique

This technique consists of three stages namely thinking, pairing, and sharing (Nuraini, 2013). Each stage has its own characteristic and purpose. In the thinking stage, students are given questions and they have to think to find out the answer to form their ideas. This stage requires students to think and construct their ideas about

the topic or answer from the questions given by the teacher.

Then in the pairing stage, students are assigned to pair. In pairing activity, they discuss their ideas and thoughts. Finally, in the third stage, namely sharing, students share their ideas and thoughts to the whole group in class (Nuraini, 2013). Think-pair-share technique is heavily related to pairing activity in which students will work in pairs. Thus, this technique promotes active teaching and learning atmosphere.

METHODS

The study uses a quantitative approach in the form of an experimental design. Furthermore, a factorial design is used in this study since this study deals with two independent variables and investigates the effect of these variables upon a single dependent variable. There are three variables in this study. Those are independent, dependent, and moderator variable.

The independent variable is the variable that is manipulated. Therefore, it is likely that the independent variables in this study are teaching techniques namely gallery walk technique and think-pair-share technique. The second variable is the dependent variable, which is affected by the independent variable. The dependent variable in this study is students' writing achievement. Meanwhile, the moderator variable is the variable that is resulted from the interaction of independent and dependent variables. The moderator variable in this study is motivation which is divided into high and low level.

The population of this study is the tenth grade students of State Senior High School 1 Simo, Boyolali who are taking English subject in the academic year of 2016/2017. Students in tenth grade are divided into science and social programs. The population in this study consists of eight classes from both programs. There are 4 classes for each program. Meanwhile, each classroom consists of 36 students.

Since there are two groups involve in this study, sampling technique is important to be used to select the samples for this study. One of the techniques in sampling namely cluster sampling is used in this study to choose the sample. In cluster sampling, the population is divided into groups. Then some groups are selected as the samples for the research. Two classes are chosen as the experimental group I and II. The samples are 36 students from X science 1 as the experimental group II and 36 students from X science 2 as the experimental group I.

Motivational questionnaire and writing test are used in this study. Motivational questionnaire is administered to determine students' motivation level into high and low category. Meanwhile, the writing test is used to measure students' writing achievement before and after the treatments. The try-out test is administered to ensure the validity and reliability of the questionnaire and writing test.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

After analyzing the results of motivational questionnaire from both experimental groups, it can be stated that there are 18 students with high motivation and 18 students with low motivation for both groups. Students' writing achievement of pre-test and post-test in both experimental groups are also analyzed. The following table presents detailed scores for pre-tests and post-tests for both groups.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Pre-Test and Post-Test on Gallery Walk

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pre_GW_Low	18	43.00	70.00	56.8333	6.15725
Post_GW_Low	18	60.00	77.00	70.1111	4.35064
Pre_GW_High	18	45.00	70.00	59.2222	6.34828
Post_GW_High	18	60.00	85.00	71.2778	6.44256
Valid N (listwise)	18				

Based on the above table, the mean score of the pre-test of students with low motivation is 56.8333. Meanwhile the mean score of the pre-test of students with high motivation is 59.2222. Students' scores in pre-test are ranged from 43.00 to 70.00. Based on the statistical calculation, the mean score of the post-test of students with low motivation is 70.1111. Moreover, the mean score of the post-test of students with high motivation is 71.2778. Additionally, students' score in post-test are ranged from 60.00 to 85.00. Students' writing achievement is increased after receiving the treatment.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Pre-Test and Post-Test on Think-Pair-Share

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pre_TPS_Low	18	45.00	65.00	57.7222	5.52859
Post_TPS_Low	18	62.00	73.00	66.7222	3.06413
Pre_TPS_High	18	51.00	70.00	59.7222	4.07006
Post_TPS_High	18	60.00	80.00	69.1667	4.73100
Valid N (listwise)	18				

The above table shows that the mean score of the pre-test of students with low motivation is 57.7222. Then, the mean score of the pre-test of students with high motivation is 59.7222. Students' pre-test scores are ranged from 45.00 to 70.00. . Students' post-test scores for both high and low motivation are ranged from 60.00 to 80.00. The post-test mean score of students with low motivation is 66.7222. Meanwhile, the post-test mean score of students with high motivation is 69.1667.

The Effectiveness of Gallery Walk Technique to Teach Writing Descriptive Text to Students with High Motivation and Low Motivation

Based on the data analysis, the mean score of the pre-test of students with high motivation who are taught with gallery walk is 59.2222. Meanwhile, the mean score of the post-

test of students with high motivation who are taught with gallery walk is 71.2778. From the result of the pre-test and post-test, it can be seen that there is an improvement in terms of students' writing achievement. Moreover, the paired samples test shows that the value of Sig. (2-tailed) is lower than 0.05. Thus, H_0 is rejected. It proves that there is a significant effect of the use of gallery walk technique to teach writing descriptive text to students with high motivation. In other words, gallery walk technique is effective to teach writing descriptive text to students with high motivation.

Furthermore, the result of data analysis also shows that the mean score of the pre-test of students with low motivation who are taught with gallery walk is 56.8333. Meanwhile, the mean score of the pre-test of students with low motivation who are taught with gallery walk is 70.1111. The paired sample test reveals that the value of *Sig. (2-tailed)* is 0.000. The value of Sig. (2-tailed) is lower than 0.05. Therefore, H_0 is rejected; it indicates that there is a significant effect of the use of gallery walk technique to teach writing descriptive text to students with low motivation. This result reveals that gallery walk technique is effective to teach writing descriptive text to students with low motivation.

The Effectiveness of Think-Pair-Share Technique to Teach Writing Descriptive Text to Students with High Motivation

From the writing pre-test and post-test analysis, the mean score of the pre-test of students with high motivation who are taught with think-pair-share is 59.7222. Meanwhile, the mean score of the post-test of students with high motivation who are taught with think-pair-share is 69.1667. The paired samples test reveals that the value of *Sig. (2-tailed)* is 0.000. The value of Sig. (2-tailed) is lower than 0.05. Therefore, H_0 is rejected. It shows that there is a significant effect of the use of think-pair-share technique in which it is effective to be used for teaching writing descriptive text to students with high motivation.

Meanwhile, the mean score of the pre-test of students with low motivation who are taught with think-pair-share is 57.7222. Meanwhile, the

mean score of the pre-test of students with low motivation who are taught with gallery walk is 66.7222. Table 4.17 shows that the value of *Sig.* (2-tailed) is 0.000. The value of *Sig.* (2-tailed) is lower than 0.05. Hence, H_0 is rejected; it proves that there is a significant effect of the use of think-pair-share technique to teach writing descriptive text to students with low motivation. Therefore, think-pair-share technique is effective for teaching writing descriptive text to students with low motivation.

The Effectiveness of Gallery Walk Technique and Think-Pair-Share Techniques toward Writing Descriptive Text Achievement of Students with High and Low Motivation

Based on the data analysis, the mean score of the post-test of students with low motivation who are taught with both gallery walk and think-pair-share is 68.4167. Meanwhile, the mean score of the post-test of students with high motivation who are taught with both gallery walk and think-pair-share is 70.2222. The independent samples test reveals that the value of *Sig. (2-tailed)* is 0.126. The value of *Sig. (2-tailed)* is higher than 0.05. Thus, H_0 is accepted. It indicates that there is no significant difference on the effect of gallery walk technique and think pair-share technique towards writing descriptive text achievement of students with high and low motivation.

The Effectiveness of Gallery Walk and Think-Pair-Share Techniques to Teach Writing Descriptive Text to Students with High and Low Motivation

In this study, the experimental group I is treated with gallery walk and the mean score of the post-test is 70.6944. On the contrary, the experimental group II that is treated with think-pair-share gets 67.9444 as the mean score of the post-test. The independent samples test shows that the value of *Sig.* (2-tailed) is 0.018. The value of *Sig.* (2-tailed) is lower than 0.05. H_0 is rejected. Therefore, it indicates that there is a significant difference in writing achievement between students with high and low motivation taught with gallery walk and think-pair-share

techniques. The mean score of the post-test of students who are taught with gallery walk is 70.6944 and students' post-test score who are taught with think-pair-share is 67.9444. The criterion of determining the significant difference is not only based on the mean score but also the standard deviation and standard error. In other words, gallery walk technique gives better effect on students' writing achievement compared to think-pair-share technique.

The Effective Interaction among Students' Motivation, Teaching Technique, and Students' Writing

The statistical result of two way anova shows that the significance value (p value) of teaching technique is 0.018. This is lower than the level of significance (α) = 0.05. Therefore, it can be stated that there is a significance difference on the post-test result between gallery walk and think-pair-share techniques. The result also demonstrates that the significance value (p value) of motivation and technique is 0.574. This is higher than the level of significance (α) = 0.05. Therefore, H_0 is accepted. It shows that there is no effective interaction between motivation and technique. Finally, it can be concluded that there is no effective interaction among motivation, teaching technique and students' writing. In other words, motivation does not influence students' writing achievement. It is the teaching technique that plays important roles in students' writing achievement.

CONCLUSION

This study deals with several research questions. The hypotheses testing have been conducted to find out the answer of those research questions. Firstly, gallery walk technique is effective and has significant effect when it is used to teach writing descriptive text to students with high motivation and low motivation. Secondly, the use of think-pair-share technique to teach writing descriptive text to students with high and low motivation is effective. Thirdly, there is no significant

difference on the effect of gallery walk technique and think pair-share technique towards writing descriptive text achievement of students with high and low motivation. Fourthly, there is a significant effect of both gallery walk technique and think-pair-share technique when it is used to teach writing descriptive text to students with high and low motivation but the gallery walk gives better effect on students' writing achievement compared to think-pair-share. Fifthly, the findings reveal that there is no effective interaction among students' motivation, teaching technique, and students' writing achievement.

To conclude, this study has portrayed the result of the implementation of two techniques in teaching descriptive text writing. Those two techniques are effective to teach writing descriptive text to both students with high and low motivation. However, based on the findings, gallery walk technique seems to be more effective compared to think-pair-share technique. Moreover, there is no effective interaction among students' motivation, teaching technique, and writing achievement. Thus, it can be stated that motivation does not directly influence students' writing achievement. Students' writing achievement is influenced by the implementation of the teaching techniques.

REFERENCES

- Bowman, S. (2015, February, 20). *The gallery walk : An opening, closing, and review activity*.
- Brown, H.D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (4the.d.) New York: Pearson Education.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rded). United States: Thomas Learning.
- Hammontree, K. (2005). The great invention adventure. *Science Scope*, 28(8), 18-23.
- Harmer.(2004). *How to Teach Writing*. London: Pearson Educated Ltd.
- Harris, K.R. et al. (2013). Bring powerful writing strategies into your classroom. *The Reading Teacher*, 66(7), 538-542.
- Hinkel, E. (2004). *Teaching academic ESL writing*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kolodner, J. L. (2002). Facilitating the learning of design practices: Lessons learned from an inquiry into science education. *Journal of Industrial Teacher Education*, 39(3), 9-40.
- Lam, S., & Law, Y. (2007). The roles of instructional practices and motivation in writing performance.
- Nuraini, E. (2013). *The effectiveness of think-pair-share to teach narrative texts writing* (master's thesis). Walisongo State Institute for Islamic Studies, Semarang.
- Pierce et al. (1997). *Motivating reluctant writers*. Master's Thesis. Illinois: Saint fXavier University.
- process, and performance. *Learning and Instruction*, 22(3), 171-184.
- Richards, J.C., & Rodgers, T.S. (2001). *Approaches and method in language teaching* (2nded). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Slavin, R. E. (1996). Research on Cooperative Learning and Achievement: What we know, what we need to know. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 21(1), 43-69.
- Sweet, A. P., Guthrie, J. T. (1996). How children's motivations relate to literacy development and instruction (national reading research center). *Reading Teacher*, 49(8), 660-62.
- Townsend, D. (2009). Building academic vocabulary in after-school settings: Games for growth with middle school English-language learners. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 53(3), 242-251
- Thuy, N, H.H. (2009). Teaching efl writing in Vietnam: Problmes and solutions – a discussion from the outlook of applied linguistics. *VNU Journal of Science, Foreign Languages*, 25, 61-66.
- Zamel, V. (1985). Responding to student writing. *TESOLQuarterly*, 19(1), 79-101.
- Zhang, Y., &Guo, H. (2013).A study of English writing and domain-specific motivation and self-efficacy of Chinese EFL learners. *Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 16(2), 103-123.