



THE EFFECT OF THINK-TALK-WRITE (TTW) TECHNIQUE ON STUDENTS' WRITING ABILITY

Rozi Setiawan¹, I Made Sujana², Kurniawan Apgrianto³

Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia¹

Universitas Mataram^{2,3}

rozisetiawan@student.upi.edul

Article first received:
30 September 2017

Final proof received:
15 November 2017

ABSTRACT: As a productive skill, writing might be considered difficult by the students. It is caused by some factors such as limited vocabulary and the lack of grammar. These things could lead students to the difficulties in developing idea and writing good paragraph. Hence, proper technique is needed to cope the problems. Therefore, this research aimed at finding out the effect of Think-Talk-Write (TTW) technique in teaching writing descriptive text. This research used an experimental design in which it employed two group pre-test and post-test design: experimental group and control group, each of whom consists of 28 students. The sampling technique of this research was population sampling (all population involved as sample). The data was collected through pre-test, treatments, and post-test. Experimental group was treated by using TTW technique, while the control group was treated by using Presentation-Practice-Production (PPP) technique. The finding shows that t-test value was higher than t-table $2.777 > 2.009$ at significant level .05 in degree of freedom (df) 54. It means that the Null Hypothesis (Ho) stated "There is no significant effect of using TTW technique on students' writing descriptive text ability" was rejected. It shows that TTW technique gave significant effect on students' writing descriptive text ability.

Keywords: TTW; Writing; Descriptive Text

INTRODUCTION

Writing is considered as one of the most essential skills among other 3 skills since the purpose of this skill is to make people write. People can express anything they want through speaking. Furthermore, they can express more through their writing when they have difficulties to express themselves orally. Writing is categorized as productive skill, together with speaking, while listening and reading are categorized as receptive skills. Productive skill means that a skill is used to produce a language which contains meaning,

while receptive skill means that a skill is used to capture meaning.

In one of the standard competence in English subject at grade ten, it is stated that expressing the meaning in short functional text and monolog text/simple essay form : narrative, descriptive, and news item accurately, fluently, and acceptably in everyday situation. This statement implies that the first grade students in Senior High School must be able to write a text. Wells (2003) in Depdiknas states there are four levels of literacy, they are performative,

functional, informational, and epistemic. In performative level, students are able to read, to write, and to speak with certain symbols. While in functional level, students are able to use language for daily. For informational level, students are expected to be able to access knowledge with their language. Last, in epistemic level students are expected to transfer knowledge in certain language. In KTSP, students of Senior High School are expected to reach informational level in order to prepare them to enter University so that this curriculum provides some genres of text to reach this level such as recount, procedure, narrative, descriptive, news item, report, exposition, explanation, and discussion. As a matter of fact, there are many students who are unable to write well. There are common problems faced by the students such as : their ability to choose a topic, their limited vocabulary mastery that sometimes make them lazy to continue writing, and idea that will be developed in the paragraphs.

Based on the researcher's interview with one of the English teachers of grade ten, the students are difficult to learn English, especially in writing. The problems faced are: they are doubt to begin writing because they are lack of vocabulary that is caused by their lack of reading habit, they have limited idea to develop paragraph, they are lack of grammar, knowledge and their difficulties in applying generic structure to organize good paragraph. According to Farooq *et al.* (2012), students often faced many difficulties in producing writing. The basis of all problems is the lack of grammar and the lack of vocabulary which make writing product become colourless, boring, and ineffective.

Besides doing interview with the English teacher, the researcher also gained information from some students of grade ten. They said that writing was more difficult than speaking. It is because they are unable to find the suitable words to write when they are writing. They also propose that the teacher should use suitable technique or method in teaching writing. Furthermore, Whitaker (1998) proposes that teachers must think carefully about what approach, technique or strategy they will use in order to arrange the students to produce writing. It is true that it is not easy to engage the students into writing and it is true that some of them are reluctant to write. However, teacher should bring

them to engage in writing and to improve their weaknesses so that they will be interested in writing. Since they are fresh graduates of Junior High School, they have difficulties in developing ideas or in organizing paragraph based on generic structure of text. Based on the problem above, the researcher assumes that the problems are from both the teacher and the students. However, the key of the problem is on the teacher because teacher is the one who guides and controls the students during teaching and learning process. Teacher should pay attention on what he/she is teaching about and what technique or method he/she is using. Hence, by using a good technique, the students' ability in writing will increase.

Based on the problems of the students, they need a partner to talk or discuss with during the writing process. There is a suitable technique named TTW (Think-Talk-Write) which is classified as cooperative learning. Cooperative learning is a learning model which is oriented on the process, not the product. So, the students' problems which are mentioned previously can be solved because the students are given chance to explore the material given by teacher deeply together with other students within group since the teacher can not control all of the students' activities during the classroom session. This technique was firstly introduced by Huinker and Laughin in 1996. According to Yamin and Ansari (2006), in TTW the students are given time to talk with themselves about the topic given by the teacher, then discuss it with his/her partner about how the topic is developed into sentences and paragraph, finally the students write a text after given time to think and to talk. Thus, the researcher intend to measure the effect of TTW technique on students' writing descriptive text ability.

Thus, this research aims to identify whether there is a significant effect of using TTW technique on students' writing ability at grade X of a Senior High School in West Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia. In order to find the answer, the following research question was employed: is there any significant effect of TTW (Think-Talk-Write) technique on students' writing ability?

Then the hypothesis of this research was divided into two, those are: Alternative hypothesis (Ha) : "there is a significant effect of using TTW technique on students' writing

descriptive text ability", Null hypothesis (Ho) : "there is no significant effect of using TTW technique on students' writing descriptive text ability".

Theoretically, this research is able to give the effect of using TTW technique in learning descriptive text. On the other hand, this research is expected to help students to improve their ability in writing descriptive text, it can be used as an alternative way to the teaching writing descriptive text in grade ten of Senior High School, and it can be used as additional information about model or technique that is suitable in teaching and learning English, especially writing text

The role of writing is as a tool of communication. Communication here means interaction between the writer and the reader. Therefore, the main goal of writing is the message or information implied must be able to be understood by the reader. Therefore, the writer must create writing product consisting of meaningful words so that the reader will fully understand what the writer intend to deliver. As Steiner (1997) states writing is the art of discovery in which it requires a good writer that is also a good thinker, equipped with essential skill in order to succeed in school, in workforce and in school. In line with this statement, it is very important for students to master writing.

Writing is not a simple activity. A writer needs some steps in order to produce good writing. According to Boardman (2001), writing is a continuous process of thinking and organizing, rethinking and organizing. Boardman (2001) further states six steps that writers go through and each step can be repeated necessarily, they are assessing the assignment, generating ideas, organizing ideas, writing the first draft, rewriting, and writing the final draft.

Descriptive text is a text which is used to describe a particular person, place, or thing (Astuti, 2011). Besides, it has two major elements, those are schematic structure and language features as follow :

1. Schematic structure
 - a. Identification
 - b. Description (physical, quality, manner, and character).
2. Language features
 - a. Focus on specific participants

- b. Use of attributive and identifying processes
- c. Use of simple present.

TTW is classified as cooperative learning which means that students are put into group in which they are working together to reach the learning objectives. As Killen (1998) states cooperative learning is both an instructional technique and a teaching philosophy which aims to encourage students to work together to gain their maximum learning, either their own learning, or the peers learning. Some teachers consider that the use of cooperative learning is effective in group which consists of four students which aims to accomplish certain material.

Basically, cooperative learning is a kind of learning model that promotes collaboration among students to achieve certain goals. It can create interdependence among students so that the learning resources for students are not only teachers and textbooks, but also their peers. Suprijono (2009) further explains that each student is responsible for his/her learning and he/she tries to find out the information to solve the problem based on the questions given by the teacher. The role of teacher is only as facilitator who gives support and motivation, but not directs students toward the results that have been prepared beforehand.

Social constructivism theory proposed by Vygotsky has put the importance of cooperative learning. Suprijono (2009) also states this theory emphasizes that knowledge is built and constructed mutually. Students are involved in sociohistoric context. Their engagement with other people is an opportunity for them to evaluate and to improve their comprehension. In this way, the experience and the social context provide important mechanism for the development of students' thinking.

Yamin and Ansari (2012) state characteristics of cooperative learning below :

1. Students are put into small groups in order to reach learning objectives.
2. Groups are consisting of students with various ability.
3. Each group consists of students with different ethnic, race, culture, and gender.
4. Teacher's awards are preferred on group work rather than individual work.

TTW was firstly introduced by Huinker and Laughlin in 1996. As Yamin and Ansari (2012) say this technique is developed based on the fact that learning is a social behavior process. In this technique, students are encouraged to think, to talk, and to write based on certain topic. This technique aims to train and to enhance the students' ability to think and to write.

Yamin and Ansari (2012) state that think-talk-write is built of activities such as thinking, talking, and writing. This technique also builds for thought and reflection, also for organizing ideas and testing these ideas before students are ready to write. The flow of TTW technique starts from students engaging in thought or doing reflective dialog with themselves, talking and sharing ideas with the others, and finally writing.

This technique is expected can increase the students' ability in writing. In this case, the students involve with themselves to think after teacher giving certain topic, then talk by sharing ideas with their friends before writing. As stated in Maulidah *et al.* (2013), for more effective, firstly, students are divided into groups consisting of 4-6 students for each group. This group is heterogeneous, it means that the group consisting of students with various ability.

There are some steps that will be followed by students in TTW. Yamin and Ansari (2012) state procedure in using TTW, they are :

1. Students read the instruction based on the topic given by teacher and make notes about what they have thought (*Think*), they also answer (make notes) some questions provided by the teacher related to certain topic.
2. The students interact and collaborate with their group to discuss the notes (*Talk*). In this activity, the students use their own words to explain ideas in their group. They are also able to be suggested by the other members in one group to add some information related to the topic given.
3. The students express the result of discussion in form of written text (*Write*). Writing can help the students realize one of learning purpose and measure students' understanding the material have learned.
4. The last learning activity is making a reflection and conclusion about what they have learned. One of the students from each

group presents their writings, while other group give an idea.

METHOD

This is an experimental research which aims to determine the relationship between independent variable and dependent variable. The researcher expected to find out the effect of using Think-Talk-Write (TTW) technique on students' ability to write descriptive text. The researcher would examine the effect of this technique by providing two groups; they were experimental group and control group. In the experimental group, the researcher would give treatment by using TTW technique, while in the control group, the researcher would not give treatment by using this technique, but the researcher would give treatment by using technique which was frequently used by teacher in the classroom, it was PPP technique. The researcher would assume that this technique could improve students' writing descriptive ability if the result of t-test is higher than t-table at significant level .05.

Arikunto (2006) defines that population is all of individual which are subject of research. Furthermore, Sugiyono (2010) defines population as generalization area consisting of the object or subject who have certain characteristic which is defined by researcher in order to be learned and to draw the conclusion. The population of this study was the students of grade ten at a Senior High School in West Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia. The total population of this study was 60 students from 2 classes, they are X-1 (ten-one) and X-2 (ten-two). Arikunto (2006) states that it is better to take all of the population if the number of population is less than 100, but if they are more than 100, the researcher can take 10-15% or 20-25% of the population. Therefore, the researcher would take all of the population as the sample since the sample was less than 100. The researcher would divide the students into two groups, they were X-1 as the experimental group and X-2 as the control group in which each class consisted of 30 students.

There were two kinds of instruments that were employed in this research, those are pre-test and post-test. Pre-test is the beginning step to collect data. It happened before giving treatment. In the pre-test, the researcher gave a writing test

to both experimental and control group. The test was about describing one of their nearest family members. The researcher asked the students to write descriptive text in order to know their current writing ability. Meanwhile, another instrument beside pre-test that was employed namely post-test. The employment of post-test is the final step of collecting data. It happened after giving treatments in both classes. This test aimed to know the students' progress before and after giving treatment. In the post-test, the researcher provided a topic about descriptive text which had relation with one of the topics (tourism object in my region) given during treatment, then they were asked to write it. As the result, the researcher would find out whether TTW technique gave significant effect in teaching writing.

First, the researcher gave pre-test to both of the groups. It was followed by giving treatment about three times to each group. The experimental group was treated by using TTW technique and control group treated by using PPP technique. After giving treatment, the researcher gave post-test to both of the groups based on material that was given in treatment. The form of post-test was achievement test in which the topic related to the topics given during treatment, it was "one of tourism objects in my region". Testing is a way to measure students' ability (Hughes, 2003). This is a way to collect the data through giving a test to students about some related material in order to know whether or not the students have understood the material. It is also a way to find out the strengths and weaknesses of the students.

After collecting students pre-test and post-test, the researcher assessed the students' writing descriptive text result. Having given the grades for result of students writing, the researcher inserted the students' score into the table data. The researcher further found the mean deviation score of pre-test and post-test by using the formula below :

$$Mx = \frac{\sum dx}{N} \quad (\text{Experimental group})$$

$$My = \frac{\sum dy}{N} : (\text{Control group})$$

The next step was calculating the square deviation by using the following formula :

$$\sum X^2 = \sum dx^2 - \frac{(\sum dx)^2}{N} \quad (\text{Experimental group})$$

$$\sum Y^2 = \sum dy^2 - \frac{(\sum dy)^2}{N} \quad (\text{Control group})$$

Then the researcher calculated the correlation coefficients of the two mean scores whether they are categorized as significant or not, the formula is below :

$$t - test = \frac{Mx - My}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\sum X^2 + \sum Y^2}{Nx + Ny - 2}\right) \left(\frac{1}{Nx} + \frac{1}{Ny}\right)}}$$

The last step was to count the degree of freedom, the researcher would use the following formula (Arikunto, 2006) :

$$df = Nx + Ny - 2$$

After obtaining the t-test scores, then it is tested at the significant levels .05 (95%). The result of the test could be interpreted by using the following formula :

- a. If $t - test \geq t - table$ at the significant level .05, H_0 is rejected.
- b. If $t - test < t - table$ at the confidence level .05, H_0 is failed to be rejected.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The data collection and the treatments were collected and conducted within three weeks, it was started from May 2nd to May 21st 2014. First, students of both groups were given pre-test about "one of your family members". After conducting the pre-test, descriptive text was explained including function, generic structure, and language features. In the next meeting, the treatment began to be given. In the experimental group, some groups firstly formed based on their score in pre-test. It aimed to create groups with various ability. It means that a group consists of 4 to 5 students with different ability. It was expected that they could help each other during *Talk* session. The students were confused at the first treatment. However, they were feeling easy after they understood about the procedure of using TTW. While in the control group, PPP was

applied in teaching writing. This technique is different from TTW, it is an individual writing. Before applying both techniques, some vocabulary were given related to the topic "My Pet", then the students asked to create sentences based on the vocabulary given. After creating sentences, then both of the techniques began to be applied based on the their own procedures. The two other topics were given, they were "My favourite teacher" and "The best place that I visited" in the next two meetings. The students and the researcher kept following the procedure of the technique in order to create a better writing.

At the end of the meeting, a post-test was given to both of groups. The students were asked to write a descriptive text about "a tourism object in my region". The researcher kept applying TTW in Experimental Group, however, the researcher did not provide some vocabulary like what the researcher did during treatments. Seven questions were provided in which they were related to the topic which would be answered by the students in *Think* phase. Furthermore, in order to control the students' writing in Experimental group, the students within a group were not allowed to write descriptive text with the same title or topic. While the students in the control group were given the same topic, the students wrote the texts individually.

In pre-test, there were 4 (14%) students who got up to the minimum standard score 70 in the pre-test of the experimental group, while

there were 24 (86%) students who got score under 70. In the control group, there were 4 (14%) students who got up to the minimum standard score 70 in the pre-test, while there were 24 (86%) students who got score under 70. The mean score of the pre-test of experimental group is 54.75 while that in control group is 55.10. From the students' writing of both the classes, it was identified that their problems were on developing idea, difficulties in grammar and structure, lack of vocabulary, and also spelling and punctuation.

In post-test the students from both groups showed their improvement. It could be seen from the number of students who got up to the minimum standard score. In the experimental group, there were 17 (61%) students who got up to the minimum standard score, while in control group there were 10 (36%) students who got up to the minimum standard score. The mean score of the post-test of experimental group is 70.57 while that in control group is 64.25. From their writing, it was found that the students' problems were grammar and spelling and punctuation. Some students in the control group were found to have these problems more than those in experimental group.

After distributing the pre-test scores and post-test scores, the deviation score was calculated in which it can be seen further in Table 1 and Table 2 below. Table 1 shows the deviation score of Experimental group, while Table 2 shows the deviation score of Control group.

Table 1. The Deviation Score of Experimental Group

Total Sample	Pre-Test (x1)	Post-Test (x2)	Deviation score of Pre-Test and Post-Test (dx)	Square deviation score (dx ²)
28	1533	1976	$\Sigma dx=443$	$\Sigma dx^2=10353$

Meanwhile, the table below shows the result of the pre-test and the post-test scores with

deviation score and square deviation scores in control group.

Table 2. The Deviation Score of Control Group

Total Sample	Pre-Test (y1)	Post-Test (y2)	Deviation score of Pre-Test and Post-Test (dy)	Square deviation score (dy ²)
28	1536	1799	$\Sigma dy=236$	$\Sigma dy^2=4006$

The table above shows the result of the pre-test and the post-test scores with deviation

score and square deviation scores in control group. In the Table 1 the deviation score of

experimental group is 443 and the square deviation score of experimental group is 10353. While in Table 2 the deviation score of control group is 236 and the square deviation score of control group is 4006. After that, the researcher computed the mean deviation score (M) and the sum of square of the mean deviation (ΣX^2 and ΣY^2) of both groups by using the total of the scores of deviation and square deviation score. Furthermore, the researcher used t-test operation by following the steps stated in the previous section.

After doing the computation, it was got that the mean deviation score (M) for experimental group (Mx) is 15821, while the control group (My) is 8428. Then, the sum square of mean deviation of experimental group (ΣX^2) is 3344.10b, while the sum square of mean deviation of control group is 2016.858. The last step is testing the t-test by employing mean deviation scores of both groups as well as their sum square of mean deviation. As the result it was got that the t-test 2.777.

During this research, there were two students from each group who were absent from the pre-test until the post-test. Thus, scores of 28 students were taken from each group to be computed and analyzed in the next step.

From the result of rough description above, the lowest pre-test scores of the two groups were not too different. It indicates that the level of ability in writing descriptive text between two groups was equal. It means that the students from the two groups had the same background in terms of writing ability. Furthermore, the mean score of pre-test from both groups was higher than the mean scores of the pre-test. Hence, it can be tentatively said that there is an effect of TTW technique on students' writing ability.

Based on the interpretation of the data, the researcher would like to interpret that there is an effect of TTW technique on students' writing ability. It can be seen by comparing the result of t-test and t-table. The computation shows that the t-test is 2.777. In this research, the researcher then took two-tailed test to know whether or not there is a significant effect of TTW technique, where the significant level is .05 (95%) with (2.009) in degree of freedom (df) 54. Hence, from comparing the t-test value with t-table, it was found that there is significant effect of TTW technique on students' writing ability. The result can be further seen in Table 3.

Table 3. Testing the Result of t-test

t-test	t-table	
2.777	df	.05
	54	2.009

Table 3 shows that there is significant effect of using TTW technique on students' writing descriptive ability. It can be seen that with the degree of freedom 54, the t-test value 2.777 is higher than the table at significance level of .05 (95%).

The use of TTW technique in teaching writing descriptive text gave positive influence towards the students rather than the use of PPP technique. It was because that TTW technique gives chances for the students to gain idea and information needed to write. In accordance to Wiederhold in Yamin and Ansari (2012), by making notes the students are enhancing their knowledge and also increasing their thinking and writing skills. When they were given a topic by the teacher, they would develop the topic by

generating the ideas in their minds. When the students felt that they were not able to develop their ideas, the teacher brought some questions related to the topic given. Hence, the students are involved in *Think* phase.

The students then did *Talk* phase by having discussion and interaction with the members within the groups. The students would not be shy because they were interacting with their peers, not their teacher. They were able to discuss what they had constructed in *Think* phase, such as the generic structure and the language features of decriptive text. The aim of this phase is not only to make them discuss, but also to make them take and give what they had already had so that if there is a student with lack of information, he/she automatically gained

information from the student who has the information. Huinker and Laughlin in Yamin and Ansari (2012) also state that this phase aims to make the students talk. Generally, communication flow naturally through talking, but not through writing. Talk can be used as a tool to produce writing. It can accelerate the students ability to express their idea in form of writing. It is because the students are given chance to talk with the other students in which it makes the students are able to construct and share idea through this phase.

After the two phases were done, the students then wrote their writing product as a complete descriptive text. It is called *Write* phase, the last phase of this technique. This phase will help the students to make relationship between their writing concept and its product and this phase also helps the teacher to monitor the students writing development. Furthermore, Masingila and Wisniowska in Yamin and Ansari (2012) state that *Write* can be used by the teacher as an opportunity to monitor the students' mistakes, misconception, and the students concept of the same idea.

Besides having advantages, this technique also has weaknesses. For instance, the students will just write based on the questions given by the teacher in *Think* phase so that their writing will contain limited information related to the questions. Meanwhile, they can elaborate more about the topic, thus, the other questions will appear on students' minds. This problem can be found among the students with low ability in writing. They will only write the information based on their answer of the question given. However, the teacher can use another strategy, such as warm the students up in the beginning of each meeting of many kinds of topics by questioning some of them. Furthermore, the other problem faced by the students was their low ability in vocabulary, grammar, and spelling. These problems affected the students' writing products. The researcher found these problems in both experimental group and control group, however, the most problems were found in the control group.

As the result, since the t-test (2.777) is higher than t-table at significant level .05 (95%) with 2.009, it means that the Null hypothesis (Ho) which states that "there is no significant

effect of using TTW technique on students' writing descriptive text ability" is rejected, so the Alternate hypothesis (Ha) which states that "there is a significant effect of using TTW technique on students' writing descriptive text ability" is failed to be rejected. Thus, the use of Think-Talk-Write (TTW) technique gives a significant effect on students' writing descriptive text ability.

CONCLUSION

Based on the result of data analysis and data interpretation as seen in chapter IV, it can be concluded that Think-Talk-Write (TTW) technique gave significant effect on students' writing descriptive ability. It was seen from the post-test result of the experimental group which was higher than that of the pre-test. The average value of the post-test was 70.57, while the average value of the pre-test was 54.75. Moreover, the average value of the post-test from control group was lower than the average value of the post-test from experimental group, it was 64.25. Thus, it proves that TTW technique was influential on students' ability in writing descriptive text.

From the data analysis, two tailed test was used in order to know the significant effect of TTW technique on students' writing descriptive text ability. The t-test was 2.777, it is higher than the t-table value at the significance level .05 (95%) with 2.009. In conclusion, the researcher stated that TTW technique gives significant effect on students' writing descriptive ability.

REFERENCES

- Arikunto, S. (2006). *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Astuti, A. P. (2011). *The Use Of the Real Object to Teach Written Descriptive Text : A Case of Eight Grade Students of SMP Negeri 1 Banjarharjo in Academic Year 2011/2012*. IKIP PGRI Semarang.
- Boardman, C. A. (2001). *Writing to Communicate*. London: Pearson Education.
- Depdiknas. (2003). *Standar Isi Bahasa Inggris SMA*. Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.
- Farooq, M. S. *et al.* (2012). Opinion of Second Language Learners about Writing

- Difficulties in English Language. *A Research Journal of South Asian Studies* Vol. 27, No. 1, January-June 2012, pp.183-194.
- Hughes, A. (2003). *Testing for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Killen, R. (1998). *Effective Teaching Strategies. Lesson from research and practice*. (2nd edition). Sydney: Social Science Press.
- Steiner, J.V. (1997). *Notebooks of the Mind*. United State of America: Oxford University Press.
- Sugiyono. (2010). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Suprijono, A. (2009). *Cooperative Learning : Teori & Aplikasi PAIKEM*. Surabaya: Penerbit Pustaka Pelajar.
- Whitaker, C. (1998). *Best Practices in Teaching Writing*. Retrieved from <http://www.learner.org/workshops/middlewriting/images/pdf/HomeBestPrac.pdf>.
- Yamin, M & Bansu I. A. (2012). *Taktik Mengembangkan Kemampuan Individual Siswa*. Jakarta : Penerbit Referensi.