IMPROVING STUDENTS' ABILITY IN WRITING DESCRIPTIVE TEXTS THROUGH GALLERY WALK TECHNIQUE

Reni Kurniasih, Patuan Raja, Tuntun Sinaga
renikurniasih123@gmail.com

Abstrak. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui (i) apakah terdapat perbedaan yang signifikan pada kemampuan menulis teks deskriptif antara siswa yang diajar melalui teknik Gallery Walk dan siswa yang diajar dengan metode konvensional, dan (ii) bagaimana tanggapan siswa terhadap penggunaan teknik Gallery Walk. Desain penelitian ini adalah *Pre-test Post-Test Control Group*. Penelitian dilaksanakan pada 30 siswa kelas X MIPA 1 and 30 siswa kelas X MIPA 2. Data diperoleh melalui tes menulis dan angket. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa terdapat perbedaan yang signifikan pada kemampuan menulis teks deskriptif antara siswa yang diajar melalui teknik Gallery Walk dan siswa yang diajar dengan metode konvensional. Hal ini dibuktikan dengan selisih nilai rata-rata siswa di kelas eksperimental dan kelas kontrol yang menunjukkan level signifikansi sebesar 0.028 (p=0.028, p<0.05).Tanggapan siswa terhadap teknik Gallery Walk dalam pembelajaran menulis adalah positif. Ini menunjukkan bahwa teknik Gallery Walk memfasilitasi siswa untuk meningkatkan kemampuan menulis mereka.

Abstract. This research aimed to investigate: (i) whether there was a statistically significant difference of the ability in writing descriptive texts between the students who were taught through Gallery Walk technique and those who were treated with the conventional method, and (ii) how the students' responses concerning the implementation of Gallery Walk technique. The research was conducted to 30 students in class X MIPA 1 and 30 students in class X MIPA 2. Pre-Test Post-Test Control Group design was used in this research. The data were obtained through the writing test and questionnaires. The result showed that there was a statistically significant difference of the students' writing ability between students who were taught through gallery walk technique and those who were treated with the conventional method. It was proven by the comparison of the gain scores of mean from experimental class and control class which showed the level of significance 0.028 (p=0.028, p<0.05). The students' responses of Gallery Walk technique in teaching writing were positive.This suggests that Gallery Walk technique facilitates the students to improve their writing ability.

Keywords: *Gallery Walk, conventional method, students' response, pretest-posttest control group, writing ability.*

INTRODUCTION

Writing is one of the language skills that should be mastered by the students besides listening, reading, and speaking. Sharples (1999:8) states that writing allows students to express something about themselves, explore and explain ideas. Through writing, student can convey their ideas in their mind by organizing them into a good text.

However, writing is considered as difficult skill to study for many students (Allan and Vallette, 1981). The writer's observation revealed that the students had problem in transferring ideas into writing. Although the students had been given some topics to write, they seemed to struggle with organizing initial ideas and arranging them into a well-organized writing. Moreover, they also confused to use the correct grammar, appropriate language, and mechanic. As a result, they were afraid of getting writing task. In addition, the students were lack of opportunities to practice writing. It was because the teacher taught them with a conventional method and rarely used certain techniques to engage students in writing activities. The teacher just explained the materials and then asked the students to do the exercises. It contributed to the students' less motivation in learning English especially in writing. This phenomenon also became one of the obstacles that made the students were difficult in mastering writing skill.

In order to solve the problems mentioned above, Gallery Walk was suggested as an innovative technique to help improve the students' writing ability. "Gallery Walk is a discussion technique that gets students out of their chair and actively involved in synthesizing important science concept, writing, and public speaking" (Francek, 2006). Moreover, according to Silberman (1996), Gallery Walk is a presentation technique in which individual learners or groups display their work products (often on posters) and then walk around the room viewing each other's work. They may be asked to provide feedback to the group of individual who creates the work. In this research, students in group were given questions or certain topic to write. Students were given time to discuss. Then, their results of writing were shown through gallery. Each student moved around the classroom visiting the gallery to give comments or suggestions to others' work. The feedbacks from other students were considered as materials for revising their writing.

Gallery walk provides an opportunity for active learning by encouraging learners' participation (Francek,2006). Learners' discussion promotes higher-order thinking skills as learners exchange ideas based on the tasks given (Johnson and Mighten, 2005). Moreover, Bowman (2005: 1) identifies that the gallery walk connects learners to each other and learners to the training topic in a number of interesting, interactive ways.

The Gallery Walk instrument offers many advantages towards student learning such as cooperative learning, peer assessment, practice on a variety of problems and tasks, and written and oral communication within the classroom setting (Hogan and Cernisca,2011). Therefore, this technique was applied in this research.

Some previous researches related to this study had been done. Anwar (2015) conducted a classroom action research to find out the enhancing of students' speaking skill through Gallery Walk and to what extent the use of Gallery Walk technique enhancing students' speaking skill. The result showed that there was significant difference of mean between pre-test and post-test. Furthermore, this technique made the students more enjoyable because the atmosphere of the learning process was not too formal. Besides that, the other similar research conducted by Dinata and Anggraini (2017) showed that there was significant difference on students' speaking achievement taught using Gallery Walk technique than students who were taught by using teacher's technique. Thus, it could be said that Gallery Walk was effective technique to improve students' ability in speaking. In this study, Gallery Walk was applied to improve writing skill.

Furthermore, a research conducted by Ahera (2014) showed that Gallery Walk technique could improve the students' writing skill in hortatory exposition text. Besides that, the students were actively involved in participating during the implementation of Gallery Walk technique. Another research conducted by Mulyani (2014) showed that the achievement of students in writing announcement text who were taught using Gallery Walk was higher or better than those who were taught using conventional method. The similar research also conducted by Batubara (2017) who investigated the implementation of gallery walk technique in improving students' ability in writing announcement text. The results from observation, interview, and documentation showed that the students could be active, enthusiastic, diligent, brave, motivated, and the students could write announcement text easily through gallery walk technique. Those researches had used the technique to improve students' ability in writing hortatory and announcement text. In this study, Gallery Walk technique was implemented to improve students' writing ability of other kinds of text that was descriptive text.

The results of those studies showed that Gallery Walk technique was effective to improve students' ability in speaking and writing. However, there were still no researches provided related to this technique which investigated the improvement of students' writing ability in descriptive text and the students' response toward this technique. Considering the previous research above, the research was aimed to investigate whether there was significant difference of students' descriptive writing ability between those who were taught by using gallery walk technique and the conventional method, and to investigate the students' response toward the implementation of gallery walk technique.

METHODS

This research was quantitative qualitative research which used *Pretest Posttest ControlGroup Design*. There were two classes that got different treatments. The first class was an experimental class which was taught through Gallery Walk technique. The second class was control class which was taught through conventional method.The population of this study was the tenth grade students of SMAN 1 Sumberejo in the academic year of 2017/2018.The samples were 30 students from X MIPA 2 as the experimental class and 30 students from X MIPA 1 as the control class which had been chosen randomly by using lottery.

The instruments used in this research were writing tests and questionnaires. To collect the data, pre-test was conducted in the first meeting before the treatment and post-test was administered in the last meeting after the treatment in both experimental class and control class. In addition, after the post test was administered in experimental class, the questionnaires were distributed to get the information about the students' response toward the implementation of Gallery Walk technique.

In this research, there are five aspects evaluated in writing such as content, organization, vocabulary, grammar and mechanic. In order to analyze the results, the gain of mean from the pretest and post-test scores of both classes were compared. The differences between the tests were analyzed using independent sample t-test.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Results

Based on the result of pre-test score in experimental class, a total of 25 students got a score ranging from 40-71 (82.5%). There were only five students who got a score in a range 72-87 (16.5%). Then, the distribution of pre-test score of control class showed that 26 students (85.5%) got score ranging from (40-71). The total of students who got the score in range 72-87 was four students (13.2%). Meanwhile, the score of learning standard mastery used in the school was 72. It indicates that the result of the pre-test in experimental class and control class are not satisfactory since most of students have score less than 72. It means that the students in both experimental class and control class have the same level or the same basic ability in writing descriptive text.

After three times of treatments were done, the post test was administered in both classes. The results of post test in experimental class showed that the total of 28 students' score of post test (92.4%)got the score in range 72-95. The others (6.6%) got the score less than 72. Meanwhile, the students in control class who got the score of post-test in range (72-95)

was 18 students (59.4%). Furthermore, there were 11 students (36.3%) who got the score in range (48-71). Comparing the data from the pre-test and the post-test, the results showed that the students' score increased. However, the increase of students' score in control class is not high as the increase of students' in experimental class.

In experimental class, the mean score increased 17.13 (from 62.60 to 79.73). Meanwhile, the mean score of control class increased 11.18 (from 61.5 to 72.67).Two means score of both classes which were taken from gain score were analyzed. The result is showed in Table 1.

Table 1. The Analysis of Gain Score in Both Classes

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Gain	Equal variances assumed	4.068	.048	2.251	58	.028	5.95000	2.64373	.65800	11.24200
	Equal variances not assumed			2.251	54.848	.028	5.95000	2.64373	.65151	11.24849

Table 1. showed that sig. (2-tailed) was 0.028. It means that the sig.<α (p<0.05; p=0.028).The calculation also showed that t-ratio>t-table, that was 2.251>2.001. It means that there is significant difference on students' writing ability between students who are taught through gallery walk technique and those who are treated with conventional method. The result of gain score analysis and hypothesis testing of the data can be summed up into Table 2.

Table 2. The Comparison of Students' Gain in Both Classes

No.	Class	Gain	Mean Difference	Sign. Value	t-ratio	t-table
1.	Experimental	17.13	5.95	0.028	2.251	2.001
2.	Control	11.18				

From the table above, there are three aspects being compared, as follows:
1. The gain score of both classes were 17.13 for experimental class and 11.18 for control class. In other words, experimental class gained score 5.95 higher than control class.
2. The significant value of students, there was 0.028 (p=0.028). Based on the table above, it can be found that the students' significant writing score was lower than alpha (0.028<0.05). It means that H_1 is

accepted and H_0 is rejected.

3. The t-ratio was higher than t-table (2.251>2.001). So, H_1 is accepted and H_0 is rejected.

Furthermore, the similar analysis is done by using Independent Sample T-test to find out whether there is significant difference on students' writing ability between experimental class and control class based on five aspects of writing including content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanic. The result of students' gain analysis in each aspect of writing can be seen on the Table 3.

Table 3. The Analysis of Students' Aspect of Writing in Experimental class and Control Class.

No.	Writing Aspects	Class	Post-Test	Pre-Test	Gain	Percent	Sign. Value
1	Content	Experimental	23.1	19.3	3.8	12.67 %	0.103
		Control	22.1	19.28	2.82	9.39 %	(P>0.05)
2	Organization	Experimental	16.4	12.7	3.7	18.5 %	0.069
		Control	15.11	12.6	2.52	12.58 %	(P>0.05)
3	Vocabulary	Experimental	16.3	12.7	3.6	18 %	0.01
		Control	14.35	12.45	1.9	9.5 %	(P<0.05)
4	Language Use	Experimental	19	14.5	4.5	18 %	0.527
		Control	17.3	13.47	3.83	15.33 %	(P>0.05)
5	Mechanic	Experimental	5	3.4	1.6	32 %	0.000
		Control	3.43	3.75	0.32	6.4%	(P<0.05)

From the table above, it can be seen that in experimental class the highest score is on mechanic aspect (32%), while the lowest score is on content aspect (12.67%). In control class, the aspect that improves the most is language use (15.33%). Moreover, mechanic aspect has the lowest score with the increase 6.4%. From the result analysis of students' gain score in both classes, it showed that the significance value of content, organization, and language use are higher than 0.05 (P>0.05). It indicates that there is no significant difference on students' writing achievement from those aspects in both experimental class and control class. However, the significance value of vocabulary and mechanic aspects are lower than 0.05 (P<0.05). It means that there is significant difference on students' writing achievement from the aspects of vocabulary and mechanic in experimental class and control class. In other words, there are some differences between gallery walk and conventional method on students'

ability. It especially came from vocabulary and mechanic aspects.

In relation tothe responses of the students toward the implementation of Gallery Walk technique are described in this section. The result of the students' responses can be seen in the table as follows.

Table 4. The Result of the Students' Questionnaire

No.	Statements	Answers				Percentage
		SA (4)	A (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	
1.	I feel enjoyable during the implementation of this technique	15	13	2	0	85.83%
2.	I feel easier to understand the topic given	11	13	4	2	77.5%
3.	This technique makes me more active in teaching and learning process	13	15	2	0	84.16%
4.	Feedbacks from other students are useful to improve my writing	10	11	7	2	74.16%
5.	Responding others' work gives me chance to share my understanding	11	13	5	1	78.3%
6.	This technique encourages me to write a good writing	12	16	2	0	81.6%
7.	This technique is better than teacher's teaching	10	16	4	0	80%
8.	I hope to learn in similar way again	9	19	2	0	80.83%
Average						80.3%

From the table above, it can be seen that the response of the students toward the implementation of gallery walk technique generally was in very high criteria (80.3%). Therefore, it can be concluded that the students' response towards the implementation of gallery walk technique in teaching writing descriptive text is positive.

Discussion

From the results of the research, there was statistically significant difference on students' writing ability between students who were taught through gallery walk technique and those who were treated with conventional method. The ability of students taught through Gallery Walk technique was better than conventional method.

Gallery walk could improve all the aspects of writing such as content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanic. The implementation of gallery walk technique provided chance for students to discuss in groups and share their idea with their friends. This activity helped students to improve their writing in content aspect. Moreover, the students also given some guided questions related to the topic of writing causing them easier in arranging idea and creating a well-organized writing. That was why the organization aspect improved. Furthermore, the other aspects such as language use, vocabulary, and mechanic also improved because students got a lot of feedback from other students.

Based on the results of data analysis, this technique had the strength in increasing the students' writing ability in terms of vocabulary and mechanic aspects if it was compared with the conventional method. Those aspects had significantly improved. It happened because Gallery Walk allowed the learners to display their work products then walk around the room viewing and giving feedback to other's work (Silberman, 1996). During the implementation of gallery walk, students got a lot of feedback especially about vocabulary and mechanic. In other words, the students gave more attentions to the choice of words, punctuation, capitalization, spelling, layout and paragraphing. This kind of activity did not exist in control class where the students got the conventional method. In the implementation of conventional method, the focus was on explaining the generic structure and language features of the text. That was why the other aspects of writing such as content, organization, and language use had no significant difference on students' writing taught through gallery walk and conventional method.

By giving feedback to the others' work, students had opportunities to share their knowledge and understanding related to the material they had learnt. It also helped them to build their critical thinking since they should know the reasons why they put that comment. It was in line with the theory that gallery walk technique encourages students to use their higher order thinking skills while engage in review (Bowman, 2005). Furthermore, by getting feedback from other students especially in terms of the writing aspects, the students' error and mistakes could be minimized since it made them aware about what they had to improve and tried not to do the same mistakes again in the following writing.

Furthermore, the students' responses of the implementation of Gallery Walk technique were analyzed. The results of questionnaire revealed that generally the students' response toward this technique was possitive. The majority of students felt enjoyable with the application of this technique. It was because the gallery walk connected learners to each other and learners to the training topic in a number of interesting, interactive ways (Bowman, 2005). It also supported the finding by Anwar (2015) who found that Gallery Walk made the students more enjoyable because the

atmosphere of the learning process was not too formal.

The other finding of questionnaire showed that the implementation of gallery walk technique made the students easier to understand the material given. It confirmed the research conducted by Batubara (2017) who stated that the students' understanding about the material was better after taught by using gallery walk technique.

In terms of students' active participation, this finding supports the research by Ahera (2014). Based on the result of observation, he found that the students were actively involved in participating during the implementation of Gallery Walk technique. Furthermore, Batubara (2017) also stated that gallery walk technique could make students became more active. The finding of this research showed the same result that gallery walk could make students active in participating during teaching and learning process. It was also in line with the theory that Gallery walk provides an opportunity for active learning by encouraging learners' participation (Francek, 2006).

The results of questionnaire also revealed that feedback from other students are useful for them to improve their writing. According to Silberman (1996), Gallery Walk is a presentation technique in which individual learners or groups display their work products (often on posters) and then walk around the room viewing each other's work. They may be asked to provide feedback to the group of individual who created the work. The feedback from others could make them aware of the errors and mistakes they have done.

Another finding of this research is the most of students agreed that they could share their understanding by responding the others' writing. Theoritically, this finding proved the theory according to Bowman (2005) who stated that this technique encourages students to speak and write the material rather than just hearing it from the teacher. It also encourages students to use higher-order thinking skills.

Besides that, the other results of questionnaire revealed that the implementation of gallery walk helped the students to create a good writing. 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 students received frequent feedback from the teacher and peers, so it helped them improve their writing.

Furthermore, 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, 2005). Therefore, students had the opportunity to get into the activity and walk around the classroom. Based on the results of questionnaire, the majority of students considered that this technique was

better than teacher's teaching. It could be infered that gallery walk might bring benefits for the students in teaching and learning process. As a result, most of students were motivated to experience this technique again in other subject.

Finally, based on the explanation above it could be concluded that there was a significant difference on students' writing ability between students who were taught through gallery walk technique and those who were taught through conventional method. The students who were taught by using Gallery walk technique had better improvement in writing ability especially in terms of vocabulary and mechanic aspect compared with the students who were treated with conventional method. The students' responses toward the implementation of gallery walk technique was also positive. It means that gallery walk technique is effective to be used in teaching writing.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Conclusion

Based on the results of the data analysis and research findings on the previous chapter, the researcher comes to the following conclusion:

1. There was significant difference of students' writing ability between students who were taught using gallery walk technique and those who were treated with conventional method. It could be seen from the results of hypothesis testing that the significant value was smaller than alpha (Sign. <α, 0.028< 0.05). The students who were taught through Gallery Walk technique performed better than students who were taught through conventional method. It worked because gallery walk technique allowed the students to actively engage in writing activity by giving and receiving feedback. It was also supported by the data of total score increased of both classes. In experimental class, the score increased was 17.13 while in control class the score increased was 11.18.

2. In addition, gallery walk was better for teaching writing English in terms of two aspects of writing; vocabulary and mechanic. The significant value of vocabulary andmechanic aspect were lower than α (0.01<0.05, 0.00<0.05). It indicated that the students who were taught using gallery walk technique had the better increase on writing especially in terms of mechanic and vocabulary rather than those who were taught using conventional method. It happened because Gallery Walk provided opportunity for students to give feedback to the others students' work and most of students gave more attentions to the dictions or word choice, punctuation, capitalization, spelling, layout and paragraphing.

3. The results of questionnaires showed that the majority of students had possitive response toward the implementation of gallery walk

technique. The majority of students agreed that gallery walk technique made them enjoyable, active, and understand the material well. Besides, they couldshare their understanding and create a better writing. So they hoped to experience this kind of technique again.

Suggestions

Referring to the conclusion above, the researcher would like to put forward some suggestions below:

1. For the teachers
   a) The teachers should consider the time allocation for the treatments. There must be a good preparation of the time in each step of gallery walk.
   b) The teachers should guide the students who face difficulties and pay more attention to the students who get low achievement. They have to encourage them to be more active so that they can have better achievement.
2. For the further researcher
   a) It is suggested that further researchers apply Gallery Walk in different language skills such as reading, listening or speaking and also in different population.
   b) It is good to use an observation sheet in order to know the students' activity and involvement in the class. It is also suggested to apply interview in collecting the data to investigate the students' difficulties during the implementation of the technique.

REFERENCES

Ahera, R. N. 2014. The use of gallery walk to improve students' writing skill to hortatory exposition text (a classroom action research at eleventh grader of MA Sunniyyah Selo Tawangharjo Grobogan in academic year of 2013/2014). Islamic Education and Teacher Training Faculty, Walisongo State Institute for Islamic Study.Semarang.

Allen, D. and Vallette, R. 1997. *Classroom technique foreign language and English as second language.* New York: Harcourt Brave Javanovich.

Anwar, F. Z. 2015. Enhancing students' speaking skill through gallery walk technique (a classroom action research at the first grade students of SMA Muhammadiyah (Plus) Salatiga in academic year 2014/2015). English Education Department of State Institute for Islamic Studies (IAIN). Salatiga.

Batubara, F. A. 2017. Improving students' ability in writing of

announcement through gallery walk technique of eight grade at MTS Jam'iyatul Alwashliyah Tembungin academic year 2016/2017. Department of English Education Faculty of Tarbiyah Science and Teacher Training State Islamic University of North Sumatera. Medan.

Bowman, S. L. 2005. *The gallery walk: an opening, closing, and review activity.* Glenbrook, NV: Bowperson Publishing and Training, Inc.

Dinata, H., and Anggraini, R.W. 2017. The use of gallery walk to enhance the speaking achievement of the ninth grade students of SMP PGRI 1 Palembang. English Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Indo Global Mandiri University. *Global Expert Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra, 6* (1): 53-55.

Francek, M. 2006. Promoting discussion in the science classroom using gallery walks. *Journal of College Science Teaching.* Retrieved from http://blog.stetson.edu/jrseminars/wp-content/uploads/Gallery-Walk.pdf .

Hogan, J.P., and Cernisca, D. 2011. *Integrating gallery walks and wikis in a synergic instructional activity: an exploratory study of students' perception.* American Society for Engineering Education. Retrieved from http://gs.mst.edu/media/academic/gs/documents/refcont/024.pdf.

Johnson, J.P., and Mighten, A. 2005. Research briefs—A comparison of teaching strategies: lecture notes combined with structured group discussion versus lecture only. *The Journal of Nursing Education, 44*(7): 319-322.

Mulyani, A.R., 2014. Teaching announcement through gallery walk tehnique (an experimental study of eighth grade students at SMP Muhammadiyah 1 Weleri, Kendal in the academic year of 2013/2014) English Department Faculty of Languages and Arts Semarang State University.

Sharples, M. 1999. *How we write: writing as creative design.* London: British Library.

Silberman, M. 1996. *Active learning: 101 strategies to teach any subject.* U.K: Pearson Education Company.

Townsend, D. 2009. Building academic vocabulary in after-school settings: games for growth with middle school english-language learners. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 53* (3): 242-251.