Increasing Students' Procedural Writing through Think Pair Share and Silent Demonstration

Sefira Sefriadi[1], Ag. Bambang Setiyadi[2], Feni Munifatullah[3]

[1,2,3]University of Lampung, Bandar Lampung, Indonesia

ABSTRACT: Writing English is a problem experienced by students. Some students were found to have difficulty applying their ideas into written form. It causes the information to be conveyed not be communicated properly. Similar to writing procedure text which expects the reader to be able to understand the steps contained in the text. Therefore, the writers are required to be able to develop their ideas in order to achieve the goals of the writing. This paper intends to focus on creating a solution for students in writing procedural text by combining the Think Pair Share and Silent Demonstration techniques. Approximately 60 final year students were selected purposively as the research sample. Using a static-group comparison research design, the students were divided into two different classes: control and experimental, were implemented in these techniques, where the control class only applied Think Pair Share, while a combination of the Think Pair Share and Silent Demonstration techniques utilized in the experimental class. Through the Independent Sample T-Test, the findings were that students with the integration of the integration Think Pair Share and Silent Demonstration techniques had higher writing achievements. The students were able to discuss with their classmates and also get a big picture of the procedures involved in doing or operating something. This was because they had seen several ideas in a video that could help them write down the whole procedure.

KEYWORDS: writing achievement, writing problems, procedure text, silent demonstration technique, think pair share technique

I. INTRODUCTION

Writing is a skill that requires a fairly long process. This refers to high academic ability to be able to write appropriate forms of writing. Thus, it acts at the level of language skills and concept development before the writer reflects them in written form (Saladino, 2009). In achieving this, the writer must be competent to consider several things such as sentence construction, vocabulary selection and the purpose of writing (Steven, 2001). Furthermore, Ahmed and Mani (2021) argue that writing is requires knowledge, understanding and skill in its application. This skill is a structured system consisting of a collection of words, phrases and even sentences obtained from the author's representation that requires knowledge (Wilson and Glazier, 2013 and Jozsef, 2001).

The form of writing consists of an arrangement of several words or phrases that form a complete sentence that forms a paragraph. Thus, this process makes it difficult for students to be implemented in their learning. Furthermore, it requires a coherent and well-organized structure. This is in line with writing a procedure text. A series of sentences that change an object containing certain steps are summarized in this text (Maeta et al., 2015). A recipe, manual for using a product and an instruction are such examples included in the type of procedure text (Zhang et al., 2012). Therefore, it is important to make the text appropriate for readers in order to fulfill this purpose.

In writing a procedure text, the learners should be able to create ideas before they implement it into whole steps. Writing and procedure in a text are difficult for the students. As in Alviana's preliminary research (2019), the students found that they were in trouble to determine the development of the topic given by the teacher. In addition, the arrangement in the procedure text was hard to compile and make them step-by-step. Furthermore, another researcher, Hidayah (2021) in her previous study argued that the students did not understand the language features in procedure text. In addition, Siska, Murninati and Andriani (2021) describe that students were less competent in designing structures in procedural text.

Based on this data, a solution is necessary to help students to be able to compose procedural text according to the structure and linguistic features contained in the requirements for writing the text. One of the solutions can be by applying the Think Pair Share technique. This is a part of collaborative learning techniques (Tint and Nyunt, 2015). Based on Kagan (2009), TPS starts with several moves: thinking, pairing and sharing. Moreover, as the name implies, Think is the first stage which requires students to think individually about the topics provided (Wuryandari and Herwin, 2021). In the second process, the results of the individual ideas are discussed with their group friends. It gives the students the opportunity to communicate with their group. This interaction can create

some information which ultimate goal is to provide agreement on ideas. After students find ideas to be developed, they then write the information into a complete text. The final stage is to share the results of their writing in front of the class.

Several studies have raised Think Pair Share to further explore its use in student writing. As in Demirci and Duzenli's (2017) research, they found that student achievement enhanced compared to traditional learning. Furthermore, the students showed a positive impact by being more active in class due to discussions in class to determine the development of information from the topic given, so that their achievement in writing increased (Sahardin et al., 2017 and Santika et al., 2022). However, there were limitations that TPS had after being investigated by Yulanda (2018), confusion could occur among the students in implementing this technique. The students found it difficult to explain the topic. Consequently, there were lacks in ideas developed. In line with Anita Lie (2004), she found that Think Pair Share only provided topic without clear information for students to be discussed. Thus, the students may produce uncertain ideas in their interaction.

Starting from these two problems, researchers took steps to integrate them with a technique that could contribute and build them into a solution. Silent Demonstration is believed to be possible for several reasons. Silberman (2011) considers this appropriate as a procedure. There are several steps that are carried out silently, so that the students give full concentration to be able to understand all the stages (Petty, 2009). This can be used as support to add ideas and information which is a limiting factor in the Think Pair Share technique.

The integration of the Think Pair Share and Silent Demonstration techniques needs to be explored further. This is because combining these two techniques is considered a solution to the problem of writing procedural texts for students. An idea spur that encourages development through discussion is important in the teaching and student learning process. In this exploration, it was decided that the research question was: is there a significant difference in the writing achievement of those taught using the integration of Think Pair Share and Silent Demonstration with students taught only using the Think Pair Share technique?

II. METHODS

Procurement of research was intended to find answers to problem formulation. Apart from that, it aimed to search for and collect information which was then analyzed. In addition, as stated by Cresswell (2012), a research can also increase and develop our knowledge of the topic or issue raised. Consequently, this study uses a quantitative approach that focuses on a static group model. It refers to the use of two different classes (Setiyadi, 2018), control and experimental, each of which utilizes different techniques. The Think Pair Share technique was applied to the control class while the integration between the Think Pair Share and Silent Demonstration techniques is implemented to the experimental group. Thus, a number of 60 twelfth students at SMK-SMTI Bandar Lampung were used as samples, each of which wass taken from two classes by using purposive sampling. As explained by Obilor (2023), the characteristic of this sampling technique focus on the study objective. Furthermore, five meetings of writing procedure text were held with the research stages include: pretest, treatments, and posttest. Analyzing the results of this process is using the *Independent Sample T-Test* to determine the comparison of the students achievements in both the control and experimental classes.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

After collecting data with tests in written form which were summarized in the pretest and posttest, the results were analyzed to see the differences as material for establishing the answer to the research problem formulation. The topics of the procedure text given to each class were the same starting from the first meeting to the last. However, the difference lay in the technique provided. In consequence, there was a slight difference in the teaching and learning process in its implementation because the experimental class added the Silent Demonstration technique as a proponent for Think Pair Share. Student scores were assessed by two raters, researcher and English teacher, by exploring aspects of writing based on Jacobs et.al (1981): content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanics. The results of the data analyses testing are recapitulated as follows:

Table 1. Pretest and Posttest Result in Control Class

Test	N	Min.	Max.	Mean
Pretest	30	52	74	64.6
Posttest	30	69	81	76

Think Pair Share was applied to the control class. The students discussed first before they wrote the entire procedure text based on developing material from the interaction with their group. There were two tests given, namely pretest and posttest. In the pretest, students were not provided with this technique, they only took the writing test given by the researcher. Hence, the results of the students' scores can be seen in Table 1 that the pretest obtained has a score of 64.6 with the highest score being 74 and the lower limit being 52. Meanwhile, after students received three treatments at the second, third and fourth meetings, the final stage that students had to go through in this research was carrying out a posttest. The average value gained by students on this test was 76. Therefore, the overall score achieved by students on both tests increased by around 11.4 points. It is a summary of the implementation of research in the control class, while the results of the experimental class can be elaborated as follows:

Increasing Students' Procedural Writing through Think Pair Share and Silent Demonstration

Table 2. Pretest and Posttest Result in Experimental Class

Test	N	Min.	Max.	Mean
Pretest	30	53	77	65.2
Posttest	30	78	87	83

The material, topics and meetings in the experimental class were not much different from the control class. However, the difference was that in this class the researcher included the Silent Demonstration technique where the students could watch a video regarding a procedure for doing or operating something according to the topic that students would write on their sheet. After that, the implementation of Think Pair Share remained the same by giving students the opportunity to discuss with their group to reach an agreement regarding the steps they would develop in their procedure text. Therefore, the results of the posttest had an average score of 83 with the highest score obtained at 87 while the pretest had an average of 65.2 with a maximum score of 77. It can be concluded that the improvement experienced by the experimental class was 17.8.

Additionally, both data were analyzed using the Paired Sample T-Test to prove that enhancement occurred when applying the integration of Think Pair Share and Silent Demonstration techniques. Furthermore, this could also answer the hypothesis that the combination of these techniques has a positive impact on students' procedural text writing achievements. This is displayed in table 3:

Table 3. Independent Samples T-Test Analysis

	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
Equal variances assumed	.000	6.800
Equal variances not assumed	.000	6.800

The significant level that must be met to be said to be an accepted hypothesis is in the range of no more than 0.05. In the table, it can be clearly seen that $p < 0.05$. In other words, the hypothesis was accepted. In conclusion, the data described previously confirms that there is a significant difference in students' procedural text writing achievement in the experimental class which implements the integration of Think Pair Share and Silent Demonstration techniques when compared to the control class which relies on Think Pair Share technique only.

Initially, the students first applied the Silent Demonstration technique in the form of a video for the students to watch. The purpose of this provision is the students can understand how the steps in something go. After that, the students were given the opportunity to think independently about the topic. They were required to discuss it with their partner and finally share the results of the entire content in front of the class.

Based on the results described, it has been found that the scores in the experimental group are superior when compared to the control class. A significant difference with a distance of around six points is an initial step that makes this integration considered capable in creating a positive impact on students' procedural text writing. Besides, the hypothesis was accepted that the requirements were fulfilled in the analysis test. This is due to the assistance of the Silent Demonstration technique on Think Pair Share. The Silent Demonstration technique itself is considered capable of being applied to procedural training (Silberman, 1999). Besides, the students can see the process of several steps so that they can be well-organized so as to form the final accomplishment in making, doing, or operating something.

Providing the Silent Demonstration technique at the beginning of the learning stage before starting the lesson is an effort to increase ideas for students. As in Sari (2018), this is to facilitate the students in gathering information on the topic. In addition, students feel enhancement of the motivation which has a positive effect because there is a guide to determine the appropriate steps in writing a procedure text (Hasliana, 2022 and Guk, 2023). The next stage given is to implement Think Pair Share as a supporting material for the previous technique. According to Holcomb (2001), the Think Pair Share technique is created to provide opportunities for students to learn. There are three stages in its form (Mundelsee and Jurkowski, 2021); Think time is a process for thinking individually: Pair process is an opportunity for students to provide justifications and arguments with group friends in order to reach a collective agreement: Share is a way to express the development of their ideas publicly to be presented to classmates (Kaddoura, 2013).

This integration provides a combination that is suitable and appropriate to see from the impact provided by justifying the value in the experimental class which is higher compared to the control group. This implies that with the integration of two techniques, Think Pair Share and Silent Demonstration, the students are capable to write procedural text according to the content and in an organized manner. If the students only apply the Think Pair Share technique, they will still be confused about determining ideas and

information as material for discussion with their partners. Apart from that, the requirements for the content and organization of these stages do not comply with procedures because they are not conveyed properly.

CONCLUSIONS

Teaching English that is interesting to students is very crucial to achieving learning goals. Likewise, in completing students' achievements in being able to write procedural text according to correct and appropriate writing rules. Finding the right solution for students to avoid boredom in learning is the task of educators so that they are able to participate in learning well. It is believed that the combination of Think Pair Share and Silent Demonstration can support students' learning in writing procedural text. In addition, these two techniques can be fun learning for students because they can see a big picture in doing or operating something in the video. Apart from that, they also afford to interact because in the Think Pair Share technique there is an activity to discuss with their classmates. Teaching and learning process feels easier and more enjoyable if the solutions provided are right on target.

REFERENCES

1) Alviana, V. (2019). The effect of recipe demonstration technique on students' writing competence in procedural text. Journal of Languages and Language Teaching, 7(2), 128. https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v7i2.1960

2) Creswell, J. W. (2012). Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research. Pearson Education.

3) Demirci, C., & Düzenli, H. (2017). Formative Value of an Active Learning Strategy: Technology Based Think-Pair-Share in an EFL Writing Classroom. *World Journal of Education*, *7*(6), 63-74.

4) Guk, M., Asrul, N., & Amaniarsih, D. (2023). Improving Students' Ability in Writing Procedure Text By Using Demonstration Method at SMK 1 TELKOM Medan. *Journal on Education*, 5(3), 10176-10181.

5) Hidayah, H., Subroto, G., & Candra, M. (2021). Students' writing difficulties in procedure text: An analysis study. *Journal of Language, Literature, and English Teaching (JULIET)*, 2(1), 16-22. https://doi.org/10.31629/jjumrah.v2i1.3130

6) Holcomb, E. L. (2001). Asking the right questions: Techniques for collaboration and school change. Corwin Press.

7) Jacobs, H. ., Zingraf, S. ., Wormuth, D. ., Hartfiel, V. ., and Hughey, J. . (1981). Testing ESL Composition: a practical approach. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House.

8) József, H. (2001). *Advanced writing in English as a foreign language*. Lingua Franca Csoport.

9) Kaddoura, M. (2013). Think pair share: A teaching learning strategy to enhance students' critical thinking. Educational Research Quarterly, 36(4), 3-24.

10) Kagan, S., & Kagan, M. (2009). Kagan cooperative learning. San Clemente: Kagan Publishing.

11) Lie, Anita. (2004). Cooperatif Learning Mempraktikkan Cooperative Learning di Ruang-Ruang Kelas. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Widiasarana Indonesia.

12) Maeta, H., Sasada, T., & Mori, S. (2015). A framework for procedural text understanding. Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Parsing Technologies. https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/w15-2206

13) Mundelsee, L., & Jurkowski, S. (2021). Think and pair before share: Effects of collaboration on students' in-class participation. Learning and Individual Differences, 88, 102015. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2021.102015

14) Obilor, E. I. (2023). Convenience and purposive sampling techniques: Are they the same. *International Journal of Innovative Social & Science Education Research*, 11(1), 1-7.

15) Petty, G. (2009). Teaching today: A Practical guide (4th Ed.). London. Nelson Thornes Ltd.

16) S. B. Ahmed and K. R. S. Mani (2021). Most Common Problems of ESL Learners in Writing: An Analysis. *Global Journal of Scientific and Research Publications (GJSRP)*, 1(4), 15-19

17) Sahardin, R., Hanum, C. S., & Gani, S. A. (2017). Using think-pair-Share for writing descriptive texts. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 4(1), 54-65. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v4i1.7004

18) Saladino, C. M. (2009). Students' reflection on their English academic writing as bases in packaging a process oriented writing manual. Unpublished Thesis.

19) Santika, L.M., Kasim, U., and Burhansyah (2022). Teaching Writing Skill by Using Think Pair Share Technique. Research in English and Education (READ), 7 (4), 135-145

20) Sari, F. (2018). Using silent demonstration Acmethod to improve students' ability on writing procedure text at the seventh grade of MTS DDI Pacongang Pinrang. EDUVELOP, 2(1), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.31605/eduvelop.v2i1.22

21) Setiyadi, A. B. (2018). Metode penelitian untuk pengajaran Bahasa asing: Pendekatan kuantitatif Dan kualitatif (2nd ed.). Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.

22) Silberman, M. L. (2011). *101 ways to make training active* (Vol. 1). John Wiley and Sons.

23) Siska, F., Murnianti, and Andriani, D. (2021). An analysis of Students' Writing Procedure Text At The Third Grade Students of SMPN 2 Sarolangun. Selecting : English Education Program Journal, 4(4)

24) Steven, G. et. al (2001). Prevention and intervention of writing difficulties for students. url: https://goo.gl/Rma3fR.Date retrieved February 21, 2024.

25) Tint, S. and Nyunt, E. (2015). Collaborative Learning with Think Pair Share Technique. *Computer Application An International Journal (CAIJ)*, 2 (1)

26) Wilson, P., Glazier, T. F. (2013). The Least You Should Know About English: Writing Skills, Form C. United States: Cengage Learning.

27) Wuryandani, W and Herwin. (2021). The effect of the think pair share model on learning outcomes of Civics in elementary school students. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Science*. 16(2), 627-640. https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v16i2.5640

28) Yulanda, E. S. (2018). Improving students' english writing through Think-Pair- Share (An experimental study at English Department of UIN Ar-Raniry) (Thesis). An-Raniry Islamic State University, Indonesia

29) Zhang, Z., Webster, P., Uren, V. S., Varga, A., and Ciravegna, F. (2012) Automatically Extracting Procedural Knowledge from Instructional Texts using Natural Language Processing. In LREC, No. 520-527, pp. 520-527).