

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF WRITE-PAIR-SHARE TECHNIQUE IN TEACHING WRITING OF HORTATORY EXPOSITION TEXT

Risma Kartika Dewi

Email: rismakartika88@gmail.com

Program Studi Sastra Inggris, Fakultas Sastra, Universitas Gresik

ABSTRACT

In learning English as a foreign language, the learners have to be able to communicate in English. The students have to have good communication in both oral and written forms which are realized into four skills; listening, speaking, reading and writing (Depdiknas, 2006: 216). However, writing is considered as the most difficult skill for the foreign language learners or students because the students have to follow the rules of the target language to produce a good writing. Learning writing is a difficult task not only for foreign language learners, but also for natives or first language learners (Nunan, 1989: 35). Writing should be practiced and learned gradually and it needs long time to make the students skillful in writing. This skill needs particular practice to develop. As Ferguson in Celce-Murcia (2001: 4) states that writing is not acquired through studying but practicing.

The problems above also occur on students of SMAN 2 Nganjuk. The students of XI IPS-1 have problems in writing composition. The English teacher of XI IPS-1 class said that most of the students show a refusal expression when they are asked to make a composition. In consequence of the students' unwillingness, most of the students' writing scores do not achieve the standard score.

This article will expose the implementation of Write-Pair-Share (WPS) technique in teaching writing of hortatory exposition text to the XI IPS-1 of SMAN 2 Nganjuk. Write-Pair-Share (WPS) is one of Cooperative Learning (CL) technique. Slavin in Cornelius-White (2010: 138) states that cooperative learning appears to be effective across all groups and levels tested, with potentially more positive effects for students who are high achievers, who receive special education, or who come from diverse cultural and ethnic backgrounds.

Keywords: *Write-Pair-Share (WPS), Writing, Hortatory Exposition Text*

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

In learning English as a foreign language, the learners have to be able to communicate in English. The students have to have good communication in both oral and written forms which are realized into four skills; listening, speaking, reading and writing (Depdiknas, 2006: 216). Oral form is listening and speaking while written form is reading and writing. Writing is one of the skills that has to be taught to the students, as well as the three other skills. As stated by Derewianka that writing is an important skill that has to be

learned beside the other language skills (1990: 14).

According to Brown, the ability to write has become an essential skill for attaining employment in many walks of life (2004: 218). In other words, writing is important for the students since writing skill is needed in many works majorities. There are many job fields that require the ability of good writing. It is as quoted by Yiyun that "no matter what career you choose, the ability to write is necessity in life" (1989: 26). It means that in people entire lives, their activities cannot be separated from writing, for example

people do writing task when they are at school, they also write letter to their friends or family, they take notes in a seminar as well. This fact indicates that writing is a demanding skill. It is an essential skill that people have to master.

The problems above also occur on students of SMAN 2 Nganjuk. The students of XI IPS-1 have problems in writing composition. The English teacher of XI IPS-1 class said that most of the students show a refusal expression when they are asked to make a composition. In consequence of the students' unwillingness, most of the students' writing scores do not achieve the standard score.

There must be a suitable strategy to teach writing and give bigger motivation to the students. Cooperative Learning (CL) technique can be a solution to the problems above. Slavin in Cornelius-White (2010: 138) states that cooperative learning appears to be effective across all groups and levels tested, with potentially more positive effects for students who are high achievers, who receive special education, or who come from diverse cultural and ethnic backgrounds. Therefore, CL is suitable to be implemented in class which the students have different acceptance of materials given by the teacher. Kessler (1992: 3) also recognize the three other important benefits of CL, i.e. first, CL classes are often more relaxed and enjoyable than traditional classes; CL can help address the needs of heterogeneous classes-diverse in home languages, English language proficiency, and academic achievement; and perhaps most important, CL offers a wide variety of techniques, strategies, and considerations for teachers.

Here, the researcher chooses her study on Write-Pair-Share (WPS) technique which is a part of cooperative learning techniques. Write-Pair-Share technique is adapted from Think-Pair-Share (Kagan, 1994: 13). The difference is, in the Think-Pair-Share (TPS), in the *Think* stage which does not include writing activity. As stated by Kagan (1994: 13) that TPS works the same way, except that instead of writing down one's thoughts in the first step, people think alone

without writing. Yet, in WPS, the *Write* stage may involve thinking process to gather the ideas, then, drawing the ideas into writing product. For that reason, the researcher considers that WPS is suitable to teach writing.

In addition, WPS consists of three stages, that is: *Write*, *Pair*, and *Share* stage. As Kagan (1994: 13) states that in dyadic technique (WPS), the students first work individually to write down their ideas on the task given to them before. Second, they discuss their ideas with their partner. Third, the students share their pair's ideas with the rest of the class. It can be concluded that *Write* stage allows students to write freely their ideas. It is expected in this stage that the students are not afraid of making errors. They can write everything that comes to their mind. This stage emphasizes on writing activity. At the *Pair* stage, the students have to discuss their composition to their partner. The students do not only write for themselves, but they get additional value by asking and giving feedback. It will increase the students' ability since it is one way to appreciate the writing product of one to another. The last, *Share* stage is time to share ideas/the writing product with the rest of the class.

For eleventh graders, hortatory exposition text is used to develop student's ability in writing. Based on competence standard, the students in the eleventh graders are expected to be able to communicate for academic purpose both in oral or written form, especially in learning to write English text (Depdiknas, 2006: 308). The mastery of hortatory exposition text as persuasive text for eleventh graders is important. Hortatory exposition text gives the benefit for students in their educational and professional life. Mostly, students will make persuasive text in term of papers, examinations, and reports. The same way also happens in professional writing, including business letters and petitions to technical & scientific reports, newsletters, lawyers' briefs, etc.

Based on the background of the study, the research question is formulated into: (1) How is the implementation of Write-Pair-Share (WPS) technique in teaching writing of

hortatory exposition texts to the eleventh grade students of SMAN 2 Nganjuk? and (2) How is the students' writing composition of hortatory exposition texts when Write-Pair-Share (WPS) technique is applied?

WRITE-PAIR-SHARE (WPS)

Write-Pair-Share technique is adapted from Think-Pair-Share (Kagan, 1994: 13). The difference is, in the Think-Pair-Share (TPS), in the *Think* stage which does not include writing activity. As stated by Kagan (1994: 13) that TPS works the same way, except that instead of writing down one's thoughts in the first step, people think alone without writing. WPS consists of three stages, that is:

- **Write Stage**

Write stage may involve thinking process to gather the ideas, then, drawing the ideas into writing product. As Kagan (1994: 13) states that in dyadic technique (WPS), the students first work individually to write down their ideas on the task given to them before. This stage emphasizes on writing activity. *Write* stage allows students to write freely their ideas. It is expected in this stage that the students are not afraid of making errors. They can write everything that comes to their mind.

- **Pair Stage**

At the *Pair* stage, the students have to discuss their composition to their partner. The students do not only write for themselves, but they get additional value by asking and giving feedback. It will increase the students' ability since it is one way to appreciate the writing product of one to another. This *Pair* stage will allow the students to work collaboratively, that is by asking and giving feedback and also giving and responding to praise (Jacobs et. al, 1997: 4). Working in group or pair will more motivate the students since they have a partner to discuss about their writing product.

- **Share Stage**

After the students get the feedback about their writing from his/her partner, then they revise their writing. The last,

Share stage is time to share their final writing product with the rest of the class. It is the stage where the students will share knowledge not only with their pair, but also with other students. The students can give comment and suggestion to their friends' writing composition so that they will be able to write a better writing composition later.

HORTATORY EXPOSITION TEXT

For eleventh graders, the mastery of hortatory exposition text as persuasive text for eleventh graders is important. The purpose of this text is to persuade the reader and listener by presenting one side of argument. Generic structures of hortatory exposition text are thesis, arguments, and recommendation. Thesis is a statement or announcement of issues concern. Arguments mean reasons for concern that will lead to recommendation. Then, recommendation is a statement of what should or should not happen or be done based on the given arguments.

The language features of Hortatory Exposition text are (Doddy, 2008: 168) the use of emotive words, the use of words that qualify statements, the use of connectives, the use of compound sentence, the use of complex sentence, the use of modals, the use of adverbs, simple present tense and passive voice.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study dealt with the implementation of Write-Pair-Share technique to teach writing of hortatory exposition text. Based on the research problems, the design of this study was a descriptive method. A descriptive method is a method that used to describe a research. According to Donald Ary descriptive research study is design to obtain information concerning a current status of phenomena (1985: 322).

Based on the way to present the data, this study was categorized as qualitative type. It described the data or observed phenomena with words rather than with numbers. According to Nuril Huda (1999: 37-38), qualitative research is contrast with

quantitative research. It did not utilize statistical analysis while quantitative research utilized statistical computation and number.

This research used non participant observation because the researcher did not take part in teaching learning process. The researcher observed the teacher and the students' activity in the class and report from beginning until the end of the lesson.

The subjects of the study were the students at eleventh graders of Senior High School. The researcher took class XI-IPS 1 of SMAN 2 Nganjuk. The researcher chose them with consideration that they had to study about hortatory exposition text and they had also to be competent in writing hortatory exposition text. Those reason were based on competence standard that the students in the eleventh graders are expected to be able to communicate for academic purpose both in oral and written form, especially in learning to write English text (Depdiknas, 2006: 308).

This study was conducted in SMAN 2 Nganjuk. In this school, the students of eleventh graders were divided into nine regular classes, they were XI-IPA 1 class to XI-IPA 6 class and XI-IPS 1 class to XI-IPS 3 class. The English teacher said that all of those classes were heterogeneous. It meant that they had different writing ability. The study was conducted in class XI-IPS 1 because the teacher had recommended this class. The teacher said that the students in this class were very enthusiastic and eager to learn English. Unfortunately, their motivation in writing was still low. Therefore, the researcher expected by the implementation of Write-Pair-Share technique to teach writing of hortatory exposition text, the students can compose a good hortatory text based on the generic structure and the language features.

In this study, the researcher used three kinds data. The first data was the data which was obtained from the result of the observation checklist. These results of data were the teacher's activities in teaching learning process, the students' activities in teaching learning process, the teaching technique, and the teaching material. The second data was obtained from field note. The third data was

the result from the students' hortatory exposition composition.

In conducting this study, the researcher collected the data through direct observation in class during teaching learning process using the instruments of research. The results of the data collected from the instruments were presented in the form of paragraph. To analyze the implementation process of WPS technique in classroom, the researcher transcribed the data gathered from the observation checklist and field note.

To answer the second problem of study, the students' compositions were analyzed by using ESL composition profile adapted from Joy M. Reid. Those were described whether its categories were *excellent to very good*, *good to average*, *fair to poor*, and *very poor*. It was used to see students' mastery and difficulties in writing hortatory exposition text. The aspects analyzed were content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanics.

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF WPS

• Day 1

The teacher prepared two topics in 1st day. Those topics were **Air Pollution in Big Cities**, **The Bad Effects of Smoking**, and **The Bad Effects of Too Many Cars in Big Cities**. The number of students was 36. He divided into 18 groups. After every student had got their partner, the teacher explained the rule of WPS technique. The first, in *Write* stage, he gave 30 minutes for every student to compose their writing about the topic which they got. Here, every student in pair got different topic. After *Write* stage had finished, they went to *Pair* stage. They could discuss about their composition to their partner in this stage. It was about 15 minutes given by the teacher in this stage.

Finishing *Pair* stage, then the students revised their composition. The result of discussion in *Pair* stage will make the students composition better. The students had 15 minutes to revise their composition. The last, the teacher chose 2 students to share their composition in front

of the classroom. At *Share* stage, the other students can ask or give feedback about their friend composition. The teacher corrected the mistake of that compositions. Through *Share* stage, all students can exchange ideas and knowledge about how to write a good and correct hortatory exposition text. It took 20 minutes. Next, if they write a hortatory exposition text, it is hoped better.

- **Day 2**

At the second implementation of WPS technique, the teacher gave three different topics in pair. The topics are **Joining Extracurricular in School, Never Try Drinking Alcohol, and Should not Bring Mobile Phone to School**. He also managed the time same as the first implementation of WPS. At *Write* stage, the teacher gave 30 minutes. Each pair got 15 minutes in *Pair* stage. Then, they were given 15 minutes to revise their composition. The last, the teacher asked two students to present their composition in *Share* stage which spent 20 minutes.

THE STUDENTS' WRITING COMPOSITION AFTER THE IMPLEMENTATION OF WPS

- **The Content of Students' Writing Composition**

Content is an important aspect in composition since it conveys the main ideas of the writer. The criteria of evaluating the aspect of content are how knowledgeable the text, substantive, thorough development of the thesis, and relevant to the topic/genre are. The criteria of scoring are excellent to very good, good to average, fair to poor, and very poor.

The students' composition in term of content shows better result in the second implementation. Most of students understand about the topics given. It means that the students can give concrete and develop ideas well. There are no students who got very poor level in both implementations of WPS.

- **The Organization of Students' Writing Composition**

The organization of students' composition is scored based on how well, logic, fluent, and cohesive the students organized the composition. The organization also deals with the generic structure. In writing hortatory exposition text, the composition produced should consist of thesis statement, arguments, and recommendation. The criteria of scoring are excellent to very good, good to average, fair to poor, and very poor.

The students' composition in organization shows the better result. The number of students who got excellent to very good and good to average level increase. It means that the students can organize their writing well. It shows that they understand about writing organization depend on how well, logic, cohesive, ideas clearly, and fluent of their composition. Moreover, there are no students who got very poor level in both implementations of WPS. It can be concluded that most of the students can organize the generic structure of hortatory exposition text i.e.; thesis, arguments and recommendation.

- **The Language Use of Students' Writing Composition**

The aspect of language use deals with tense, number, word order or function, articles, pronouns, and preposition. Since the composition analyzed is hortatory exposition, the evaluation of language use includes the use of simple present tense, subjective opinions, abstract nouns, adverbs, modals, connective, emotive words, compound and complex compound. The criteria of scoring are excellent to very good, good to average, fair to poor, and very poor.

Although a few of the students do not increase from the first implementation to second implementation of WPS in good to average level, all the result of students' composition in language use get better in the second implementation of WPS. It means that most of the students understand the language use especially in the use of

simple present tense, action verb, linking verb, conjunctions (although, because, however, therefore and etc), and modality (will, must, should, would, etc).

- **The Vocabulary of Students' Writing Composition**

The students' composition in vocabulary deals with word/idiom choice and usage; word from mastery; and appropriate register used. The criteria of scoring are excellent to very good, good to average, fair to poor, and very poor.

In the second implementation of WPS, there are no students who get fair to poor and very poor level. It shows that the students understand the words usage of the vocabulary/keyword related to the topics.

- **The Mechanics of Students' Writing Composition**

In order to make the composition readable, the students should pay attention to the mechanics of writing. It deals with the spelling, punctuation, and capitalization. The criteria of scoring are excellent to very good, good to average, fair to poor, and very poor.

The students' composition in mechanics shows the better result. There are no students who got very poor level in the first implementation of WPS. Besides, there are also no students who got fair to poor and very poor level in the second implementation of WPS. It shows that most of the students understand the right spelling, punctuation, and capitalization in writing a composition.

CONCLUSION

WPS technique described in this article can be a suitable technique in teaching writing. This technique helps the students in organizing and revising the ideas easily after they had discussed their writing composition with their pair in *Pair* stage. Having a partner to discuss about their composition can motivate the students in writing a hortatory exposition text. Then, in *Share* stage, the other students can give comment and suggestion to

their friend's composition published in front of the class.

In the second implementation of WPS technique can be known that the students' composition get better since the students had shared and exchanged knowledge of hortatory exposition text with their friends in *Pair* and *Share* stages of first implementation of WPS.

REFERENCES

- Cornelius-White, Jeffrey H.D., and Harbaugh, Adam P. 2010. *Learner-Centered Instruction: Building Relationship for Students Success*. California: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Brown, H.D. 2004. *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practice*. New York: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Depdiknas. 2006. *Standar Isi dan Standar Kompetensi Lulusan: Mata Pelajaran Bahasa Inggris (SD/MI, SMP/MTS, SMA/MA, SMK)*. Jakarta: Depdiknas.
- Derewianka, B. 1990. *Exploring How Text Work*. Australi: Primary English Teaching Association.
- Doddy. 2008. *Look Ahead: An English Course for Senior High School Students Year XI, Science and Social Study Program*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Jacobs, George M., Ball, Jessica, & Gan, Siowek L. 1997. *Learning Cooperative Learning Via Cooperative Learning: A Sourcebook of Lesson Plans For Teaching Education on Cooperative Learning*. San Clemente, CA: Kagan Cooperative Learning.
- Kagan, S., & Kagan, M. 1994. *The Structural Approach: Six Keys to Cooperative Learning*. Handbook of Cooperative Learning Methods. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Kessler, C. 1992. *A Teacher's Resource Book: Cooperative Language Learning*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Luo, Yiyun. 1989. From Craft to Art – How to Teach Composition. *English Teaching Forum*, 27, 4, pp. 26-28.

Reid, Joy M. 1993. *Teaching ESL in Writing: English for Academic Purpose (EAP) and Integrated Skills Activities*. USA: University of Wyoming.

Appendix 1

The rubric below is used to assess students' composition of organization and language use.

Adapted from ESL Composition Profile (Reid, Joy M., 1993: 236-237)

ASPECT	SCORE	CRITERIA/LEVEL
Content	30-27	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: knowledgeable • substantive • thorough development of thesis • relevant to assigned topic.
	26-22	GOOD TO AVERAGE: some knowledge of subject • adequate range • limited development of thesis • mostly relevant to topic, but lacks detail.
	21-17	FAIR TO POOR: limited knowledge of subject • little substance • inadequate development topic.
	16-13	VERY POOR: does not show knowledge of subject • non-substantive • not pertinent • OR not enough to evaluate.
Organization	20-18	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cohesively organized and logically sequenced • Thesis: clearly stated, reflects the writer's attitude towards the issue and clearly states the issue being addressed. • Argument: clearly stated, supports the thesis and the recommendation, logical. • Recommendation: clearly stated, in accordance with the thesis and argument, reflects the writer's attitude.
	17-14	GOOD TO AVERAGE: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Somewhat choppy, but logically sequenced • Thesis: not clearly states but represents the writer's attitude and the issue being addressed. • Argument: fairly supports the thesis and recommendation, quite logical. • Recommendation: clearly stated, and in accordance with the thesis and the argument, reflects the writer's attitude.
	13-10	FAIR TO POOR: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expression not fluent, loosely organized, lacks logical sequencing. • Thesis: confusedly stated, quite reflects the writer's attitude. • Argument: weak and confusing • Recommendation: not clearly stated, but quite reflects the writer's attitude.
	9-7	VERY POOR: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not communicate, no organization, OR not enough to evaluate. • Thesis: not clearly stated, unclear writer's attitude, unclear issue being addressed. • Argument: irrelevant to thesis and recommendation. • Recommendation: unclear.

Vocabulary	20-18	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: sophisticated range • effective word/idiom choice and usage • word form mastery • appropriate register.
	17-14	GOOD TO AVERAGE: adequate range • occasional errors of word/idiom form, choice, usage <i>but meaning not obscured</i> .
	13-10	FAIR TO POOR: limited range • frequent errors of word/ idiom form, choice, usage • <i>meaning confused or obscured</i> .
	9-7	VERY POOR: essentially translation • little knowledge of English vocabulary, idioms, word form • OR not enough to evaluate.
Language use	25-22	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: effective complex constructions • few errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions.
	21-18	GOOD TO AVERAGE: effective but simple constructions • minor problems in complex construction • several errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions <i>but meaning seldom obscured</i> .
	17-11	FAIR TO POOR: major problems in simple/complex constructions • frequent errors of negation, agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronoun, prepositions, and/or fragments, run-ons, deletions • <i>meaning confused or obscured</i> .
	10-5	VERY POOR: virtually no mastery of sentence construction rules • dominated by errors • does not communicate • OR not enough to evaluate.
Mechanics	5	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: demonstrates mastery of conventions • few errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing
	4	GOOD TO AVERAGE: occasional errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing <i>but meaning not obscured</i> .
	3	FAIR TO POOR: frequent errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing • poor handwriting • <i>meaning confused or obscured</i> .
	2	VERY POOR: no mastery of conventions • dominated by errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing • handwriting illegible • OR not enough to evaluate.

Appendix 2

The Percentage of Students' Writing Composition in Each Aspect from the First and Second Implementation of WPS Technique

Aspects	1 st Implementation				2 nd Implementation			
	EVG	GA	FP	VP	EVG	GA	FP	VP
Content	8,3%	77,8%	13,9%	0%	13,9%	80,6%	5,6%	0%
Organization	27,8%	58,3%	13,9%	0%	36,1%	61,1%	2,8%	0%
Lang. Use	13,9%	41,7%	38,9%	5,6%	19,4%	41,7%	36,1%	2,8%
Vocabulary	16,7%	55,6%	22,2%	5,6%	36,1%	63,9%	0%	0%
Mechanics	41,7%	52,8%	5,6%	0%	55,6%	44,4%	0%	0%

EVG : Excellent to Very Good

GA : Good to Average

FP : Fair to Poor

VP : Very Poor