THE EFFECT OF USING GALLERY WALK AS AN ALTERNATIVE TECHNIQUE TO STUDENTS' ACHIEVEMENT IN SPEAKING

by CEK TURNITIN

THE EFFECT OF USING GALLERY WALK AS AN ALTERNATIVE TECHNIQUE TO STUDENTS' ACHIEVEMENT IN SPEAKING

Indah Puspitasari[1]
[1]STKIP PGRI Pacitan, 0819887047
[1]inkiku47@gmail.com

Abstract

The objective of this research was to find out whether there is a significant effect of using Gallery Walk as an alternative technique to students' achievement in speaking. This research is a pre-experimental research using one group pre-test post-test design. The sample of the study was 25 students of X MIPA 3 in SMAN Tulakan. The data were collected by means of a speaking test. The result of the sample t-test showed that the mean difference between students' pre-test and post-test was 5.98, with significance value was 0.05. This result showed that teaching speaking using Gallery Walk as an alternative technique had a significant effect on students' achievement in speaking. In other words, it can be concluded that teaching speaking using Gallery Walk as an alternative technique significantly improved students' achievement in speaking.

Keywords: gallery walk, alternative technique, speaking

Introduction

English is an international language which is spoken all over the world. It has been widely spoken as a communication tool of many sectors of human life such as education, economics, commerce and industry, information technology, diplomacy, and international collaboration. English is learnt by the greatest number of students in the world as a foreign language, probably, because it is in the school curriculum whether they like it or not (Harmer, 2002: 1-2).

The objective of English teaching and learning is to enable students to do English communication in both oral and written forms. Therefore, the emphasis of English teaching and learning is on developing students' four language skills, they are listening, speaking, reading, and writing. These language skills are closely related to each other. Among those skills, speaking is the most important one due to the large number of students who want to study English in order to be able to use English for communicative purposes.

Speaking is one of the four language skills that is taught in the teaching of English. It is one of the productive skills. Many experts have their own ideas in defining the meaning of speaking. Hornby (1995) defined that speaking is the skill that the students will be judged upon most in real-life situations. It is an important part of everyday interaction and most often the first impression of a person is based on his/her ability to speak fluently and comprehensively. In line with Hornby, Grognet (1997) stated that speaking is one of the skills that have to be mastered by students in learning English. Speaking is an essential tool for communicating. Meanwhile, Scott and Ytreberg (2004: 125) said that Speaking is perhaps the most demanding skill for the teacher to teach. Speakers talk in order to have some effect on their listeners. When speaking to other people, speakers try to make their communication run well. Speakers have to speak when they want to assert things to change their knowledge. They ask them questions to get them to provide information. They request things to get them to do things for them. In speaking, communication between two people should happen.

Based on the explanation above, it can be concluded that speaking is one of the productive skills in teaching English that have to be mastered by students. Since, speaking skill is an essential tool for communicating and to change the knowledge.

The fact is that the teaching and learning of English at schools has not achieved the goal yet. Many schools tend to give more attention on teaching reading or vocabulary. Besides, the teacher still uses dialogues in which the students only read and then practice the dialogues with their friends at teaching speaking in the school. Quite a few teachers teach using games or other interesting activities during the lesson. Because of those facts, it is obvious that the teaching and learning of English have failed to make students have good speaking ability. The students are often confused and do not know what to say when someone speaks in English to them.

The result is that most of the senior high school students seem to have great difficulties in speaking English. There are several reasons of having difficulties to speak. First, the students often do not have self-confidence in speaking because they often feel afraid in making mistake. Second, the students do not have motivation to perform their speaking skill in front of class. Third, the teaching technique and teaching materials are not interesting for the students.

On a preliminary study was conducted by the researcher at SMAN Tulakan Pacitan. She observed some classes in the teaching-learning processes of speaking English. When the teacher asked the students some questions that require oral answers, most of them did not say a single word. Some of them seemed confused and tensed. Some of the confused students admitted that they did not understand what the teacher asked so they did not know how to answer the questions. They were afraid of being punished, laughed at, or looking stupid. Some were nervous, and they gave various reasons of why they felt so.

Referring to the cases above, to create the excitement, students need the appropriate technique in learning. The teaching technique that is appropriate for students will support the success of learning. Gallery Walk technique is able to be an alternative to teach speaking skill. Silberman (1996: 24) stated that Gallery Walk is a presentation method 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. From Silberman's statement means gallery walk allows students to be actively engaged as they walk throughout the classroom. They work together in small groups to share ideas and respond to meaningful questions, images, and problem-solving situations or texts. In the other hand, Francek (2006: 27) describes that gallery walk is a discussion technique that gets students out of their chairs and into active engagement. The advantage of the method is its flexibility. A Gallery walk holds a variety of benefits for students and teachers alike.

The gallery walk is a powerful opening, closing, or review activity. In this activity, participants write on various pieces of chart paper that they have taped to the training room walls. Through a gallery walk, the students are able to learn from one another and from their own previous knowledge. The technique serves many different types of students' intelligences and many different ways in which students learn. It serves the kinesthetic learner, because it involves walking around and other movement, it serves the interpersonal learner, because it includes small group interaction, and it serves the verbal/linguistic learner, because it includes discussion and written answers.

By the use of gallery walk as an alternative technique, the researcher hopes the students are able to involve the emotional power to find a new knowledge and motivate them to be active to improve their self-confidence on English language especially in speaking skill. Then in this research, the researcher wants to find out whether there is a significant effect of using Gallery Walk as an alternative technique to students' achievement in speaking.

Methodology

This research was a pre-experimental research with aimed to find out whether there is a significant effect of using Gallery Walk as an alternative technique to students'

achievement in speaking. This research was conducted by using one group pre-test – post-test design. Creswell (2005: 160) states that "This design includes a pre-test measure followed by a treatment and a post test for a single group". From that statement, there was no control group in this study. It could be argued that the exposure of the treatment to the students could be maximized since there was only one group. In this research, the researcher compared the scores in pre-test and post-test to see whether the treatment is effective or not on the students' achievement in speaking skill. In this study, the researcher used population-single technique. Arikunto (2006) stated that population is all of the subjects who are connected to the research. The population of this research was all first year students of SMAN Tulakan Pacitan. There were three classes of MIPA and two classes of IPS. While, sample is a number of individuals for a study in such a way that the individuals represent the larger group from which they were selected (Arikunto, 2006). By using cluster random sampling, the sample in this research was X MIPA 3 that consisted of 25 students, 8 males and 17 females.

Table 1.
One Group Pre-test and Post-test (Sugiyono, 2015)

Group	Pre-test	Treatment	Post-test
Experiment	O1	-	O2

The group of students who got involved as the sample of the study was exposed to Gallery Walk as an alternative technique through four meetings, including pre-test and posttest. Each meeting covered a 45-minute teaching learning activity. To gain qualified data, the data were collected by using observation checklist, interview guidelines, and a speaking scoring rubric. To analyze the data, the researcher used the quantitative descriptive analysis. The quantitative data obtained from speaking performances were presented in the form of tables and mean scores. The indicator of the success of this research was based on oral proficiency scoring categories proposed by Brown (2001: 173). The research is considered as successful if the students make a significant improvement on their grammar, vocabulary, comprehension, fluency, pronunciation and task. By the researcher, that the verbal proficiency assessment category was later adapted into three categories: fluency, content, and appearance. In fluency, there are pronunciation, intonation and stress. While in content there are generic structure, grammar, and vocabulary. Furthermore, the last category is appearance consisting of body language and expression. The instruction of speaking test used in this research was students were asked to give their opinion. The indicator of students' success in speaking achievement was when their scores reached the passing grade set for English in the first year students of SMAN Tulakan Pacitan which was 75. Normality and homogeneity testing are the prerequisite test which was applied before used sample t-test to analyze the data.

Findings and Discussion
The assessment of the students' achievement in speaking was based on oral proficiency scoring categories proposed by Brown (2001: 173). The research is considered as successful if the students make a significant improvement on their grammar, vocabulary, comprehension, fluency, pronunciation and task. The speaking rubric score was later adapted into three categories: fluency (pronunciation, intonation and stress), content (generic structure, grammar, and vocabulary), and appearance (body language and expression). In this research, the researcher compared the scores in pre-test and post-test to see whether the treatment is effective or not on the students' achievement in speaking skill. While, the passing grade set for English subject was 75.

Before analyzing the result of the pre-test and the post-test scores, the researcher checked the normality of both the pre-test and the post-test by using Liliefors testing. The formula used to determine the normality is:

$$z_i = \frac{X - \overline{X}}{s} \quad \text{where } s = \sqrt{\frac{\sum (X - \overline{X})^2}{n-1}} \quad or$$

$$\sqrt{\frac{\sum X^2 - \frac{(\sum X)^2}{n}}{n-1}} \quad or \quad \sqrt{\frac{\sum x^2}{n-1}}$$

The normality test is to check whether the data are in normal distribution or not. If L_o (L obtained) is lower than L_t (L table) at the level of significance α = 0.05 on Liliefors, the sample is in normal distribution. The result of calculating the normality test can be seen in the table as follows.

Table 2
The Result of Calculating the Normality Test

	L_o		L_t	α
Pre-test	0.131	≤	0.404	0.05
Post-test	0.299	≤	0.404	0.05

According to the table above, it can be described that the L_o of the pre-test was 0.131 and 0.299 for the post test, which is L_t = 0.404 at the level of significance α = 0.05. Therefore, it can be concluded that all of the values of L_o are lower than L_t. It means that both of pre-test and post test data were in normal distribution.

After getting the normality test, the researcher then analyzed the score distribution of pre-test and post-test using Bartlett formula. The algebraic formula used to determine the homogeneity is:

$$\chi^2 = (ln10) \{B - \sum (n_i - 1) \log s_i^2\}$$

Bartlett formula used to find out whether the data are homogeneous or not. The result of calculating homogeneity tests can be seen in the table as follows.

Table 3.
The Result of Calculating Homogeneity Tests

χ_o^2		χ_t^2	α
0.675	≤	3.841	0.05

Based on the table above, it can be described that the value of chi-square observation was 0.675 while the table value of the chi-square at the level of significance α = 0.05 was 3.841. Because χ_o^2 is lower than χ_t^2, it can be concluded that the data are homogeneous.

Next, the result of the sample t-test analysis conducted for the pre-test and the post-test is shown in Table 4 as follows.

Table 4
Result of Sample T-test

	Mean	Mean Difference	Significant Value
Pre-test	57	5.98	0.05
Post-test	80		

T-test is formula to know the significant differences between pre-test and post-test. As shown in Table 4, the mean score of the students' pre-test was 57, while the mean score of the post-test was 80. The mean difference between pre-test and post-test was 5.98 with the significant value was 0.05. Because the mean difference is higher than significant value (5.98 ≥ 0.05), it means that there were students' improvement before and after conducting the research that is the use of the Gallery Walk as an alternative technique to students' achievement in speaking.

Based on the analysis of the result in the pre-test, showed that the students' achievement in speaking was still poor and far for being expected. Thus, the fact in the findings of the pre-test showed that the class' average score of speaking achievement was only 57, in which the students' individual score ranged from 30 as the lowest score and 90 as the highest one. It means that less than half the number of students who achieved the passing grade set for English subject which is 75. The students admitted that the activities in teaching speaking were monotonous before conducted Gallery Walk as an alternative technique. After the researcher taught the students by Gallery Walk as an alternative technique, all of the

students' post-test score increased. The result of sample t-test also showed that there was significant difference between the result of pre-test and post-test. This indicates that teaching speaking by using Gallery Walk as an alternative technique is effective for increasing their achievement in speaking.

In addition to the interpretation, based on the result of the pre-test and post-test, the researcher also made some interpretations based on what the researcher encountered during the study. First, the researcher found that the students were very interested to learn because of the implementation of Gallery Walk as an alternative technique. As explained previously, the students have low achievement in speaking skill. The students also admitted that the teaching speaking activities before conducted Gallery Walk as an alternative technique were monotonous. Based on the researcher experience in teaching, before conducting this research, the students' achievement of speaking was still far from being expected. It is happened because the teaching technique before was not effective as much as Gallery Walk.

The implementing Gallery Walk as an alternative technique in the teaching and learning process is proven to be able to improve the students' achievement in speaking. The improvement can be seen from the scores of the students' achievement in speaking taken from the results of pre-test and the post-test which can be seen in table 5.

Table 5
Score of Students' Progress from the Pre-Test and the Post-Test

	Total Average Score of Students' Achievement in Speaking
Pre-test	57
Post-test	80
Progress Point	**23**

According to the table, the total average score of students' speaking achievement in pre-test was 57, while in post-test was 80. So, the progress point from those tests was 23. It can be concluded that teaching speaking

using Gallery Walk as an alternative technique significantly improved students' achievement in speaking. The use of Gallery Walk as an alternative technique made the students more enjoy because the atmosphere of the learning process not too formal. The students could express what they want to say and it could increase their skill in speaking such as sharing their idea to the other friends in front of the class.

Finally, based on the results of the interpretations, the researcher claims that the Gallery Walk as an alternative technique can help the students become interest, enjoy, and easy in learning English especially in speaking skill. As what Bowman (2005:1) argued that Gallery walk is one of the most versatile learner centered activities. The gallery walk connects learners to each other and learners to the training topic in a number of interesting, interactive ways. By the use of gallery walk technique as an alternative technique, the researcher hoped the students are able to involve the emotional power to find a new knowledge and motivate them to be active to improve their self-confidence on English language especially in speaking skill.

Conclusion

From the result of the study, it can be concluded that Gallery Walk as an alternative technique is effective to improve student's achievement in speaking. That can be seen from the students' mean score on post-test (80) was higher than on pre-test (57). Then, it was found that the mean difference between pre-test and post-test was 5.98 with the significant value was 0.05. Because the mean difference is higher than significant value ($5.98 \geq 0.05$), it means that there were students' improvement before and after conducting the research that is the use of the Gallery Walk as an alternative technique to students' achievement in speaking. It means that the independent variable has a significant effect on the dependent variable. The improvement happens because Gallery Walk as an alternative technique motivate students to

speak using their own language and helping them expand their vocabulary by expressing their ideas and thoughts more confidently.

Based on the result of the research and conclusion that regarding with enhance students' speaking skill through gallery walk as an alternative technique is enjoyable, the writer would like to teacher, students, and further researcher. For teacher, the result of this research can support the English teachers to apply this technique in teaching Teachers should prepare materials well and they can create good atmosphere with fun learning and make it more interesting. In teaching learning process, teacher should make students more comfortable to enjoy the activities. Their interest can raise their motivation in learning then make them easier to learn. Meanwhile for students, the students should take part actively in learning process, do not shy and afraid to express idea especially in speaking. They also must pay attention, seriously when the teaching learning is going on. The students have to develop their self-motivation and minimize their anxiety of studying English. Furthermore for further researcher, the result of this research can be used as the reference for further research in another topic discussion, in different English language skills by the deeper investigation. It may also useful to have research with different students' condition like students' motivation interest.

References

[1] Arikunto, S. 2006. *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara

[2] Bowman, Sharon L. 2005. *The Gallery Walk: An Opening, Closing, and Review Activity*. [online] available: http://www.boperson.com/BOWPERSON/GalleryWalk.pdf. retrieved 4 March 2019.

[3] Brown, H. D. 2001. T*eaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy. 2th edition*. San Fransisco: Longman.

[4] Cresswell, J. W. 2005. *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research Second Edition*. Upper Sadle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

[5] Francek, Mark. 2006. "Promoting Discussion in the Science Classroom Using Gallery Walks". *Journal of College Science Teaching*, September. Page 27-31 [online] available: http://blog.stetson.edu/jrseminars/wp-content/uploads/Gallery-Walk.pdf. Retrieved 25 February 2019.

[6] Grognet, A.G. *1997. Definition of Speaking skill* .Providence: Jamestown Publisher.

[7] Harmer, J. 2002. *The practice of English Language Teaching: 3rd edition*. Malaysia: Longman.

[8] Hornby 1995. *Definition of Speaking Skill*. New York: Longman.

[9] Scott, Wendy A dan Lisbeth H. Ytreberg. 2004. *Teaching English to Children*. New York:Longman

[10] Silberman, Mel. 1996. *Active learning: 101 Strategies to Teach Any Subject*. U.K. A: Pearson Education Company.

[11] Sugiyono. (2011). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatifdan R&D*. Bandung :Alfabeta.

THE EFFECT OF USING GALLERY WALK AS AN ALTERNATIVE TECHNIQUE TO STUDENTS' ACHIEVEMENT IN SPEAKING