Journal of Educational Sciences
Journal homepage: https://jes.ejournal.unri.ac.id/index.php/JES

P-ISSN 2581-1657
E-ISSN 2581-2203

The Effect of Think, Talk, Write (TTW) Strategy on The Writing Descriptive Text Ability of SMK Students

Fitri Annisa*, Supriusman, Masyhur
Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, University of Riau, Pekanbaru, Riau, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 10 Dec 2024
Revised: 14 March 2025
Accepted: 16 March 2025
Published online: 24 March 2025

Keywords:

Think,
Talk, Write (TTW),
Descriptive Text,
Writing Ability,
Vocational High School

* *Corresponding author:*

E-mail: fitriannisaa06@gmail.com

Article Doi:

Doi: https://doi.org/10.31258/jes.9.2.p.615-625

A B S T R A C T

This study aims to find the effect of Think, Talk, Write (TTW) strategy on the writing descriptive text ability of SMK students. The study used a quasi-experimental method with two groups: an experimental class taught using the TTW strategy and a control class using the conventional method. The data collection instrument was a descriptive writing test conducted before (pre-test) and after (post-test) treatment, with an assessment based on the Arthur Hughes rubric. The data were analyzed using independent sample t-test. The results showed that the TTW strategy had a significant effect on students' writing ability. The average value of the final test of the experimental class reached 87.17, higher than the control class which obtained an average of 76.25. This difference was also confirmed through a statistical test with a p value <0.001, which showed that students taught with the TTW strategy experienced a greater improvement in writing ability than students taught with the conventional method. The TTW strategy helps students to think critically, discuss, and organize their writing in a more structured way, thus improving the quality of the text they produce. The findings support the effectiveness of TTW in improving descriptive writing skills. This study recommends the use of TTW strategy in writing learning to create a more collaborative and in-depth learning process. Future researchers are expected to explore the application of TTW on different text types or populations.

1. Introduction

Writing is a fundamental skill that allows individuals to express ideas, opinions, and information in written form. According to Brown (2001), mastering the craft of writing is seen as a developmental process that empowers students to write in the same style as established authors, select their own themes and genres, and draw on personal experiences or observations. Writing enables students to engage deeply with the language, helping them to refine their thoughts and express them clearly and concisely. However, writing is not an easy task for many students, especially in a foreign language. As noted by Harmer (2004), students often encounter difficulties when writing in English due to differences in grammar,

sentence structure, vocabulary, and cultural contexts between their native language and English.

One of the key challenges students face when writing in English is the complexity of constructing coherent and well-structured texts. This is particularly true for vocational high school (SMK) students, who may lack interest or confidence in writing, as observed in a classroom study conducted by the researcher at SMKN 1 Pekanbaru. Many students struggle with writing descriptive texts, often failing to follow the proper structure and language features required for such texts. Moreover, traditional methods of teaching writing, which focus on rote memorization and lack interactive elements, have proven to be ineffective in engaging students and improving their writing skills. Consequently, there is a pressing need for innovative teaching strategies that can make writing lessons more engaging, interactive, and effective for students.

One such strategy that has gained attention in recent years is the Think, Talk, Write (TTW) strategy. The TTW strategy, which involves three key stages—Think (reflecting on the topic), Talk (discussing ideas with peers), and Write (writing down the ideas)—has been shown to improve students' writing abilities by providing a structured process for organizing thoughts, discussing ideas, and expressing them in written form (Huinker & Laughlin, 1996). This strategy is designed to help students overcome their fear of writing by allowing them to first process their ideas individually, then share and discuss them with peers, and finally write them down in an organized manner.

In addition, the TTW strategy fosters a collaborative learning environment, which is crucial for enhancing students' confidence and motivation in writing. By engaging in discussions with peers, students can gain feedback, clarify misunderstandings, and improve their language skills. As noted by Gerot and Wignell (2004), a key feature of descriptive texts is the ability to communicate detailed and vivid information about a person, place, or thing. The TTW strategy supports this process by enabling students to reflect on their ideas, articulate them clearly, and structure them in a coherent and descriptive manner. This strategy not only enhances writing skills but also helps students build confidence in their ability to communicate effectively in English.

This research focuses on investigating the effect of the Think, Talk, Write strategy on the descriptive text writing ability of vocational high school students. Given the challenges faced by students in mastering writing skills and the need for more effective teaching strategies, this study aims to if there is a significant effect of Think, Talk, Write (TTW) strategy on the writing descriptive text ability of SMK students. By examining the effects of this strategy, the study contributes to the ongoing efforts to enhance writing instruction and support students in overcoming the challenges they face in learning English.

2. Methodology

This study used a quasi-experimental research method that requires an experimental class and a control class. The sample of this research is class X AKL 3 as an experimental class and class X TKJT 1 as a control class, with a total of approximately 35 students. To determine sampling by identifying certain qualities that are in accordance with the research objectives that are expected to address the research problem, participants were selected using a purposive sampling.

Data collection was carried out through pre-test and post-test. The pre-test was given before the treatment was carried out, to measure students' basic ability in writing descriptive text. The pre-test was carried out for 60 minutes and students are given two different treatments, for the experimental class was treated with Think, Talk, Write (TTW) strategy while the control class was given conventional learning. After that, a post test was given in the form of a descriptive text writing test, the post test was carried out for 60 minutes.

The flow for analyzing data is that the data that has been collected from pre-test and post-test, then the test was scored using the Arthur Hughes scoring rubric. The scores from the tests were then analyzed with SPSS to find significant data results from this study. To analyze the data in this research, the researcher was helped by 3 raters to validate the data.

3. Results and Discussion

A. Research Result

This section will explain the data analysis of the research results that have been conducted. The data from the pre-test and post-test will be analyzed to find "Is there any significant effect of Think, Talk, Write (TTW) strategy on the writing descriptive text ability of SMK students?". In this study, the test results were assessed using Arthur Hughes' scoring rubric which has 5 assessment components namely content, organization, vocabulary, language use, mechanics. In order to make the data more valid, objective, and dependable, the research's results were derived from the ratings of three raters.

The Result of Pre-Test

Table 1. The Result of Pre-Test Experimental Class

Score	Number of Students	Percentage (%)	Category
70 -79	2	6%	Good
60 - 69	13	38%	Poor
50 - 59	19	56%	Very Poor
Total Students	**34**	100%	
Average Score			**64.23**
Maximum Score			**72**
Minimum Score			**58**

The experimental class Pre-test results, as seen in Table 1 above, showed a fairly varied distribution of scores among the students, but could generally be categorized as "very poor" to "good". The total average score, 64.23, out of 34 students, is considered very poor. The student with the highest score, 72, is classified as good, while the student with the lowest score, 58, is classified as very poor. In the table above, the "Good" category includes only 2 students or 6% of the sample who scored between 70-79. On the other hand, there is the "Poor" category which includes 13 students or 38% of the sample who scored between 60-69. Then there is the "Very Poor" category, which consists of 19 students or 56% of the sample who scored 50-59.

Table 2. The Result of Pre-Test Control Class

Score	Number of Students	Percentage (%)	Category
80 - 89	5	14%	Very Good
70 - 79	17	48%	Good
60 - 69	7	20%	Poor
50 - 59	6	17%	Very Poor
Total Students	**35**	100%	
Average Score			**71.03**
Maximum Score			**87**
Minimum score			**55.33**

The control class pre-test results in Table 2 show that the majority of students were in the good category or very good category, with an average score 71,03, which is in the good category. The student who received the lowest, with 55.33, is classified as very poor, while the student who received the highest, with 87, is classified as very good. In the table above, there are 5 students or 14% of the sample classified as "Very Good" who received scores between 80-89. Then in the "Good" category there were 17 students or 48% of the sample who scored between 70-79. On the other hand, in the "Poor" category, there were 7 students classified in this category or 20% of the sample who scored 60-69. Then the "Very Poor" category there are 6 students in this category or 17% of the sample who scored 50-59.

The Result of Post-test

Table 3. The Result of Post-Test Experimental Class

Score	Number of Students	Percentage (%)	Category
90 -100	11	32%	Excellent
80 - 89	23	67%	Very Good
Total Students	**34**	100%	
Average Score			**87.17**
Maximum Score			**95**
Minimum Score			**79.67**

In the table above, 11 students in the "Excellent" category or 32% of the sample scored between 90-100 indicating that they consistently achieved high scores in

all aspects assessed. In the "Very Good" category, there were 23 students or 67% of the sample with average scores ranging from 80-89. The lowest scoring student in the "Very Good" category had a mean score of 79.67, which is close to this category. Overall, this post-test data reflects good achievement, with most students being above average and some students showing significant excellence in their learning outcomes.

Table 4. The Result of Post-Test Control Class

Score	Number of Students	Percentage (%)	Category
80 - 89	9	25%	Very Good
70 -79	20	57%	Good
60 - 69	5	14%	Poor
50 - 59	1	3%	Very Poor
Total Students	**35**	100%	
Average Score		**76.25**	
Maximum Score		**89.67**	
Minimum Score		**59.33**	

In the table above, 9 students or 25% are in the "Very good" category, students who are in this category get scores in the range 80 to 89. There are 20 students or 57% in the "Good" category, this category includes students with scores in the range of 70 to 79. Then the "Poor" category includes students who have scores below 70 but above 60, there are 5 students or 14% in this category. Finally, the "Very Poor" category includes only 1 student or 3% who scored below 60.

Table 5. The Comparison of Post-Test of Experimental and Control Class

Score	Category	Experimental Class	(%)	Control Class	(%)
90 - 100	Excellent	11 students	32%	-	0
80 - 89	Very Good	23 students	67%	9 students	25%
70 – 79	Good	-	0	20 students	57%
60 – 69	Poor	-	0	5 students	14%
50 - 59	Very Poor	-	0	1 student	3%
Total Students		**34 students**	**100%**	**35 students**	**100%**
Average Score		**87.17**		**76.25**	
Maximum Score		**95**		**89.67**	
Minimum Score		**79.67**		**59.33**	

Comparison of post-test results between experimental and control classes in the table 4.5, the experimental class showed much stronger academic results compared to the control class. The majority of students in the experimental class were in the higher categories (Very Good and Excellent) with an average score is 87.17, whereas in the control class, most students were in the Good category, with a few students in the Poor and Very Poor categories and the average score 76.25. These results indicate that the Think, Talk, Write (TTW) strategy implemented in the experimental class succeeded in improving students' ability to write descriptive text significantly compared to the control class.

Descriptive Analysis

Table 6. Descriptive Analysis

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pre-Test Experiment	34	14	58	72	64.23	3.584
Post-Test Experiment	34	15	80	95	87.17	4.745
Pre-Test Control	35	32	55	87	71.04	8.608
Post-Test Control	35	30	59	90	76.25	7.131
Valid N (listwise)	34					

Based on the descriptive statistics in Table 6 above, the average post-test of the experimental group is much higher 87.17 compared to the control group 76.25. This shows that the treatment applied to the experimental group is more effective in improving student learning outcomes. The experimental group's range of scores on the post-test (15) was narrower than the control group (30). This indicates that students in the experimental group had more even results and there were no extreme differences in scores between them, while in the control group, the difference in performance between students was still quite significant. The Descriptive Statistic above shows that the experimental group experienced a much more significant increase in learning outcomes compared to the control group. This can be seen from the higher average post-test and the more consistent range of scores in the experimental group. Thus, it can be concluded that the Think, Talk, Write (TTW) strategy applied to the experimental group has a significant effect in improving students' descriptive text writing ability.

Normality Test

Table 7. Test of Normality

Tests of Normality

	Class	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Students' Result	Pre-Test Experimental	.075	34	.200*	.980	34	.780
	Post-Test Experimental	.114	34	.200*	.940	34	.063
	Pre-Test Control	.094	35	.200*	.967	35	.355
	Post-Test Control	.098	35	.200*	.966	35	.352

Based on the results of the normality test conducted on the pre-test and post-test data in the experimental and control classes, it can be concluded that the data distribution meets the assumption of normality. In the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, the significance value (Sig.) for pre-test and post-test data in both classes, both experimental and control, are all greater than 0.05. Specifically, the Sig. value on the experimental class pre-test was 0.200 > 0.05, and on the post-test it was also 0.200 > 0.05, indicating that the data distribution in this class was not significantly different from the normal distribution. Similar results were found in the control

class, where the Sig. values of the pre-test and post-test were 0.200 > 0.05 respectively, which also indicated normal data distribution. In addition, the Shapiro-Wilk test on the experimental class pre-test, the Sig. value was 0.780 > 0.05, while on the post-test the Sig. value was 0.063 > 0.05, for the control class the Sig. pre-test and post-test values were 0.355 > 0.05 and 0.352 > 0.05 respectively, indicating all data were normally distributed.

As a result, these two normality tests show that the experimental and control classes' pre- and post-test data are normally distributed. In parametric statistical analysis, such as the t-test and ANOVA, this indicates that the assumption of normality, an important required, has been satisfied.

Homogeneity Test

Table 8. Homogeneity Test

Test of Homogeneity

		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Students' Result	Based on Mean	2.366	1	67	.129
	Based on Median	1.781	1	67	.187
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	1.781	1	48.603	.188
	Based on trimmed mean	2.211	1	67	.142

In this test, the significance values or p-values generated from various test methods, whether based on the mean, median, median with adjusted degrees of freedom (df), or trimmed mean, are all higher than the general significance limit set at 0.05. More specifically, the significance value for the test based on the mean is 0.129 > 0.05, for the median is 0.187 > 0.05, for the median with adjusted degrees of freedom is 0.188 > 0.05, and for the trimmed mean is 0.142 > 0.05.

Independent Sample T-Test

Independent Sample T-Test is one of the parametric statistical tests used to compare the means of two independent groups. This test aims to determine whether there is a significant difference between the two groups in terms of the variable being measured. In this study, the researcher proposed two hypotheses: the null hypothesis and the alternative hypothesis. The null hypothesis (Ho) states that “there is no significant effect of think, talk, write (TTW) strategy on the writing descriptive text ability of SMK students”. Meanwhile, the alternative hypothesis (Ha) states that “there is significant effect of think, talk, write (TTW) strategy on vocational high school (SMK) students' writing descriptive text ability.” If the calculated significance value (2-tailed) is less than 0.05 (t < 0.05), then Ho is rejected and Ha is accepted. Otherwise, if the calculated (2-tailed) significance value is more than 0.05 (t > 0.05), then Ha is rejected and Ho is accepted.

Table 9. Group Statistic

	Class	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Students' Result	Post-Test Experimental (TTW)	34	87.17	4.745	.814
	Post-Test Control (Conventional)	35	76.25	7.131	1.205

Based on the results of group statistics obtained, there is a significant difference between groups using the think, talk, write (TTW) learning strategy and groups using conventional learning models. In the experimental class, the average student learning outcomes were 87.17, while in the control class the average obtained was 76.25. From this comparison, it can be concluded that students who follow learning with the think, talk, write strategy have significantly higher learning outcomes than students who follow conventional learning models. The average difference between the two groups is quite significant, which is 10.92 points, with the experimental class showing better results.

Table 10. Independent Sample T-Test

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Students' Result	Equal variances assumed	2.366	.129	7.466	67	<.001	10.919	1.463	8.000	13.838
	Equal variances not assumed			7.508	59.354	<.001	10.919	1.454	8.009	13.829

It can be seen in Table 10 above, there is a significant difference between the experimental group and the control group in achieving student learning outcomes. Levene's test for equality of variances shows a significance value of 0.129 > 0.05, so it can be concluded that the assumption of equality of variances is fulfilled. The t value obtained is 7.466 with degrees of freedom (df) of 67, and the significance value (Sig. 2-tailed) <0.001 which is less than the standard alpha level of 0.05. This shows that there is a very significant difference between the two groups. The

average difference in learning outcomes between the groups using the TTW strategy and the conventional method was 10.919, indicating a large effect, where students using the TTW strategy obtained much better scores compared to those who studied using the conventional method.

The conclusion that can be drawn from this independent sample t-test is that Ho is rejected and Ha is accepted. Because there is a significant difference from the post-test results of the experimental class and the control class.

B. Discussion

This study aims to find out if there is a significant effect of think, talk, write (TTW) strategy on the writing descriptive text ability of SMK students. This research uses a quasi-experimental method that requires an experimental class and a control class. Data collection during the study was using pre-test and post-test and then the data results were analyzed by 3 raters to increase the reliability and validity of the data. Based on the results of data analysis, it can be concluded that the TTW strategy has a significant effect on improving students' writing skills.

The experimental class given the treatment will be compared with the control class and the results of the post-test show a significant difference from the two classes. In the experimental class, the post-test results showed a significant improvement compared to the pre-test. The average score achieved by the students was 87.17, which is in the very good category. On the other hand, the control class got an average score of 76.25 which was classified as good. This difference shows that the think, talk, write (TTW) strategy applied in the experimental class was successful.

In addition, the data was tested with an independent sample t-test to determine if there was a significant difference between the two classes. The results of this test show statistically significant that the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted with the result of p-value or sig (2-tailed) <0.001 which is smaller than the standard alpha level of 0.05. It can be concluded that the use of Think, Talk, Write (TTW) strategy has a significant impact on the descriptive text writing ability of vocational students.

The results of this study are in accordance with research conducted by Tamara and Rusfandi (2021), who also found that the TTW strategy was effective in improving students' writing ability on descriptive text. This result also supports the theory that collaboration and discussion-based learning can improve students' understanding and writing skills, as students are given the opportunity to exchange ideas and get feedback before writing. Similarly, Asvini, Suputra and Hadisaputra (2020) also suggested that students in classes using the TTW strategy experienced significant improvements in writing skills. These results are in accordance with this study, where the TTW strategy also succeeded in improving students' ability to write descriptive texts, showing that this strategy is effective for various types of texts. Additionally, research conducted by Nurfisi Arriyani and Videla Sari (2019) showed that the implementation of TTW strategy not only

improved students' writing skills, but also increased their motivation in learning to write. This research supports the findings of this study, which shows that the TTW strategy is effective in improving students' writing skills through a collaborative and systematic approach.

4. Conclusion

There is a significant effect of TTW strategy on the writing descriptive text ability of SMK students. Students in the experimental class who used the TTW strategy had better learning outcomes than students in the control class who used the conventional learning method. Based on the results of the Independent Sample T-Test analysis, the significance value (Sig.) generated is <0.001, which is smaller than the significance level $\alpha = 0.05$. Which means, the null hypothesis (H0) is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted which claims there is a significant effect of the think, talk write (TTW) strategy on vocational high school students' writing descriptive text ability, is accepted.

The results of this study also show that the TTW strategy can help overcome some of the challenges students face in writing descriptive text. Students often struggle to develop ideas and organize them logically, especially when asked to write in a foreign language such as English. The TTW strategy provides a clear and structured framework, where students can think first, discuss with friends, and then write with more confidence. This makes the writing process more systematic and purposeful, resulting in better writing.

References

Arriyani, N., & Sari, V. (2019). Teaching Writing Through Think, Talk, Write (TTW) Techniques For Junior High School Level. Holistics (Hospitality and Linguistics): Jurnal Ilmiah Bahasa Inggris, 11(2).

Arthur Hughes. 2003. *Testing for Language Teachers*, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press

Asvini, K. D., Suputra, P. E. D., & Hadisaputra, I. N. P. (2020). The Effectiveness Of Think-Talk- Write (TTW) Strategy On Students' Writing Skill Of The Tenth Grade Students At SMKN 1 SUKASADA In The Academic Year 2019/2020. Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris undiksha, 8(1), 21-27.

Belangi, E. S. (2019). *The effect of think-talk-write (ttw) strategy on students' writing descriptive text ability (a quasi-experimental study at the seventh grade of smpn 87 in academic year 2018/2019)* (Bachelor's thesis, Jakarta: Fakultas Ilmu Tarbiyah dan Keguruan UIN Syarif Hidayatullah).

Brown,H. Douglas. (2001). Teaching by Principle An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy. New York: Longman

Gerot, L., & Wignell, P. (1994). Making sense of functional grammar (pp. 192-217). Cammeray, NSW: Antipodean Educational Enterprises.

Harmer, J. (2004). How to Teach Writing. https://www.academia.edu/33185006/How_to_teach_Writing_by_jeremy_harmer?source=swp_share

Huinker, D., & Laughlin, C. (1996). Talk your way into writing. In P. C. Elliott & M. J. Kenney (Eds.), Communication in mathematics, K-12 and beyond: 1996 yearbook (pp. 81-88).

Rusfandi, R., & Tamara, D. R. (2021). The use of Think-Talk-Write (TTW) strategy and its effect on the tenth grade students' ability in writing descriptive text. Jurnal Inspirasi Pendidikan, 11(1), 51-60. http://dx.doi.org/10.21831

Setiawati, I., & Zuniati, M. (2019). Improving The Students' Writing Ability In Descriptive Text Through Think-Talk-Write Strategy. *Attractive: Innovative Education Journal*, *1*(1), 72-79. https://doi.org/10.51278/aj.v1i1.2

Suminar, R. P., & Putri, G. (2018). The effectiveness of TTW (Think-Talk-Write) strategy in teaching writing descriptive text. *Academic Journal Perspective: Education, Language, and Literature*, 2(2), 300-305.

How to cite this article:

Annisa, F., Supriusman., & Masyhur. (2025). The Effect of Think, Talk, Write (TTW) Strategy on The Writing Descriptive Text Ability of SMK Students. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, *9(2)*, 615-625.