Bringing the poster presentation model into classroom

Ima Widyastuti
Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Sarjanawiyata Tamansiswa
Tahunan, Umbulharjo, Yogyakarta City, Special Region of Yogyakarta 55167
email: ima@ustjogja.ac.id

Info artikel

Abstrak

Making students to speak English in a large classroom becomes a big challenge for teachers. On one hand, there is no enough time for all students speak equally. On the other hand, most students are lack of confidence and English competence. As a result, the students tend to be reluctant toward the speaking activities. There have been many research under the speaking classroom activities, however, modeling professional activity into classrooms has been rare. The recent action research on a Poster Presentation model aims to make students participate in the classroom activities actively by considering their characteristics. From the individual interview and classroom observations of the 17 passive students enrolled on the four Speaking for Academic Purposes classrooms at Sarjanawiyata Tamansiswa University, Indonesia, the researchers found that the Poster Presentation model with two rules applied, i.e. no talk no grade and interrelated questions motivated the students' participation in the speaking classroom activities. However, the Poster Presentation model did not work on those who have never experienced in natural speaking practices before. Thus, managing the classroom using the present model brings double facets among students.

INTRODUCTION

In Indonesia, most students have been studying English since they are in the primary schools or even in preschools. They are boosted with grammar explanation, memorizing vocabulary and practicing conversations taken from both textbooks and electronic materials. They are also familiar with the presentations in front of the classrooms. Unfortunately, most students commonly memorize whatever they will present. In the question-answer session of the presentation, for example, sometimes, they list the questions, then give those questions to the audience before the class, so that they seem to speak fluently in answering all questions from the audience. As a result, the students become passive due to their routine experience. Even, bilingual school students who should be familiar in using English refuse to speak English as their routine (Mukminin et al., 2019). That is why, the teachers must struggle to create a positive environment for guiding students in building and increasing the students' motivation towards speaking English naturally, without any scripts and memorizing the prepared materials. In other words, if teachers fail in providing new reasons for students to study English, the students will also fail in mastering English skills (Berwick & Ross, 1989). One of ways is through the classroom management.

The classroom management in the foreign language classroom context is defined as how the teachers control the classroom using the appropriate teaching techniques and procedures. In creating a positive environment in the classroom, the teachers should pay attention on both intrinsic and extrinsic characteristics of the classroom management (Fowler & Şaraplı, 2010). The former refers to how the teachers treat the students as giving space for the students in

expressing their ideas; and the teachers' characteristics such as friendly, enthusiastic, and respectful. The later one is more about the classroom rules.

The recent action research scheme investigates the passive students in getting a classroom treatment of a Poster Presentation model introduction. The Poster Presentation model used in the recent study is the adaptation of the poster presentation session commonly existed in the international seminars or conferences. The students of this study practiced doing poster presentation in the classroom by omitting the poster introduction for reducing the memorizing the materials. In other words, the practices only cover the presenter's personal introduction and the question-answer session. This is a part of a task-based activity which allows learners communicate using the target language for reaching the set learning outcome (Willis, 1996).

The appropriate classroom management styles, for sure, affect on the students' motivation in the classroom. Besides the classroom management idea, the Poster Presentation Model is also a part of the extrinsic motivation environment created in the classroom. The extrinsic motivation drives the learners' ambition in pursuing something (Dörnyei, 2001a). The recent study sets a grade gained through the Poster Presentation participation as the thing that the learners should achieve.

METHOD

The participants in this research were 17 passive students enrolled among the four Speaking for Academic Purposes Unit classes at English Department, Sarjanawiyata Tamansiswa University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia. The recent research is belonged to the action research which is done in a series stages; planning, action, observation, and reflection (Kemmis & Mc Taggart, 1988) into two cycles. Before doing the planning on the first cycle, the researcher have identified 17 students were quiet or even did not talk at all during the individual interviews. They seemed afraid of making mistakes in their speaking. The first cycle of the research was designed based on the problem identification phase, while the second cycle design was created after the evaluation of the first cycle. The observation and interview data of the present research were discussed qualitatively with the respects of the motivation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

On the first classroom observation, the researcher found that on the first meeting, the lecturer did an introduction by explaining the unit course outline, watching a Poster Presentation activities video on Youtube followed by the individual interview. The individual interviews aimed to screen the students' speaking abilities. In this structured interviews, the lecturer asked about the students' personal information, families, hobbies, opinions on speaking classes should be and past experiences. Generally, most students answered the questions in a very limited words and there were 17 students only gave a smile without words uttered.

Results

From the identification phase finding, the lecturer set natural speaking practices on week 2-5 for making the 17 passive students to be familiar and confident in natural speaking. The main materials used were the Poster Presentation preparations in small group discussions. To succeed this activity, the active students were encouraged to provide more space or even challenge by giving easy questions so that the reluctant students were able to participate on the discussions actively. Unfortunately, the researcher found that 3 out of 17 still did not speak at all. They only smiled or kept silent when they got turn to talk. From the findings on the identification phase, the researcher designed the two research cycles as on the action research scheme. The descriptions of both cycles are presented below:

Cycle One

The students practiced the individual Poster Presentation Practice 1 on week 6 as the real Poster Presentation in the seminars. All students stamped their posters on the classroom wall and windows. After attaching the posters, the students were divided into four groups: Group A, Group B, Group C and Group D. In One group, there were 6-7 students. When Group A got their turn in doing presentation, for example, they stood next to their own stamped poster. Group B recorded the interaction between the presenter and the audience. The rest groups, i.e. Group C and Group D were the audiences. Both last groups were freely moving around, stopping to posters they love and having conversation with the presenter. The researcher categorized the students based on their participation in the Poster Presentation Practice 1 as follows:

Table 1 The Cycle I Category

Category	Descriptions	Participants
A	No talk at all, only gestures, such as nodding, shaking head, pointing, waving hands, laughing, or smiling	CA, SO, SU, AN (4)
B	Being pointed, those who would talk after the presenter pointed them	EM, RI, AG, AL, OR, ANG, FI (7)
C	Limited English utterances, some Bahasa and gestures, such as *yes, no, yeah, apa itu*, *iya itu maksudnya*	AB, AR, ARF (3)
D	One initial similar question for each week and gestures, such as *what that mean? Explain that!*	AE, LA, PI (3)

The data above showed that most participants were still passive. On the Category A, the participants mostly only showed their participation by gestures. The participant grouped on the Category B were actually able to pronounce English utterances well, but they did not talk without being pointed. Both Category C and D showed limited English production in words and expressions respectively.

Cycle two

The lecturer applied two rules, i.e. *no talk no grade* and *interrelated questions*. The former rule was for making all students talk unless they got no grade for the weekly participation. The later was for avoiding the same or similar questions given to the presenters. A week before the practice, the students should upload their poster materials on Edmodo, an educational social media. In the classroom, the students were divided into four groups structurally consisted of one presenter, one recorder, and four audience each group. The four presenters did the poster presentation at once without explaining their poster contents as the audience had read the poster contents on Edmodo application and had five more minutes reading in the classroom before. The researcher categorized the participants' types as follows:

Table 2 The Cycle 2 Category

Category	Descriptions	Participants
D	One initial similar question for each week and gestures, such as *what that mean? Explain that!* not able to develop other audiences' questions. Some Bahasa Indonesia and gestures. Reading the poster frequently	CA, AN, SU, SO (4)
F	Developing questions without providing narrations, comments, or opinions	AR, ARF, AL, ANG, AM, PI (6)
G	Developing questions with narrations, comments or opinions	AB, AG, OR, FI, AE, LA, RI (7)

The table shows that there were two more categories added, i.e. Category F and G, as none of the participants were included on the Category A-C. The 17 passive students in the recent study varied in their English participation improvement. There were four students who were struggling in participating the poster presentation activity. They mostly asked questions at the beginning of the poster presentation process such as, *what does this mean? can you explain this point? What is the main finding of your research?* In practicing the interrelated questions, they often found difficulties in following the situation. They were struggling to ask questions or giving responses, however, they mostly switched the language into their mother tongue and used gestures. The second category of the improvement was that there were six students who were able to make questions based on the previous questions of their friends. Though they could not give complete comments or opinions, they succeeded in relate their questions to the former questions. The last category was those who were able to practice in making interrelated questions and provided comments and opinions.

Discussions

One of the significant hypothesis why the 17 students in the recent study were reluctant on speaking English in the classroom was because they had not been familiar on practicing the natural speaking. Besides, they had not experienced in getting motivation on their learning outcomes through the classroom management before. Through the action research, the researcher applied an intervention phase during the action stage of the Cycle Two. In this phase, the researcher does experiments as a response to the hypothesis (Burns, 2003). In this recent research, two rules. i.e. *no talk no grade* and *interrelated questions* applied on the Poster Presentation activities pushed the students to actively participate in the Poster Presentation.

No talk no grade

The first rule is, *no talk no grade.* Based on the unit course syllabus, the participation assessment is based on the frequency of their weekly speaking participation in the classroom activities. In other words, students will only get the weekly participation grade if they speak in the classroom discussions. Practically, once the students sat in a small circle facing a poster as the audience, they should respond to the poster content by giving questions, comments, opinions or suggestions.

This cooperative learning which opens greater opportunities to talk and share information and opinions related to one topic (Coelho, Winer, & Winn-Bell Olsen, 1989) was introduced to make all students speak out in the Poster Presentation practices. The rule of *no talk no grade* also became a classroom management strategy which increased the students' participation on the Poster Presentation discussion. In other words, this rule becomes a positive classroom environment created by the lecturer which determines the students' motivation (Fatiha, Sliman, Mustapha, & Yahia, 2014) in building the students' communication skills in group work (Johnson & Johnson, 1991).

In the recent research, the Poster Presentation model promoted more fluency in English rather than accuracy. The rule of *no talk no grade* have boosted the participants of this study struggling to talk though sometimes they uttered Bahasa or showed gestures for expressions or words they did not know in English. They also kept talking though their grammar was not correct. Most participants in the present study preferred to speak English though they frequently made mistakes grammatically. This is in line to a belief that teaching communicative activities are more useful for learners than teaching grammar (Ellis, 1997). Most participants in this study used similar English expressions to maintain the discussion going. For example *can you explain it? What do you mean? can you give me one example?* Though those expressions were uttered frequently, the participants gained their confidence in speaking English. This is understandable as commonly learners use gambits in contexts to fluent their speaking (Brinton, 2000). In this case, English expressions used by the participants belong to gambits in the Poster Presentation Practice in the present study. In other words, the rule of *no talk no grade* was such kind of extrinsic motivation for achieving weekly grades even though they made mistakes grammatically.

Another facet of the "no talk no grade" was related to the assessment used in the Speaking Unit. Criterion referenced assessment (Brown, 1990) was chosen as a tool to see the students' competency whether their speaking skills were improved or not through Poster Presentation model. By keeping the students' weekly grades, the progress could be seen clearly.

Interrelated questions

The second rule applied in the Poster Presentation Practice in the recent study is *interrelated questions.* The audience who asked first, had a biggest chance to start the discussion. The following students had to develop the first question by asking other questions, giving opinions or comments as the response to the presenter's answer. Thus, the students are pushed to think fast and creatively in producing English utterances naturally depending on the situations.

For practicing the interrelated questions, both presenters and audiences must master the poster materials which were taken from selected academic journal articles. The educational social media named Edmodo was used as a medium for sharing the information on the presented journal articles. In this case, the technology supports the collaborative learning among the students in the classroom (Wu, Lee, Chang, & Liang, 2013). Presenting articles on poster was a new experience for the participants. Commonly, they did presentations using power point program where they commonly only read the materials and there was very limited time allocated for question-answer session. On the Poster Presentation Model, there was only one session applied, question-answer session. As a results, the participants should comprehend the chosen journal article content and think fast in involving the discussions. However, if they should find specific terms from the articles, they could find easily and fast on one paper-sized poster. It can be said that though only use one page of poster, the participants showed their best performance as the presenters and audience. This result might be because the participants experienced new model. Another reason might be because they enjoy in learning using the chosen media (Rockwell & Singleton, 2007). Thus, the use of poster challenges the students to speak out in the discussion.

Though Poster Presentation Model is such kind of reproductive task through journal articles, the rule of *interrelated questions* challenge the learners to produce language creatively (Nunan, 1999). Participant AB for example, enabled to produce some questions based on the previous questions from other Poster Presentation participants. When Participant AG asked about the reason why the presenter was interested in choosing the journal article presented, the presenter said that actually she did not like the article because she did not really understand the content. After hearing the answer from the presenter, participant AB responded by giving a question, i.e. *why do you continue to read that article if you don't like it?* However, most participants on this study still manipulated and practiced asking similar questions. Take an example, participants AL and AR mostly asked similar questions such as *what is the finding? How's the method?* and *what do get from this research?* Basically, this Poster Presentation role-play activity allowed the students to create their own situations which fit to the target and let the students to work scientifically (Mulder, Lazonder, T, Anjewierden, & Bollen, 2012).

From the individual interview, the researcher found that the participants realized that both poster audience and the presenter would lose grade if both failed to make the discussion naturally. Consequently, one another frequently helped each other by providing signals and spaces to talk. For example, the presenter called participant CA who rarely spoke in the middle of the discussion and asked her opinion on the poster. In other words, there is a positive interdependence (Johnson & Johnson, 1991; Rijsewijk, Oldenburg, Snijders, & Dijkstra, Jan Kornelis; Veenstra, 2018) among members in the group which is built because of external pressure from the classroom rules.

The Poster Presentation Model boosted the participants' behaviors in the speaking classroom, however, it also left another phenomenon. Participant SU showed an interesting case. Though she frequently attended the Poster Presentation discussion and was able to ask one or two questions, she did not present her poster. From the open-ended interview after the semester, she said that she pushed herself to talk in the classroom as she avoided punishment of not being graded weekly which would make her fail in the course unit. Besides, she admitted that she was over afraid of talking in front of people though they were her friends. She also mentioned that she was shocked joining the speaking class which was very different from her previous speaking classes. She told that in her previous speaking units, 1-3, she mostly only spoke based on the prepared dialogues or texts. In her case, the natural speaking environment in the present speaking course unit became a demotivation factor in doing Poster Presentation practice.

There are two factors of demotivation namely negative affect/ frustration and unwillingness to participate (Bacon & Finnemann, 1990). In the present study, SU suffered stress as she had never experienced natural speaking before joining the Poster Presentation Practices. As a result, she created various reasons to avoid perform her poster. Besides, teacher behavior and course format are also the demotivation factors (Christophel & Gorham, 1995). Though the lecturer always gave her space and additional time for doing her Poster Presentation, SU still refused to perform. In this case, the Speaking course design which only focuses on the Poster Presentation with natural speaking activities became the prominent factor on SU's demotivation condition. The worst was, the participant SU also mentioned that she felt that she could not follow the lesson because she could not speak well as her friends did. This feeling belongs to amotivation as the learner felt incompetent in involving the course (Deci, E.L., and Ryan, 2008). Though the demotivation factors were vary, demotivation on the learners affects on their motivation in learning (Dörnyei, 2001b). The demotivation faced by SU in the present study led her to struggle in participating in the Poster Presentation Practice as the audience due to the weekly grade. However, her demotivation also made her frustrated facing the presentation. In this case, the Poster Presentation model which requires a journal article as the main material for the poster brings anxiety on some participants. It is suggested that learning materials should bring enjoyment on the students which can be achieved by balancing the challenges and the learners' capacity (Csikszentmihalyi, 2002). Therefore, applying the Poster Presentation Model in the classroom for motivating students active in speaking requires several

considerations, not only from the classroom management but also from the students' characteristics.

CONCLUSION

The setting of *no talk no grade* and *interrelated questions* rules on the Poster Presentation practices brings effects on the students' behaviors. They struggled to participate actively in the discussions though they frequently used gambits and worked collaboratively with other students due to the weekly grades. However, for students who have never practiced speaking naturally, the rules make them anxious and created demotivation.

Designing another rules in the classroom which can reduce the students' anxiety and turn the demotivation into motivation will be prospective next research. As the major reason of the students' anxiety and demotivation is lack of practicing natural speaking, it would be better if the natural speaking environment is set in all speaking classes or even in all classes. For doing this, the English Department in Universitas Sarjanawiyata Tamansiswa needs to support in redesigning the department curriculum which allows the integrated syllabus in all unit courses.

REFERENCES

Bacon, S. M., & Finnemann, M. . (1990). A study of the attitudes, motives, and strategies of university foreign language students and their disposition to authentic oral and written input. *Modern Language Journal*, *74*, 459–473.

Berwick, R., & Ross, S. (1989). Motivation after Matriculation : Are Japanese Learners of English still Alive after Exam Hell. *JALT Journal*, *11*(92), 193–210.

Brinton, L. J. (2000). *The structure of modern English: A linguistic introduction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Brown, J. D. (1990). Where do test fit into language program? *JALT Journal*, *12*(1), 1–10.

Burns, A. (2003). *Collaborative Action Research for English Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Christophel, D. M., & Gorham, J. (1995). A test-retest Analysis of Student Motivation, Teacher Immediacy and Perceived Sources of Motivation and Demotivation in College classes. *Communication Education*, *44*, 292–306.

Coelho, E., Winer, L., & Winn-Bell Olsen, J. (1989). *All Sides of the Issue: Activities for Cooperative Jigsaw Groups*. Hayward: Alemany Press.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2002). *Flow*. London: Rider.

Deci, E.L., and Ryan, R. . (2008). Self-Determination Theory: A Macrotheory of Human Motivation, Development, and Health. *Canadian Psychology*, *49*(2), 182–185.

Dörnyei, Z. (2001a). *Teaching and Researching Motivation*. England: Pearson Education.

Dörnyei, Z. (2001b). *Teaching and Researching Motivation*. England: Pearson Education Ltd.

Ellis, R. (1997). *SLA research and language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fatiha, M., Sliman, B., Mustapha, B., & Yahia, M. (2014). ATTITUDES AND MOTIVATIONS IN LEARNING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGAUGE. *International Journal of Arts & Sciences*, *7*(3), 117–128. Retrieved from https://search.proquest.com/docview/1644634381/fulltextPDF/C3700C7C6BB84314PQ/1?accountid=38628

Fowler, J., & Şaraplı, O. (2010). Classroom management: What ELT students expect. *Procedía Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *3*, 94–97. Retrieved from www.sciencedirect.com

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1991). *Learning together and alone: Cooperative, competitive, and individualistic learning* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Kemmis, S., & Mc Taggart, R. (1988). *The Action Research Planner*. Victoria: Deakin University.

Mukminin, A., Sari, S. R., Haryanto, E., Habibi, A., Hidayat, M., & Al, E. (2019). They can speak English, but they don't want to use it." Teaching Contents through English in a Bilingual School and Policy Recommendations. *The Qualitative Report*, *24*(6), 1258–1274.

Mulder, Y., Lazonder, A., T, de J., Anjewierden, A., & Bollen, L. (2012). Validating and optimizing the effects of model progres-sion in simulation-based inquiry learning. *Journal of Sci Ence, Education & Technology*, *21*(6), 722–729.

Nunan, D. (1999). *Speak out*. Singapore: International Thomson Asia.

Rijsewijk, L. G. M. van, Oldenburg, B., Snijders, T. A. B., & Dijkstra, Jan Kornelis; Veenstra, R. (2018). A description of classroom help networks, individual network position, and their associations with academic achievement. *PLoS One*, *13*(12). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0208173

Rockwell, S. ., & Singleton, L. . (2007). The Effect of the Modality of Presentation of Streaming Multimedia on Information Acquisition. *Media Psychology*, *9*(1), 179–191.

Willis, J. (1996). *A framework for Task-based Learning*. Essex: Pearson Education Ltd.

Wu, H., Lee, S., Chang, H., & Liang, J. (2013). Current status,opportunities and challenges of augmented reality in education. *Computer Education*, *62*, 41–49.