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**ABSTRACT**

This research was conducted to increase students’active involvement in their speaking ability by using the Think-Pair-Share Technique. The researcher wanted to find out whether or not Think-Pair-Share Technique can increase the students speaking skill and to analyze the classroom situation when the Think-Pair-Share Technique is implemented in speaking class. This research used Classroom Action Research (CAR) and composed for two or more cycles then it observed and evaluated to identify all facts including the success and the failure of the action. It means that the action should be stopped or continued and revised to the next cycle based on the selected criteria of success. After the implementation of Think-Pair-Share Technique in every cycle, the students’ speaking score were getting better. It can be seen from the result of students average score Cycle 1 was 65.17 and Cycle 2 was 74.81. It can be concluded that Think-Pair-Share Technique can increase students’active involvement in their speaking ability.
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1. **Introduction**

Learning English is very important because English able for linking and make easily people in the most of countries are communicated each other based on the development in the field of economic, business, education and also politic. Communication is one of the implementation of language function in society as a means of carrying out the affairs. In learning English, There are four language skills of English. They are listening, speaking, reading and writing. Speaking is one of the fourth skills that are taught in teaching English. Speaking is also one of the ways in communication. Through speaking, students can express their feeling and express what they want to say to the listener in spoken form. Speaking is the highest target in English language because speaking is basis of communication which becomes function learning. Beside of that, by speaking, it also gives the students a chance to express their ideas and opinions with others. When the student wants to speak, they have to think about what is going to be spoken and have
to consider some of language components like vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation and fluently to be acceptably in giving and responding the information.

According to (Brown 2004) “speaking is a productive skill that can be directly and empirically observed, those observations are invariably colored by the accuracy and effectiveness of the test-takers listening skill, which necessarily compromises the reliability and validity of an oral production test”. (Brown 2007) defines speaking as an interactive process of constructing meaning that involves producing, receiving and processing speech of sounds as the main instrument. While Bygate in (Torky 2006) adopting a definition of speaking based on interactional skills which involve making decision about communication. This is considered a top-down view of speaking”. From the definitions of speaking skill above, it can be concluded that speaking skill is a productive skill which is part of our daily life and it is difficult to assess reliably.

According to Harmer in (Nurhaida 2017) there are many types of classroom speaking activities. They are:

1. Acting from script
2. Communication games
3. Discussion
4. Prepares talks
5. Questionnaires
6. Simulation and Role Play

From a communicative purpose, speaking is closely related to listening. The interaction between this ability is shown in the conversation. Brown in (Nurhaida 2017): 20- 21) says that there are seven principles for designing speaking techniques.

* 1. Use techniques that cover the spectrum of learner needs, from language based focus on accuracy to message-based on interaction, meaning, and fluency.
	2. Provide intrinsically motivating techniques
	3. Encourage the use of authentic language in meaningful contexts.
	4. Provide appropriate feedback and correction.
	5. Capitalize on the natural link between speaking and listening.
	6. Give students opportunities to initiate oral communication.
	7. Encourage the development of speaking strategies.

Speaking is defined as an interactive process constructing meaning that involves producing, receiving, and processing information orally using organ of speech. Ideas are someone’s messages would like to be transferred to another. It means that another person should person should understand the messages well. In learning English, the students sometimes lack of motivation. They think that speaking is a hard work and difficult subject because they should consider many things; such as using grammar, using appropriate word, phrase, and also to pronounce the words. Besides, they are fear to make mistake in speaking English and their friends laugh at them. It made them is not self-confident. So, most of the students tend to be silent in the classroom and they are lazy to speak their ideas or opinion. They were shy if they want to express something. They afraid make mistake when they speak. Beside of that, the next problem, they are lack of vocabulary. Many of them cannot remember the new words that have learned. So that, it makes them cannot speak naturally and effectively. Because of that we also improve our vocabulary. Then we can speak well.

(Utama, Marhaeni, and Jaya 2013) also stated that the students’ speaking difficulties could be caused by inside and outside factors. The inside factors such as lack of self-confidence and lack of motivation could make students felt ashamed to speak, scared to make mistake, and felt not confidence. Meanwhile, the outside factor is related to the teacher. The teacher should be able to recognize the students’ problem and create a good atmosphere in teaching learning process in the classroom that can raise students’ enthusiasm to speak English. The teacher should provide time for the students to practice their speaking skill because through practice students can learn to express their feeling, emotion, thought, and their intention.

To solve the problems the researcher tries to find the effective teaching technique in order to help the students improve their speaking skill. The effective technique in teaching speaking will help the students in their speaking activity and solve their problem in speaking. The researcher chose Think pair-share to help students in their speaking especially in expressing suggestion and opinion. This technique will divide the students in pair discussion which consists of two members. In this case, each pair will think and sharing their knowledge and information that they have from their pair to another. By using this technique, the students use their ability to think a problem, discuss it with their partner who may have different opinion toward the problem. In discussing the problem, the students are helped by other student to confirm their opinion which is unclear and improve their pronunciation. In sharing procedure, the students improve their ability to convey a result of their discussion to the whole class whether it is understandable or not.

The *think-pair-share* is a technique designed to provide students to think a given topic by enabling them to formulate individual ideas and share these ideas with another student. This technique is a learning technique developed by Lyman to encourage student classroom participation. The *think-pair-share* is a cooperative discussion technique to help students work in group. In applying this technique, the lecturer poses a question, preferable one demanding analysis, evaluation, or synthesis, and gives students about a minute to think through an appropriate response (Lyman 1987) .

Think-Pair-Share is introduced by Dr. Frank Lyman, University of Maryland Instructor and educational consultant. Think-Pair-Share technique has been a foundational tool in cooperative learning it can be applied such as in many classroom, workshop, and training rooms. When the facilitator asks the audience a question, the some few people answer enthusiastically, while the rest just sit passively. Think-Pair-Share (TPS) is a technique designed to provide students with ‘food for thought’ on a given topics enabling them to formulate individual ideas and share these ideas with another student. Teachers announce a discussion topic or problem to solve. Give students at least 10 seconds of think time to THINK of their own answer (Desi, Nitiasih, and Artini 2013)

Think-Pair-Share is a short activity which is intended to get the students thoughtfully
involved in dealing with a topic, and may serve effectively as a warm-up to instruction and class
discussion on new course material (Hamad 2017). Think-pair-share have some clues: (1) teacher poses a question (usually a low consensus question), (2) Students think of a responses, (3) Students discuss their responses with a partner, (4) Students share their partner’s responses with the class. This technique can be applied in teaching speaking to give the time for the students to think about the problem/topic, enhance students’ oral communication through critical thinking and meaningful interaction where the students are free to suggest and give their opinion (Huda 2011). As stated by (Kusrini 2012) that Think-Pair-Share builds the democratic situation where the students are free to suggest and give their argumentation. By giving discussion section to the students, this technique could get the students actively involved in speaking activities.

**2. Methodology**

***Research Design***

This research is designed as a collaborative classroom action research (CAR). The *think-pair-share* technique is expected to solve this problem to be implemented in the process of CAR. This design is implemented in a cyclical process that consists of four steps. They are planning, implementation / action, observation, and reflection (McTaggart and Kemmis 1988)



**Figure 1**. Classroom Action Research Cycle of Kemmis and Taggart Models

The planning phase includes the activities of designing learning tools, preparing evaluation of
learning, and making observation sheets of student activities. In the first step (planning) the researcher prepared the teaching technique, designed lesson plans, prepared teaching materials and media in order to implement the *think-pair-share* strategy well.

The action/ implementation phase includes the presentation of subject matter regarding sound waves, group discussions, and question exercises. The second step is action/ implementing. In implementing process, the lecturer divided the students into groups of 2 (two). Each group was posed with some questions to be shared with their pairs about the topics provided by the lecturer. The students shared the topics in their own pairs and then presented to the whole class. In the process of implementing, the collaborator observed the process of teaching and learning by noting particular events to be analyzed.

The observation phase includes data collection activities by filling in the observation sheets of students’. During the implementation process, the collaborator observed the teaching and learrning process based on the observation checklist. The observation focused on the classroom atmospheres dealing with the students’ involvement in the classroom.

The reflection phase includes the activity of analyzing the weaknesses of the learning activities throughout the study, so that they can be corrected in the next cycle. This is the last step. The focus of this step is synthesizing and analyzing the data collected in the observation step about the classroom atmospheres. In this session, the data obtained from the subjects (students) were synthesized and analyzed whether qualitatively or quantitatively depending on the kind of data. The data analyzed were then matched to the criteria of success in order to judge whether the implementation of the strategy is stopped or continued to the next cycle based on the judgment on the students’ improvement in speaking skills

To implement the *think-pair-share* technique well, this research were conducted by the lecturer as a researcher and a collaborator as an observer. If the students’ performance in speaking does not improve in the first cycle, the research will be continued to the second cycle. If the students do not improve their achievement in the second cycle as expected in the criteria of success, the research will be continued to the third cycle, and so on. But on the contrary, if the first cycle has met the criteria of success, the action will be stopped.

The participant of this research is first Semester Students of STIKOM Tunas Bangsa Pematangsiantar in academic year of 2021-2022. The sample of this research is focused two classes that consist of 42 students.

***Instruments***

Instrument is a way to get the data. The instruments were used in the present research to collect data, namely speaking test and questionnaire.

**Speaking Test**

This test consists of Pre Test and Post Test. The pre-test was given before starting using think-pair share technique to improve the standards of the students in the oral language in order to allow for sound assessment. Post-test was given to the students after the treatment was given (applying Think-Pair-Share Technique and without applying Think-Pair Share Technique) to measure their achievement in speaking and the effectiveness of the program. The students were asked to describe thing, person, or place orally.

**Questionnaire**

Questionnaire was used to obtain information about students’ interest toward the application of Think-Pair Share technique speaking. The researcher gave optional were: a. Strongly agree, b. Agree, c. Undecided, d. Disagree and e. Strongly disagree. The questionnaire was distributed to the students after the post-test was given.

***Procedure of Collecting Data***

The procedure of collecting data in this research involved the following :

**Speaking Test**

To collect the data from the process of implementing the action, it is important to provide some instruments. They are the test. The researcher gave score to the students’ result test

**Questionnaire**

The researcher distributed the questionnaire to the students / after post-test was given to know the students’ interest toward the application of Think-Pair-Share Technique in speaking.

***Techniques of Data Analysis***

The data analysis was quantitative. To get the score, the researcher used scoring scale which
included of accuracy, fluency and clarity. The data was analyzed by employing the following
procedures.

**Speaking Test**

The speaking scoring by using the scoring criteria level is introduced by (Heaton 1991) as follows:

Table 3.1. The Scoring Classification for Accuracy

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Classification | Score | Criteria |
| Excellent  | 6  | Pronunciation is only influence by the mother tongue. Two or three minor grammatical and lexical errors. |
| Very good  | 5  | Pronunciation is slightly influenced by mother tongue. A view minor grammatical and lexical error. |
| Good  | 4  | Pronunciation is still moderately influence by mother tongue but not serious phonological errors. A few minor grammatical and lexical error. |
| Average  | 3  | Pronunciation is influence by the mother tongue, only a few phonological errors. Several grammatical and lexical errors, some of which cause confusion. |
| Poor  | 2  | Pronunciation is seriously influence by the mother tongue with the mother tongue with errors causing a breakdown in communication. Many grammatical and lexical errors. |
| Very poor  | 1  | Serious pronunciation errors as many basic grammatical and lexical errors. No evidence of having mastered any of language skills and areas practice in course. |

Table 3.2. The Scoring Classification for Fluency

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Classification | Score | Criteria |
| Excellent  | 6  | Speaks without too great an effort with fairly wide range of expression. Search for words occasionally by only one or two unnatural pauses. |
| Very good  | 5  | Has to make an effort at time to search for words. Nevertheless, smooth delivery on the whole and only a few unnatural pauses. |
| Good  | 4  | Although he has to make an effort and search for words, there are not too many unnatural pauses. Fairly smooth delivery. |
| Average  | 3  | Occasionally fragmentary but succeed in conveying the general meaning. Frequently fragmentary and halting delivery. Limited range of expression. |
| Poor  | 2  | Long pauses while he searches for the desired meaning. Frequently fragmentary and halting delivery. Almost give up making the effort at times limited range of expression. |
| Very poor  | 1  | Full of long unnatural pauses. Very halting and fragmentary delivery. At times gives up making the effort, very limited range of expression. |

Table 3.3. The Scoring Classification for Comprehensibility

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Classification  | Score  | Criteria |
| Excellent  | 6  | Easy for the listener to understand the speaker’s intention and general meaning. Very few interruptions on clarifications. |
| Very good  | 5  | The speaker’s intention and general meaning are fairly clear. A few interruptions by the listener for the sake of clarification are necessary. |
| Good  | 4  | Most of what the speaker says is easy to follow. His intention is always clear but several interruptions are necessary to help him to convey the message or to seek clarification. |
| Average  | 3  | The listener can understand a lot of what is said, but he must of the speaker’s more complex or longer sentences. |
| Poor  | 2  | Only small bits (usually short sentences and phrases) can be understood and then with considerable effort by someone who is listening to the speaker. |
| Very poor  | 1  | Even when the listener makes great effort or interrupts, the speaker is unable to clarify anything to say |

* 1. **Scoring the Result of the Students’ Speaking Test**

 Statistical technique is used to find the mean score. The formula to find the mean as
stated by Ngadiso in (Mundriyah and Parmawati 2016) as follows:

The formula is as follow:

Where *:*

*X* = The Mean Of Score

Σx = The Total Of Score

N = The Sum Of Students Number

* 1. **Classifying the Score of the Students**The classifying of students’ score is shown on the table below.

Table 3.4. The Scoring Classification of the Students’ Speaking Abilities

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Score | Classification |
| 87 – 100  | Excellent |
| 73 – 86  | Very good |
| 59 – 72  | Good |
| 45 – 58  | Average |
| 30 – 44  | Poor |
| < 30  | Very poor |

 (Nasional and KURIKULUM 2006)

**Questionnaire**The obtained data of the students’ interest from the questionnaire was analyzed by using following procedures:

1. **Scoring the Students’ Responses by Using Likert Scale**

Table 3.5.Likert Scale of Questionnaire

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Positive Statement | Negative Statement |
| Category | Score | Category | Score |
| Strongly Agree  | 5 | Strongly Agree  | 1 |
| Agree  | 4 | Agree  | 2 |
| Undecided  | 3 | Undecided  | 3 |
| Disagree  | 2 | Disagree  | 4 |
| Strongly Disagree  | 1 | Strongly Disagree  | 5 |

 (Sugiyono 2013)

1. **Categorizing the Students’ Interest**

Table 3.6.The Interval Score of Interest Classification

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Interval Score | Category |
| 85 – 100  | Strongly Interested |
| 69 – 84  | Interested |
| 52 – 68  | Moderate |
| 36 – 51  | Uninterested |
| 20 – 35  | Strongly Uninterested |

 (Sugiyono 2013)

1. **Findings and Discussion**

***Findings***

**Students’ Speaking Score**

a.Students' Score of Pre-Test

Table 4.1. The Rate Percentage and Frequency of Students’ Scores of Pre-test

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Classification  | Score  | F  | %  |
| Excellent  | 87 – 100  | 0 | 0.0 |
| Very Good  | 73 – 86  | 0 | 0.0 |
| Good  | 59 – 72  | 7 | 16.7 |
| Average  | 45 – 58  | 30 | 71.4 |
| Poor  | 30 – 44  | 5 | 11.9 |
| Very Poor  | <30  | 0 | 0.0 |
| Total  |   | 42 | 100.0 |

The mean of students’ score in the Pre – Test as follow:

b. Students' Score of Cycle 1

Table 4.2. The Rate Percentage and Frequency of Students’ Scores of Cycle 1

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Classification  | Score  | F  | %  |
| Excellent  | 87 – 100  | 0 | 0.0 |
| Very Good  | 73 – 86  | 7 | 16.7 |
| Good  | 59 – 72  | 28 | 66.7 |
| Average  | 45 – 58  | 7 | 16.7 |
| Poor  | 30 – 44  | 0 | 0.0 |
| Very Poor  | <30  | 0 | 0.0 |
| Total  |   | 42 | 100.0 |

The mean of students’ score in the Cycle 1 as follow:

1. Students' Score of Cycle 2

Table 4.3. The Rate Percentage and Frequency of Students’ Scores of Cycle 2

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Classification  | Score  | F  | %  |
| Excellent  | 87 – 100  | 2 | 4.8 |
| Very Good  | 73 – 86  | 25 | 59.5 |
| Good  | 59 – 72  | 15 | 35.7 |
| Average  | 45 – 58  | 0 | 0.0 |
| Poor  | 30 – 44  | 0 | 0.0 |
| Very Poor  | <30  | 0 | 0.0 |
| Total  |   | 42 | 100.0 |

The mean of students’ score in the Cycle 2 as follow:

**Students’ Interest**

Students' Score of Questionnaire

Table 4.4. The Rate Percentage and Frequency of Students’ Scores of Questionnaire

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Category | Interval Score | F | % |
| Strongly Interested  | 85 – 100  | 2 | 4.8 |
| Interested  | 69 – 84  | 37 | 88.1 |
| Moderate  | 52 – 68  | 3 | 7.1 |
| Uninterested  | 36 – 51  | 0 | 0 |
| Strongly Uninterested  | 20 – 35  | 0 | 0 |
| Total  |   | 42 | 100 |

**Discussion**

The researcher found that the existence of Think-Pair-Share technique in teaching speaking made easy the students in speaking English. They shared ideas or information to other easily. By this technique, the students can improve their score. The students also can discussion with their partner. Pair in Think-Pair-Share technique in teaching speaking helped the students. The students was given opportunity to collect their knowledge and give opportunity to discuss answer in pair and share their answer with the whole class.

In Pre Test, the mean score was 51.69. From 42 students speaking, there were only 16.7% (7 students) the students who got good score. While 71.4% (30 students) got average score, and 11.9% (5 students) got poor score. The score of the students indicated that the students faced many problems in speaking. They have many problems in making a piece of English speaking, because their speaking skill was low. The result in the Pre Test was low, most of students had problem in pronunciation, lack of vocabulary and were not confident to speak.

In cycle 1, the mean score was 65.17. It was qualified as average to good. From 42 students speaking, there were 16.7% (7 students) the students who got very good score. While 66.7% (28 students) got good score, and 16.7% (7 students) got average score. In this cycle, the students showed their effort to speak English well, although a few of them still made mistake in term of pronunciation.

In cycle 2, the mean score was 74.81. It was qualified as good to very good and excellent. From 42 students speaking, there were 4.8% (2 students) the students who got excellent score. While 59,5% (25 students) got very good score, and 35.7% (15 students) got good score.

From the result of analysis, the research findings of this Classroom Action Research was satisfactory. And when the researcher made the questioner to the student, they enjoyed the class and felt interested. In questioner, From 42 students speaking, there were only 7.1% (3 students) felt moderate. While 88.1% (37 students) felt interested, and 4.8% (2 students) felt strongly interested. As conclusion, Think-Pair-Share technique was suggested to use at school especially English teacher to improve students’ speaking ability. Besides, this technique could be used to invite students’ participation and interaction in teaching and learning process.

1. **Conclusion**

Based on the results of the data analysis in the study, it can be concluded that *think-pair-share* Technique is successful to increase students’active involvement in speaking ability on the first Semester Students of STIKOM Tunas Bangsa Pematangsiantar after being implemented in two cycles that considers two criteria, namely the students’ spoken test results and the students’ active involvement during the implementation of the technique. This technique could make the students actively involved in speaking activity by sharing it to the whole class.
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