

THE EFFECT OF USING THINK PAIR SHARE TECHNIQUE TOWARD STUDENTS' SPEAKING ABILITY AT THE 10TH GRADE OF MAN 3 AGAM

Endang Kurnia¹, Eliza², Febria Sri Artika³, Absharini Kardena⁴

^{1,2,3,4}Universitas Islam Negeri Sjech M. Djamil Djambek Bukittinggi

kurniaendang025@gmail.com¹, eliza@uinbukittinggi.ac.id²,

febiasriartika@uinbukittinggi.ac.id³, absharinkardena@uinbukittinggi.ac.id⁴

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to examine the effect of the Think Pair Share (TPS) technique on students' speaking ability at MAN 3 Agam, where many tenth grade students had difficulty in speaking English. Vocabulary limitations hindered communication during class activities, causing students to prefer using local language which is "Minang language." Inaccurate pronunciation also caused misunderstandings, making it difficult for them to express ideas spontaneously. This study used quantitative methods with a quasi-experimental research design of nonequivalent control group design. The population of this study were all tenth grade students at MAN 3 Agam, with samples selected by cluster random sampling. Class XE.2 was selected as the experimental group and XE.3 as the control group. The instrument used was an extensive speaking test (monologue), which was validated by content validation and tested for reliability using Inter-rater reliability with Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC) method. Data analysis included normality and homogeneity tests, followed by hypothesis testing using paired sample t-Test and independent sample t-Test. The results of the paired sample t-test in the experimental class showed Sig (2-tailed) < 0.05, indicating a significant effect of TPS. The independent sample t-test comparing the two classes also showed Sig (2-tailed) < 0.05, indicating a significant difference between students taught with TPS and those not taught with TPS. The post-test scores showed that the experimental class achieved a higher mean score than the control class, indicating that the speaking ability of the class taught using TPS technique was better than the class not taught using TPS technique.

Keywords: Think Pair Share technique (TPS), Speaking.

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengkaji pengaruh teknik Think Pair Share (TPS) terhadap kemampuan berbicara peserta didik di MAN 3 Agam, di mana banyak peserta didik kelas X mengalami kesulitan dalam berbicara bahasa Inggris. Keterbatasan kosakata menghambat komunikasi selama kegiatan pembelajaran di kelas, sehingga peserta didik lebih memilih menggunakan bahasa daerah, yaitu bahasa Minangkabau. Selain itu, pelafalan yang kurang tepat juga menyebabkan terjadinya kesalahpahaman, sehingga menyulitkan peserta didik untuk mengekspresikan ide secara spontan. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode kuantitatif dengan desain penelitian kuasi-eksperimen berupa nonequivalent control

group design. Populasi dalam penelitian ini adalah seluruh peserta didik kelas X MAN 3 Agam, dengan sampel yang dipilih melalui teknik cluster random sampling. Kelas XE.2 ditetapkan sebagai kelas eksperimen dan kelas XE.3 sebagai kelas kontrol. Instrumen yang digunakan berupa tes berbicara berbentuk monolog, yang telah divalidasi melalui validitas isi serta diuji reliabilitasnya menggunakan inter-rater reliability dengan metode Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC). Analisis data meliputi uji normalitas dan uji homogenitas, kemudian dilanjutkan dengan pengujian hipotesis menggunakan paired sample t-test dan independent sample t-test. Hasil uji paired sample t-test pada kelas eksperimen menunjukkan nilai Sig. (2-tailed) < 0,05, yang mengindikasikan adanya pengaruh signifikan penggunaan teknik TPS. Selanjutnya, hasil uji independent sample t-test yang membandingkan kedua kelas juga menunjukkan nilai Sig. (2-tailed) < 0,05, yang menandakan adanya perbedaan yang signifikan antara peserta didik yang diajar menggunakan teknik TPS dan peserta didik yang tidak diajar menggunakan teknik TPS. Hasil post-test menunjukkan bahwa kelas eksperimen memperoleh nilai rata-rata yang lebih tinggi dibandingkan dengan kelas kontrol. Hal ini menunjukkan bahwa kemampuan berbicara peserta didik yang diajar menggunakan teknik Think Pair Share (TPS) lebih baik dibandingkan dengan peserta didik yang tidak diajar menggunakan teknik tersebut.

Kata kunci: Teknik Think Pair Share (TPS), Berbicara.

A. Introduction

Speaking is one of the important skill that must be mastered by students in learning English. This is because it will help students use English effectively in communication and interaction with others (Desnita et al., 2022). According to Nunan (2003), speaking refers to the ability of verbally producing language. This involves using the right vocabulary, correct sentence structure, appropriate intonation, and supportive gestures to create effective communication. Speaking allows for two or more people to exchange

thoughts, ideas, and emotions smoothly and effectively (Fadhillah et al., 2023). Achieving the ability to speak English well requires students to have mastery of several essential speaking components.

There are several components that students must master to achieve good speaking. As stated by Brown (2001), five components must be mastered in speaking, namely pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. First is pronunciation, pronunciation is the way a word is pronounced correctly by paying attention to sound, stress, and

intonation patterns. According to Mardiah (2024), the ability to pronounce words correctly is a key element in acquiring a language. The second is grammar, grammar is a rule or system that is used as a guide or reference in composing sentences. Grammar plays a crucial role in understanding and using spoken language, as it enables the production of correct and well-structured utterances (Rianto et al., 2021). Third is vocabulary, vocabulary is very important in learning a language especially English (Humairoh et al., 2023). Vocabulary is a series of words that are known and used when speaking. Fourth is fluency, fluency is the ability to read, speak, or write easily, smoothly and expressively. The last is comprehension, comprehension is the ability to understand the meaning of spoken language conveyed by others.

Based on preliminary research conducted by the researcher on February 20, 2025 at MAN 3 Agam, the researcher found several problems about the speaking ability of tenth grade students at MAN 3 Agam. First, the lack of vocabulary mastered by students makes students unable to interact in English in class, so they

tend to use the local language which is "Minang Language" during teaching and learning activities. Second, students are not good when pronouncing vocabulary in English so it is feared that there will be misunderstandings of meanings. Third, the students still find it difficult to express their ideas verbally in English spontaneously.

From these problems, researcher tried to find effective teaching technique to overcome the problems. Among the various teaching techniques available, the researcher took the techniques from the cooperative learning method. It is because students who are involved in cooperative learning more quickly develop interpersonal communication skills compared to students in ordinary classes (Macpherson, 2000). In this case, the researcher chose the Think Pair Share technique as one of the techniques of cooperative learning to improve students' speaking ability. As emphasized by Wijaya (2021), Think Pair Share is a cooperative learning technique that first proposed by Frank Lyman in 1981. Whitehead (2007, as cited in Azlina, 2010) states that the Think Pair Share technique improves students' oral communication by

allowing time to discuss, resulting in more thoughtful response.

Based on the research problems identified by the researcher and the problem-solving plan involving the use of the Think Pair Share technique to improve students' speaking abilities, the objectives of this research are as follows: to determine whether there is a significant effect in the use of Think Pair Share technique in improving students' speaking ability, to determine whether there is a significant difference between the class that applies the Think Pair Share technique and the class that does not apply the Think Pair Share technique in improving students' speaking ability, and to determine whether there is the speaking ability of students who implement the Think Pair Share technique better than students who do not implement the Think Pair Share technique.

B. Research methods

In this study, researcher used quantitative methods with a quasi-experimental research design of nonequivalent control group design. The population of this study were all tenth grade students at MAN 3 Agam, with samples selected by cluster

random sampling. Class XE.2 was selected as the experimental group and XE.3 as the control group. The instrument used was an extensive speaking test (monologue), which was validated by content validation and tested for reliability using Inter-rater reliability with Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC) method. Data analysis included normality and homogeneity tests, followed by hypothesis testing using paired sample t-Test and independent sample t-Test analyzed using SPSS 26.

C. Finding and Discussion

Finding

Description

a. Data from the pre-test of the experimental and control classes

In the range 1-49, there were 14 students from control class and 11 students from experimental class. In the range 50-64, there were 12 students of control group and 13 students from experimental class. In the range 65-79, there was 1 student from experimental class. These

results are illustrated in the following table:

Table 1.
Pre-test scores of the control and experimental classes

Rang e of the scor e	Descripti on	Contr ol class	Experimen tal class
80-100	Very good	0	0
65-79	Good	0	1
50-64	Fair	12	13
1-49	Bad	14	11
Total		26	25

(Arikunto 2000)

Based on the calculation from the data that researcher got from pre-test, the lowest pre-test score gained by the control class was 35.89 and the highest score was 60.25. The mean score was 47.82, the median score was 48.07, standard deviation score was 6.83 and the variance score was 46.65. For the experiment class, the lowest score was 42.67 and the highest score was 66.67. The mean score was 52.90, the median score was 74.67, the standard deviation score was 6.67, and the variance score was 44.55. It can be seen in the following table:

Table 2.
The calculation results of the speaking test scores obtained from the pre-test

	Contr ol class	Experime ntal class
Minimu m	35.89	42.67
Maxim um	60.25	66.67
Mean	47.82	52.90
Median	48.07	74.67
Standar d deviation	6.83	6.67
Varianc e	46.65	44.55

b. Data from the post-test of the experimental and control classes

In the range 50-64, there were 16 students of the control group and 6 students from experimental class. In the range 65-79, there were 9 students from control class and 12 students from experimental class. In the range 80-100, there was 1 student from control group and 7 students from experimental class. These results are illustrated in the following table:

Table 3. Post-test scores of the control and experimental classes			
Rang e of the scor e	Descripti on	Contr ol class	Experimen tal class
80-100	Very good	1	7
65-79	Good	9	12
50-64	Fair	16	6
1-49	Bad	0	0
	Total	26	25

(Arikunto 2000)

Based on the calculation from the data that researcher got from post- test, the lowest score of post- test gained by the control class was 49.99, and the highest score was 82.05. The mean score was 63.30, the median score was 61.54, the standar deviation score was 7.82, and the variance score was 61.30. For the experiment class, the lowest score was 53.33 and the highest score was 86.67. The mean score was 72.26, the median score was 74.67, standar deviation score was 9.48, and the variance score was 89.94. It can be seen in the following table:

Table 4. The calculation results of the speaking test scores obtained from the post-test		
	Control class	Experimental class
Minimum	49.99	53.33
Maximum	82.05	86.67
Mean	63.30	72.26
Median	61.54	74.67
Standard deviation	7.82	9.48
Variance	61.30	89.94

After doing pre- test and post- test, the researcher compared both the result of the pre- test and post- test from the control and experimental class. The comparison test result of pre- test and post- test from the control and experimental class were higher than the result of the pre- test ($52.90 > 72.26$). The comparison of post- test results between the control class and experimental class showed that the control class test was lower than the experimental class. This is shown by the average score of the control class post- test results (63.30) which means lower than the experimental class post- test results (72.26). The results were shown in the following table:

Table 5.
**The comparison of pre test and post-test
of the
control and experiment class.**

X	Pre- test	Post- test
Control	47.82	63.30
Experiment	52.90	72.26

Analysis Prerequisite test

a. Normality test of pre-test score of control class and experimental class

Analyzing of the data was conducted to find out whether the data was distributed normally or not. The data is normal if $\text{Sig. (p value)} > 0.05$ and is not normal if $\text{sig. (p value)} < 0.05$. In the result of the normality test of the pre-test in the control and experimental classes, it was found that the Sig. (p-value) of the control class pre-test was $0.200 > 0.05$, and the Sig. (p-value) of the experimental class was $0.144 > 0.05$, its meant that the data were distributed normally. The result of the normality test conducted using SPSS was presented in Table 6:

Table 6.
Test of normality
**One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov
Test**

	Pre-test score of control class	Pre-test score of experimental class
N	26	25
Normal Parametersa, b	Mean 47,8258 Std. 6,83049	52,9060 6,67498
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute ,117 Positive ,098 Negative -,117	,151 ,151 ,097
Test Statistic	,117	,151
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	,200c,d	,144c

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Normality of post-test score of control class and experimental class

Analyzing of the data was conducted to find out whether the instrument was distributed normally or not. The data is normal if $\text{Sig. (p value)} > 0.05$. In the results of the normality test of the post-test in the control and experimental classes, it was found that the Sig. (p-value) of the control class post-test was $0.062 > 0.05$, and the Sig. (p-value) of the experimental class post-test was $0.068 > 0.05$. This meant that the data were distributed normally. The result of the homogeneity test conducted using SPSS was presented in Table 7:

**Table 7
One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test**

		Post-test score of control class	Post-test score of experimental class
N		26	25
Normal Parameters ^{a,b}	Mean	63,3092	72,2672
	Std. Deviation	7,82942	9,48397
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	,166	,168
	Positive	,166	,168
	Negative	-,086	-,120
Test Statistic		,166	,168
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		,062 ^c	,068 ^c

a. Test distribution is Normal.

c. Homogeneity test of the pre-test score from control and the experimental class

In the results of the homogeneity test of the pre- test of the control and experimental classess, it was found that the significance value (sig) based on Mean is $0.824 > 0.05$, it can be concluded that the variance of the

control class and the experimental class pre- test data is the same or homogeneous. The data from the pre- test of the control class and experimental class were homogeny as presented in the table 8:

**Table 8
Test of Homogeneity of Variances**

		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Pre-test score of control class & experimental class	Based on Mean	,050	1	49	,824
	Based on Median	,117	1	49	,734
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	,117	1	46,581	,734
	Based on trimmed mean	,059	1	49	,809

d. Homogeneity test of the post test score from the experimental class and control class

In the results of the homogeneity test of the post- test of the control and experimental

classes, it was found that the significance value (sig) based on Mean score was $0.087 > 0.05$, it can be concluded that the variance of the control and experimental classes post- test data is the same or homogeneous. The data from

the post-test of control and experimental classes also

homogenous, it can be seen in the table 9:

Table 9
Test of Homogeneity of variace

		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Post-test score of control class & experimental class	Based on Mean	3,050	1	49	,087
	Based on Median	2,655	1	49	,110
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	2,655	1	48,801	,110
	Based on trimmed mean	3,120	1	49	,084

1. Testing Hypothesis

The hypotheses of this research were tested as follow:

a. The first hypothesis

Based on the result, it was found that the Sig (2- tailed) in the first hypothesis test was $0.000 < 0.05$, which showed that there was a

significant effect in the used of Think Pair Share technique in students' speaking ability in the experimental class. From the data, it can be concluded that H_a is accepted. It can be seen in the table 10:

Table 10
Paired Samples Test

		Mean	Paired Differences				T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
			Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	Lower			
Pair 1	Pre-test and Post-test Score of Experimental Class	-19,36120	6,50004	1,30001	-22,04428	-16,67812	-14,893	24	,000

b. The second hypothesis

Based on the results, it was found the Sig. (2-tailed) in the second hypothesis test was $0.001 < 0.05$, which showed that there was a significant difference between the class that applied the Think Pair

Share technique and the class did not apply the Think Pair Share technique in improving students speaking ability. From the data, it can be concluded that H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted. It can be seen in the table 11:

**Table 11
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	
Post-test score of control and experimental classes	Equal variance assumed	3,050	,087	-3,685	49	,001	-8,95797	2,43116	-13,84357	4,07237
	Equal variance is not assumed			-3,671	46,565	,001	-8,95797	2,44039	-13,86862	4,04732

c. The third hypothesis

Based on the average results of the students' speaking ability test in the post-test, the score of experimental class is higher than the score of control class, which was $(72.26 > 63.30)$. This

means that the hypothesis (H_0) is rejected and (H_a) is accepted, it can be concluded that students who were taught using Think Pair Share technique was better than the control class

that was taught using conventional activities.

Discussion

Based on the results of the hypothesis, the researcher found that the use of Think Pair Share technique had a significant effect on students' speaking ability. This could be seen from the average pre-test and post-test in the experimental class. The average post- test of the experimental class was higher than the average of the pre-test of the experimental class.

This finding is in accordance with the theories of experts related to the use of one of the cooperative learning techniques, namely the Think Pair Share technique in improving students' speaking ability. Students who are involved in cooperative learning more quickly develop interpersonal communication skills compared to students in ordinary classes (Macpherson, 2000). Whitehead (2007, as cited in Azlina, 2010) says that the Think Pair Share technique improves students' oral communication by allowing time to discuss, resulting in more thoughtful response. Based on this theory, it can be concluded that the results of this study are in accordance with the theories of the experts, namely an

increase in students' speaking ability by using the Think Pair Share technique.

This finding is also in line with several previous studies, namely Fitriawati (2021), Fitriani Siringo Ringo (2019), and Ahmed Amin Awad Raba (2017). Fitriawati (2021) found that the Think Pair Share technique has a significant effect on students' speaking skills. In addition, Fitriani Siringo Ringo (2019) also found that there was a significant effect of Think Pair Share technique on speaking students' ability. Furthermore, Ahmed Amin Awad Raba (2017) found that the Think pair Share technique improve students' oral skills. This was also found by the researcher in this research, namely that there was a significant effect of Think Pair Share on students' speaking ability.

In the experimental class that applied Think Pair Share technique, students' speaking ability increased. Thus, Think Pair Share had an effect on students' speaking ability. Meanwhile, in the control class that used conventional activities, the effect in students' speaking ability was not as the students in the experimental class. In control class, only a few

students had an effect in speaking ability.

Based on the explanation above, it can be concluded that the findings of this research corroborate the theories of experts that the Think Pair Share technique can improve students' speaking ability. In the findings of this research, the Think Pair Share technique significantly improved students' speaking ability. This can be seen from the results of the pre-test and post-test of the experimental class which showed that the mean score of post-test was higher than the pre-test score. In addition, there is a difference in the post-test scores of the control class and the experimental class which shows that the mean score of the experimental class is higher than the mean score of the control class.

D. Conclusion

Based on the results of the study, it can be concluded that the Think Pair Share technique has a significant effect on the speaking abilities of the 10th grade students at MAN 3 Agam. The experimental class showed a significant improvement in speaking abilities, as indicated by an increase in the average score from

52.90 on the pre-test to 72.26 on the post-test. Meanwhile, the control class showed only a slight improvement compared to the experimental class, with the average score increasing from 47.82 on the pre-test to 63.30 on the post-test. These results prove that the use of the Think Pair Share technique is more effective in improving students' speaking abilities than conventional teaching methods.

DAFTAR PUSTAKA

Ainun Mardiah, Loli Safitri, Eliza, S. (2024). Improving Students Ability in Pronunciation Through Reading Aloud for the 8th Grade of SMPN 2 Bukittinggi. *Continuous Education:: Journal of Science and Research*, 5(2), 178–186.

Azlin, N. (2010). CETLs: Supporting Collaborative Activities Among Students and Teachers Through the Use of Think Pair Share Techniques. *IJCSI*, 7(5), 10–39.

Brown, H. D. (2001). Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy. In New York: Addison Wesley Longman Inc. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587655>

Fadhillah, N., Putri, H. P., Dewi, M. P., & Syafitri, W. (2023). The Effect of Task-Based Learning (TBL) Towards Students' Speaking Skill. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai*, 7, 29563–29570.

<https://jptam.org/index.php/jptam/article/view/11752%0Ahttps://jptam.org/index.php/jptam/article/download/11752/9067>

Macpherson, A. (2000). *Cooperative Learning Group Activities for College Courses: Guide for Instructors*.

Mona Desnita, Irwandi, Eliza, L. S. (2022). *The Effect of Round Robin Technique Toward Students' Speaking Performance at MTS . Muhammadiyah Pulau Punjung*. 01(01), 72–82.

Nunan, D. (2003). Practical English Language Teaching. In *McGraw-Hill*.

Rianto, Febria Sri Artika, L. S. (2021). *The Effect of Prophet Yusuf Storytelling on Students' Grammar Mastery*. 5(2), 129–139.
<https://doi.org/10.31002/metathesis.v5i2.2742>

Suci Humairoh, Absharini Kardena, & Rahmi Novianti. (2023). the Effectiveness of Simon Says Game To Improve Students Vocabulary Mastery in Learning English. *Jurnal Pendidikan, Bahasa Dan Budaya*, 2(1), 49–55.
<https://doi.org/10.55606/jpbb.v1i2.975>

Wijaya, H. (2021). *Model Pembelajaran Think Pair Share Berbasis Pendidikan Karakter* (Issue December).
<https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/xn4dw>

Raba, A. A. A. (2017). The Influence of Think-Pair-Share (TPS) on Improving Students' Oral Communication Skills in EFL Classrooms. *Creative Education*, 08(01), 12–23.
<https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2017.81002>

Fitriawati. (2021). The effect of using think-pair-share strategy on students' speaking skill (Skripsi, State Islamic University of Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta). Retrieved from
<https://repository.uinjkt.ac.id/dspace/handle/123456789/60578>

Fitriani Siringo Ringo. (2019). The effect using Think-Pair-Share strategy towards students' speaking ability at the ten grade student of SMAN 1 Tapung Hilir Kabupaten Kampar (Skripsi). Universitas Islam Riau. Retrieved from
<https://repository.uir.ac.id/7747/1/156311139.pdf>