

The Effectiveness of Using Think Pair and Share Technique on Students' English-Speaking Performance

Meisya Alfiolin Apriliani^{1*} Asri Purnamasari²

Article History:

Received: 13 October 2024

Revised : 08 January 2025

Accepted: 16 January 2025

Available Online:

15 February 2025

Keywords:

EFL; think pair and share; speaking performance

ABSTRACT

Speaking is very crucial for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners. However, many students find it challenging to master due to the use of improper teaching and learning approaches. Research suggests that one teaching method that can effectively help to solve the problem is a strategy of the collaborative learning approach called Think Pair and Share (TPS). This study aimed to determine the effectiveness of using TPS on English-speaking skills for students at SMPN 117 Jakarta. Using a quasi-experimental design, this study involved 72 eleventh graders who were divided equally into the control group and the experimental group. Data was collected using pre-tests and post-tests and analyzed using SPSS version 26. The results showed there was a significant effect of using TPS on students' English-speaking performance but no significant difference between the speaking scores of male and female students, indicating that both male and female students benefit equally from TPS use. Based on the results, EFL teachers are recommended to implement this technique to help students develop their speaking performance.

¹ Yokomine Preschool & Kindergarten, Jakarta, Indonesia. E-mail: msyaaprl@gmail.com

*Corresponding Author

² Universitas Kristen Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia. Email: asri.purnamasari@uki.ac.id

 <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1511-9031>

INTRODUCTION

Among the four English language skills, speaking is a crucial skill for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners to master as it shows learners' mastery of the language (Nazara, 2011). One's proficiency in speaking is determined by how accurately and fluently he or she uses spoken language during a conversation (Dao, 2017). Yet, Indonesian students consider speaking difficult to master, and they are not confident enough to speak in English because they are afraid of making mistakes. One of the major causes is the students' improper mastery of English. Noviyenty et al. (2020) found that Improper proficiency in a language will distort the entire language, as shown in reading, speaking and writing. This is confirmed by Raqib, Firman and Sastrawati (2023) who stated that speaking becomes challenging due to the limited vocabulary, low self-confidence, poor grammatical rules, and speaking strategies' deficiency. Such condition could be worsened if the teachers speak in the students; mother tongue too often, which, according to Wang (2014) limited students' English speaking as they had limited opportunities to speak in English in the classrooms. What is more, mother tongue interference causes non-native speakers to make mistakes in language basics, including speaking.

Another causing factor, which is probably the most crucial to tackle, is related to the teaching approach. In Indonesian EFL contexts, most educators still implement the old method, which is teacher-oriented. The teachers used to lecture, and students should keep listening. This method cannot improve students' speaking skills because they have less opportunity to practice speaking in the classroom. The implementation of the out-of-date instructional approaches in EFL classrooms will suffer students' learning achievement (Baek & Lee 2018; Chen & Hwang, 2019). Therefore, to help students overcome the challenges in developing speaking performance, implementing up-to-date and suitable instruction approaches is indispensable.

Various research has recommended implementing a collaborative learning approach to facilitate more effective speaking classrooms. Collaborative learning is highly recommended as it promotes social interaction, student-centeredness and learner autonomy (Rai, 2024; Salma, 2020). In this learning approach, while endeavoring to accomplish a task in groups, the students exchange ideas and create understanding that help them achieve better. In speaking classrooms, collaborative learning endorses interaction, leading to the development of communicative competence. What is more, collaborative learning caters to a stress-free learning environment, which provides the students a better chance for developing their language proficiency.

One of the effective techniques to implement collaborative learning is the Think-Pair and Share strategy (TPS), a type of cooperative learning technique that organizes classroom activities as academic and social learning experiences. Initially conceived by Professor Frank Lyman at the University of Maryland in 1981, TPS is a learner-centered and highly effective collaborative teaching strategy that has been widely used in higher education. The strategy is a multimode discussion cycle that encourages students to receive the assigned question or issue, formulate their own ideas, and share them with other students (Usman, 2015). It can be implemented in speaking classrooms to encourage learners' involvement by guiding them to find the freedom to understand English by themselves (Yulianingsih, 2017).

According to Kagan (as cited in Aprianti & Ayu, 2014), the benefit of the Think Pair and Share technique is that students have more time to focus on their work and listen to each other's opinions. Through this learning method, students are trained on how to deliver their ideas in public and learn to respect others' ideas while still referring to the material/learning objectives. TPS can develop and increase students' ability to remember information and discuss information before presenting in the class. This method can also improve students' confidence because all students are given the same chance to participate in the class (Kurjum, Muhid, & Thohir, 2020). During the discussion, the teacher can concentrate on listening to students' answers, observing students' reactions, and asking high-level questions. This technique can help students to be responsible with their tasks and also their friends (Dewi, 2023).

Syafii (2018) outlines three phases of TPS: (1) thinking phase; (2) pair phase; and (3) sharing phase. In the thinking phase, the teacher asks a question or problem. Students then have time to think about it on their own. This helps them come up with their answers and improves how they respond to questions. This phase helps them develop their critical thinking. In the pair phase, students pair up with a classmate nearby to discuss their ideas. This helps them learn from each other and understand what they know and what they do not. They share their answers and combine them with their partner. In the sharing phase, the teacher asks pairs to share their answers with the whole class. Other pairs can add comments or extra ideas. This helps students evaluate themselves and learn from their classmates. It also lets the teacher see how well everyone understands the topic. In the end, students feel more comfortable sharing after discussing with a partner because any mistakes are shared.

To be appropriately applied in language classrooms, Macpherson (2009, as cited in Wichadee & Orawiwatnakul, 2012) suggested TPS to be built upon six principles. First, group tasks are designed to be suitable for group work. Second, positive interdependence is built in, as cooperation is necessary for students to succeed. Third, attention and class time are given to interpersonal/cooperative skill building. Fourth, participants learn together in small (2–5 members) groups. Fifth, students are individually accountable for learning and participation. Finally, the instructor's role changes from being the 'sage on the stage' to the 'guide on the side'.

Various studies have been conducted on the effectiveness of using TPS in speaking classrooms. Sriyanda and Priyana (2024) conducted classroom action research, which is defined by Pardede (2016) as a research design used to solve problems or to increase the outcomes of every day's learning activities related to cognitive, motoric, and attitude domains, using TPS to enhance students' critical thinking skills and explore students' perceptions of its application in speaking classes. Involving 30 second-grade students of a senior high school in Banda Aceh, they collected the data employing tests, observations, questionnaires, and interviews. The results showed that TPS significantly improved students; critical thinking skills, and the participants responded positively to the use of the technique. Asrifan (2016) conducted a quasi-experiment at SMPN 4 Panca Rijan, South Sulawesi, to investigate the effectiveness of using TPS in improving students' speaking ability. The results showed that TPS technique effectively improved students' speaking ability, and the students found the learning activities interesting. Hetika, Farida, and Sari

(2016) also conducted a quasi-experimental design research to investigate whether TPS can improve students speaking skills. Involving students of SMK Pelayaran Putra Samudera Yogyakarta, she collected the data using the speaking test. The result showed that the use of TPS significantly improved the students' speaking skills. Bunaya (2019,) conducted a classroom action research to investigate the effectiveness of TPS in improving students' speaking confidence. By involving 30 twelfth graders of SMAN 6 Kota Bengkulu. The results showed TPS could improve students' speaking confidence, and the participants show positive responses to the use of TPS.

These previous studies primarily conducted a quasi-experimental design and action research, employing tests, observation, interviews, and questionnaires to collect data. They involved students of junior high schools, senior high schools, and colleges in Banda Aceh, Sulawesi, Yogyakarta, and Bengkulu. Notably, none of the studies was conducted in Jakarta. Furthermore, no research had investigated whether there is a significant difference in the effectiveness of the Think Pair and Share technique between male and female speaking performances. To fill this gap, the present study was conducted to see the effect of TPS on students' English-speaking performance and the different effect of the technique on male and female students' speaking skills development at SMPN 117 Jakarta.

Concerning the background above, the research questions to address in this study are stated as follows: (1) Is there any significant effect of using TPS on students' English-speaking performance at SMPN 117 Jakarta? (2) Is there any significant different effect of using TPS on male and female students' speaking performance at SMPN 117 Jakarta?

Two answer these questions, two sets of hypotheses were formulated. Both were tested at 0.05 level of significance.

H₀1: $\mu_1 > 0,05$ (The use of think pair and share technique does not have any significant effect on students' English-speaking performance at SMPN 117 Jakarta.)

H_a1: $\mu_1 < 0,05$ (The use of the think pair and share technique has a significant effect on students' English-speaking performance at SMPN 117 Jakarta)

H₀2: $\mu_1 > 0,05$ (The use of the think pair and share technique does not have any significant difference between male and female speaking performance at SMPN 117 Jakarta)

H_a2: $\mu_1 < 0,05$ (The use of the think pair and share technique has any significant difference between male and female speaking performance at SMPN 117 Jakarta)

METHODS

Research Design

This study employed a quasi-experimental research design, which is used to establish a cause-and-effect relationship between an independent and dependent variable (Thomas, 2020). Since an experimental study is used to estimate the effect of a treatment or an intervention using an empirical comparison (Reichardt, 2019), it befits this study, which aims to see the different effects of speaking instruction with and without TPS to students speaking performance and the different effect of the technique to male and female students. The research design is illustrated in Table 1.

Table 1. Pre-test and Post-test Designed of the Study

Class	Pre-Test	Usage of an Independent Variable	Post-Test
Experimental	Pre-Test	Using the Think Pair and Share technique	Post-Test
Controlled	Pre-Test	Teacher-oriented teaching method	Post-Test

Research Setting

This study was conducted at SMPN Jakarta in the odd semester of 2024/2025 academic year. The population was the whole students of the school, while the sample were 72 students selected purposively (due to administrative constraints) by taking the 36 students at VIII6 as the experimental group and the 36 students at VIII7 the control group. The sample size of the study is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Sample of the Study

No.	Class	Gender	
		Male	Female
1.	VIII-6	19	17
2.	VIII-7	19	17
Total		72 Students	

Instrument

The data was collected using speaking pre test and post test adopted from Sijil Pelajaran Malaysia (SPM) 2022 speaking testing, students should respond to five 5 questions. Both tests were assessed for validity and reliability. The validity assessment revealed that the r value $> r$ table for every test item, indicating the items are valid. The reliability test using Cronbach's Alpha test resulted the reliability coefficient of 0.926, which exceeds 0.60, indicating that the instrument is considered reliable and meets the necessary standards

Data Collecting Procedure

Before implementing the TPS technique, the researcher delivered the pretest to the experiment and control group to investigate their level of speaking performance. The test consisted of a set of oral tests. After getting students' pretest score, the researcher implemented TPS to teach speaking in the experimental group while in the control group, the researcher adapted the strategy used to employ by English teachers at the school. Each group was taught in five sessions. After that, the researcher administered a post-test to evaluate their progress in speaking skills.

Data Analysis Technique

The data was analyzed using two types of statistical tests: descriptive and parametric statistics. Descriptive analysis presented the quantitative descriptions in manageable forms such as mean, maximum, minimum, and standard deviation, whereas the parametric

statistics were used to test the hypothesis. To help conducting the descriptive analysis, the category proposed by Nurkacana and Suharta (in Putri, Ratminingsih, Budasi, 2022) was used to describe the results into very poor to very good scales.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistical Analysis

Formula	Result	Description
$Mi + 1.5 (SD) \leq x \leq 100$	$79,5 \leq x \leq 100$	Very Good
$Mi + 0.5 (SD) \leq x < Mi + 1.5 (SD)$	$72,5 \leq x \leq 79,5$	Good
$Mi - 0.5 (SD) \leq x < Mi + 0.5 (SD)$	$65,5 \leq x \leq 72,5$	Average
$Mi - 1.5 (SD) \leq x < Mi - 0.5 (SD)$	$58,5 \leq x \leq 65,5$	Poor
$20 \leq x < Mi - 1.5 (SD)$	$20 \leq x \leq 58,5$	Very Poor

$$Mi = \frac{1}{2} (ST + SR) \quad SDi = \frac{1}{6} (ST - SR)$$

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Pre-Test

As shown in Table 4, the highest score achieved by the control class was categorized good (78), while the highest score of the experimental group was categorized very good (80). The lowest scores of both the control and experimental groups were categorized as poor (28 and 30 respectively). Additionally, the mean scores of both groups were categorized poor (52.56 and 50.97 respectively). The standard deviation (SD) in the control group was 12.528 and the standard deviation (SD) in the experimental group was 14.860. These figures indicate that the speaking performance of both groups was relatively similar in the poor level.

Table 4. Pre-Test Descriptive Result

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pre_Test_Experiment	36	30	80	50.53	15.127
Pre_Test_Control	36	28	78	52.56	12.528
Valid N (listwise)	36				

Post Test

After implementing the treatment, the researcher administered the post-test to both control and experimental groups to measure their speaking performance. The results are presented in Table 5.

Based on the data above, the highest score achieved by both the control and experimental group was categorized very good (86 and 90). The lowest score gained by both groups was categorized very poor (50 and 48). But the categories of the mean scores of both group was different. The control group got average level (68,72), while the experimental group gained good level (72.64). This indicates that the students learnt using TPS got higher achievement than those learnt without TPS.

Table 5. Post-Test Results

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Dev.
Post_Test_Control	36	50	86	68.72	8.551
Post_Test_Experiment	36	48	90	72.64	11.362
Valid N (listwise)	36				

Test Results of Hypothesis 1

To answer research question 1, whether TPS has significant effect on students’ English Speaking Performance, a t-test was administered using SPSS version 25. The results are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Test Results of Hypothesis 1

		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
Speaking_Score	Equal variances assumed	.629	.430	-2.165	70	.034	-5.556	2.566	-10.674	-.438
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.165	69.448	.034	-5.556	2.566	-10.674	-.437

Table 5 displays that the significant-two-tailed value is 0.034. Since $0,034 < 0.05$, it is concluded that the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis 1 (H_a) is accepted. As shown in the table, the significant value is < 0.015 . Thus, there is a significant effect of using TPS on students’ English-speaking performance at SMPN 117 Jakarta. This finding confirms the findings of Asrifan (2016), Desta (2017), and Hetika, Farida, and Sari (2016) revealing that TPS had a significant effect on students’ English-speaking performance.

Test Results of Hypothesis 2

To answer research question 2, whether there is any significant difference of the effect of TPS on male and female students’ English-speaking performance, hypothesis 2 was tested using the two-way ANOVA. The results are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Test Results of Hypothesis 2

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects						
Dependent Variable: Speaking Score						
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
Corrected Model	376.405 ^a	3	125.468	1.137	.340	
Intercept	361402.803	1	361402.803	3274.718	.000	
Class	179.823	1	179.823	1.629	.206	
Sex	174.642	1	174.642	1.582	.213	
Class * Sex	5.364	1	5.364	.049	.826	
Error	7504.582	68	110.361			
Total	370691.000	72				
Corrected Total	7880.986	71				

a. *R Squared* = .048 (*Adjusted R Squared* = .006)

Table 6 shows that the significant two-tailed value is 0,340 which is lower than 0.05. The researcher concluded that the null hypothesis 2 (H_02) is accepted and the alternative hypothesis 2 (H_a2) is rejected. The significant value is > 0.05 , which means there is no significant difference between the male and female students' English-speaking performance who used TPS in SMPN 117 Jakarta. In other words, TPR is effective in developing the speaking skills of both male and female students.

The findings showed that there was a significant difference in the mean achievement of students taught using TPS and those taught using the conventional method, in favor of TPS. Thus, TPS is an effective strategy to help students increase their speaking performance. Several factors contribute to the effectiveness. First, the technique encourages students' engagement and participation in the class. Second, TPS facilitates a comfortable environment as the students interact and share ideas with their classmates, leading to a relaxed atmosphere. It will be different if they directly share their ideas with the teacher. Some students can feel nervous as they are afraid of making mistakes in front of the teacher. Nur (in Kaur & Aziz, 2020) stated that some students have language anxiety due to their feelings of tension and fear in the classroom. TPS helps students to increase their confidence because they get the chance to express their ideas.

Third, TPS facilitates students to hone their higher-order thinking skills. (Macpherson, 2007). In this strategy, the teacher posed a question and gave time for students to think about it and, later, share their thoughts with each other through group discussions. Finally, they should present or explain what they have discussed with the pair to share in the class. All of these activities encourage students to develop their thinking skills.

Another finding shows there were no statistically significant differences observed between males and females in the experimental groups in terms of their speaking performance. This indicates that while TPS improved students' speaking performance, it caused no significant difference in male and female students' speaking scores. This finding

contravenes Hamdan's (2017) finding that female students taught science using the think-pair-share strategy significantly outperformed their male counterparts. It also contradicts the findings of Nwaubani, Ogbueghu, Adeniyi, and Eze (2016) that female Nigerian senior high school students achieved better than their male counterparts in learning economics using TPS. This finding, therefore, indicates that TPS is not gender sensitive or gender bias in speaking classrooms. It improves speaking performance for male students, much as it did for female students.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings and discussions, three conclusion were drawn. First, TPS is an effective strategy for the teaching and learning of speaking skills. Second, it makes the learning of speaking more comfortable and engaging for students. Third, TPS facilitates the development of students' higher-order thinking skills. Fourth, TPS is not gender sensitive or gender bias in speaking classrooms.

Considering the findings of the study, two suggestions are recommended. First, EFL teachers should adopt the use of TPS in speaking classrooms to ensure higher learning achievement. Second, since this study was carried out only in five sessions, future studies are recommended to carry out longer experiments to obtain more rigorous results.

REFERENCES

- Apriyanti, H. (2018). The effectiveness of "Find Someone Who" game toward students' speaking skill (An experimental research of seventh-grade students junior high school at SMP Negeri 1 Kelapa Dua Tangerang) (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Islam Negeri "Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin" Banten).
- Asrifan, A. (2016). The effectiveness of Think-Pair-Share technique in improving students' speaking ability and interest. *English Literature and Language Review*, 2(3), 24-35.
- Baek, J., & Lee, C. H. (2018). University students' perceptions and engagement in mobile assisted blended learning in English speaking classes. *Multimedia-Assisted Language Learning*, 21(4). <https://doi.org/10.15702/mall.2018.21.4.11>
- Bunaya, M. S. (2019, June). Improving speaking confidence by using Think Pair Share (TPS) teaching strategy to high school students. In *3rd International Conference on Current Issues in Education (ICCIE 2018)* (pp. 349-355). Atlantis Press.
- Chen, M. R. A., & Hwang, G. J. (2019). Effects of a concept mapping-based flipped learning approach on EFL students' English speaking performance, critical thinking awareness and speaking anxiety. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 51(3), 817-834. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12887>
- Dao, H. (2017). Identify factors that negatively influence: Non-English major students' speaking skills. *Higher Education Research*, 2(2), 35-43.
- Dewi, Y. P. (2023). Improving students' speaking ability in expressing opinion through Think Pair Share: English. *Journal of English Development*, 3(01), 29-37.

- Hamdan, R. K. A. (2017). The Effect of (Think-Pair-Share) Strategy on the Achievement of Third Grade Student in Sciences in the Educational District of Irbid. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 8(9), 88-95.
- Hetika, H., Farida, I., & Sari, Y. P. (2017). Think Pair Share (TPS) as Method to Improve Student's Learning Motivation and Learning Achievement. *Dinamika Pendidikan*, 12(2), 125-135.
- Kurjum, M., Muhid, A., & Thohir, M. (2020). Think-pair-share model as a solution to develop students' critical thinking in Islamic studies: Is it effective? *Cakrawala Pendidikan*, 39(1), 144-155.
- Nazara, S. (2011). Students' perception of EFL speaking skill development. *Journal of English Teaching*, 1(1), 28-43. <https://doi.org/10.33541/jet.v1i1.50>
- Nwaubani, O.O., Ogbueghu, S.N., Adeniyi, K.D. & Eze, D.M. (2016). Effects of think-pair share (TPS) and student teams-achievement divisions (stad) instructional strategies on senior secondary school students' achievement in economics. *Australian Journal of Basic & Applied Science*, 10(13), 1-9.
- Pardede, P. (2016). Action Research in EFL Learning and Teaching. Paper presented in *UKI's English Education Department Collegiate Forum held on Friday, December 9, 2016*
- Putri, S. A. M. D. U., Ratminingsih, N. M., & Budasi, I. G. (2022). Quality of instructional media of multilingual thematic digital dictionary for elementary school students. *E-Link Journal*, 9(2), 112-124.
- Rai, H. (2024). Role of collaborative learning for developing speaking skills of secondary level students. *Gipan*, 6(1), 71-79.
- Reichardt, C. S. (2019). *Quasi-experimentation: A guide to design and analysis*. Guilford Publications.
- Salma, N. (2020). Collaborative learning: An effective approach to promote language development. *International Journal of Social Sciences & Educational Studies*, 7(2), 57-61.
- Sriyanda, R., & Priyana. J. (2024). Promoting Critical Thinking in Speaking Classes Using the Think-Pair-Share Technique. *JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 12(4), 1913-1925. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v12i4.12582>
- Syafii, M. L. (2018). Using the Think-Pair-Share strategy to increase students' active involvement and to improve their speaking ability. *IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education)*, 5(1), 61-80.
- Usman, A. H. (2015). Using the Think-Pair-Share strategy to improve students' speaking ability at Stain Ternate. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(10), 37-45.
- Wang, Z. (2014). Developing accuracy and fluency in spoken English of Chinese EFL learners. *English Language Teaching*, 7(2), 110-118. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v7n2p110>

Apriliani & Purnamasari (2024). *The Effectiveness of using Think-Pair and Share ...*

Wichadee, S., & Orawiwatnakul, W. . (2012). Cooperative language learning: increasing opportunities for learning in teams. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning*, 9(2) 93-100.

Yulianingsih, L. (2017). The use of Think Pair and Share technique in teaching reading to the seventh grade of senior high school. *Academic Journal Perspective: Education, Language, and Literature*, 5(2), 99-108.