AL-IRSYAD
Journal of Education Science
e-ISSN: 2828-0830 Homepage: https://ejurnal.stkipddipinrang.ac.id/index.php/jse

THE IMPLEMENTATION THINK PAIR SHARE (TPS) TO IMPROVE STUDENTS' SPEAKING SKILL OF SMK BARAMULI PINRANG

Rasmah N[1*], Mariani[2], Ayu Ashari[3]
University of Kaltara, Indonesia [1], Politeknik Ilmu Pelayaran Makassar, Indonesia [3]
*Corresponding Author: Rasmahamrah@gmail.com

Article Submission:	*Article Revised:*	*Article Accepted:*	*Article Published:*
29 November 2025	*08 December 2025*	*16 December 2025*	*17 December 2025*

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the research was to find out whether or not the application of Think Pair Share (TPS) Technique may increase the students to speaking up about recount text content. The study employed mix-method design with two groups pretest and post-test design. The TPS technique was the independent variable, and the students' interest and speaking ability were the dependent factors. The sample of this research was 37 students from 2 classes selected from the population of 10th grade students, where each class had 14 students. The Speaking Test is the tool used in this study. The conclusion of the data analysis shows that students' writing skills have increased dramatically. This is revealed by the average score of the pre-test, which is 27.50 and the post-test, which is 61.07. This shows that the application of the Think Pair Share (TPS) strategy can improve students' speaking skills on the Recount test material. After analyzing the data quantitatively, the t-test value exceeds the t-table for the post-test, which is 6.711 exceeding 1.761. The conclusion is that the TPS technique improves students' competence in speaking recount texts in grade 10 of SMK Baramuli Pinrang.

Keywords: Recount Text, Speaking Skill, Think Pair Share Technique

INTRODUCTION

Speaking is said as a portion of the language capacity in productive skill associated to aural and oral medium that students need to develop (Akhter, 2021; Masuram & Sripada, 2020). Students may use it as a communication tool (Wiyono et al., 2020; Zahra et al., 2023). By speaking with one another, the pupils can learn additional facts (Rao, 2019). Furthermore, Speaking is very crucial for students to improve their communication (Amelia et al., 2022). Considering that English is the majority language in the world, it is crucial to be able to interact in it (Mohamadsaid & Rasheed, 2019; Ravinder & Mahesh, 2023). Those who can do so will find it simpler to obtain employment in addition to improving their knowledge and abilities (Rivaldo & Nabella,

2023). Furthermore, when they travel, they won't have any trouble interacting and communicating with individuals from all over the world (Deutschmann, 2022). Developing speaking competence is a priority goal of language training because individuals cannot succeed in school or society if they cannot communicate orally (Rahmon, 2024). Nunan (1991) describes the ability to converse in the target language as a measure of language proficiency. This suggests that speaking is an indicator of language comprehension, and it is quite difficult to assess.

During a preliminary investigation conducted in SMK Baramuli Pinrang, the researcher noticed many pupils at the tenth grade were unable to explain their ideas. Most students scored below average, while the minimum competency criterion (KKM) was 70. Many factors contributed to this problem. First, some students lacked vocabulary mastery. Vocabulary is the primary reason why pupils find it challenging to communicate their thoughts (Aji et al., 2023; Rosyada-AS & Apoko, 2023; Susanto, 2021). In this case, when students speak English in class, the majority of them use Indonesian to expand their discourse. This demonstrates how vocabulary influences students' ability to articulate their thoughts. In terms of core competencies, this is quite crucial. A good vocabulary makes students more effective communicators. Second, students tend to use their mother tongue (Indonesian) for transfer. Some of them still speak Indonesian while learning English. Teachers and English instructors are expected to have instructional strategies to address the challenges that pupils have when learning to speak the language.

Observational studies show that students' speaking ability tests of the tenth year at SMK Baramuli by an interview and give questionnaire to the students before deciding to held this research showed that most students have low speaking skills (poor). According to the Assessment Guidelines for Junior High Schools in the 2013 Curriculum (Revised 2016) issued by the Ministry of Education and Culture of Indonesia, students' scores are converted into letter grades in which 86–100 is categorized as A (excellent), 71–85 as B (good), 56–70 as C (fair), and ≤55 as D (poor). Therefore, an English score of 60 falls within the "C" (fair) category, which belongs to the 56–70 range (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2016).

The utterances often head produced by students of SMK Baramuli were concluded in mispronunciation, grammatical error (inaccuracy). Too much pauses or switching (influence), They use Indonesian forms of sentences such us: "*My everyday activity", "I am wake up"* (the utterance *is* in grammatical error). "*I am prepare my self*

to go to school", the word '*prepare*' is pronounced *pri'fer/, /go to skol/* (mispronunciation), this problem is too serious to be handled to avoid the misunderstanding of the listeners of utterances. "*in the evening eee then in the evening sometimes eee* (too much pauses).

This kind of situations caused the pupils uninterested with the learning process, there are numerous challenges in teaching speaking. First, it refers to the situation of the students who are short of vocabulary, second, the students more frequent speak in Indonesia language, third, they are rarely practice to use English to communicate. The last and the significantly difficulty is that they are not interested in the process in learning speaking.

According to Orlich et al, "cooperative learning offers an alternative to the competitive education model and provides unique learning experiences for students." Furthermore, cooperative learning has been proven to benefit various types of students, including academically advanced students, typical students, and English language learners (ELL). This is because cooperative learning stimulates learning and builds correlation and respect among diverse groups of students. Furthermore, cooperative learning provides various benefits for both teachers and students. For students, it can boost both academic learning and social skills. Additionally, it helps teachers with instruction and classroom management. Cooperative learning can be used to boost the academic accomplishment of students of all ability levels since in cooperative learning, they are not only stressing academic side but also emphasizing social role. Here, the students are asked to work in group with diverse student skill.

At least there are some classroom activities which include to cooperative learning; think-pair-share, jigsaw, discussion, small-group, and so on. Each method give benefit for students to increase their skill and it can help the teacher to push student skill. In addition, relating with this research, the researcher interests in the usage of Think-Pair-Share as one of cooperative learning to increase students speaking skill.

Richard & Schmidt (2010) describes thinking as a strategy employed in exploring learning processes, in which learners think aloud as they are executing a task. Pairing is a learning exercise used in language instruction when students collaborate in pairs. exchanging information that listeners and speakers have in common and that could affect how they communicate. Speaking of Think-Pair-Share, this is not the first study that focuses on speaking.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study used a hybrid technique. According to Creswell (2010), a mixed method is a research method that combines qualitative and quantitative methods. The author of this study used the QUAN-qual technique, which gives more optimal weight to quantitative data than qualitative data. The quantitative data for this study were obtained from a speaking test, while the qualitative data were obtained from a questionnaire. Therefore, there were two groups that played a role in this study: the control and experimental group. The class that received speaking instruction through TPS was the experimental group, while the class that received instruction using teacher techniques was the control group. Both independent and dependent variables are studied in this research. Speaking tests will be used as research equipment. In this research, the researcher employed speaking exam as the instrument. The data of this research was gathered by many procedures, such as test, and questionnaire.

The population of this research was taken the tenth-year students of SMK Baramuli Pinrang in academic year 2018. The total numbers of population are 37 students, consists of 3 classes, they are: X audio video class consist of 14 students, X Tgb class consist of 9 students, and X Nurses class consist of 14 students.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

The result of students' pre-test between experimental class and control class of the tenth- year of SMK Baramuli Pinrang in academic year 2018/2019 was tabulated as follows:

Table 4.1. Rate Percentage Score of the Students' Pre-Test

NO	CLASSIFICATION	SCORE	Experimental class		Control class	
			F	%	F	%
1	Excellent	81 – 100	0	0	0	0
2	Good	61 – 80	0	0	0	0
3	Fairly Good	41 – 60	0	0	0	0
4	Fair	21 – 40	14	100	14	100
5	Poor	0 – 20	0	0	0	0
	Total		14	100	14	100

Source: Author's result

Table 4.1 revealed the rate percentage of students' score of speaking skill in experimental class and control class. The table revealed that all the students got fair. Nine students had a score of 25, three received a score of 30, and two received a score of 35, indicating that the students' speaking was mediocre.

Meanwhile, the rate % score of students' speaking in control class showed that all pupils achieved fair classification. There were 4 students received 25 score, 9 students got 30 score, and 1 student got 40 score. Refer to Appendix 1.

The percentage of post-test scores of students in the experimental and control classes was assessed. The table reviewed is as follows:

Table 4.2. Rate Percentage Score of the Students' Post-Test

NO	CLASSIFICATION	SCORE	Experimental class		Control class	
			F	%	F	%
1	Excellent	81 – 100	0	0	0	0
2	Good	61 – 80	14	100	0	0
3	Fairly Good	41 – 60	0	0	6	42.85
4	Fair	21 – 40	0	0	8	57.15
5	Poor	0 – 20	0	0	0	0
	Total		14	100	14	100

Source: Author's result

The percentage increase in student scores in the experimental and control classes is shown in Table 4.2. The experimental class's scores appear to be more optimal than those of the previous class. Each student has a very optimal classification. This means that students' speaking abilities have improved.

The percentage of student scores in the control class showed that 6 students achieved quite optimal scores and 8 students achieved sufficient scores. This indicates that students in the control class also experienced an increase from their previous results.

Table 4.3. Total and Mean of Pretest and Posttest Score Of Experimental Group

Test		G	V	P	D	S	total
PRE	Total	19	16	14	14	14	77
	Mean	**1.35**	**1.14**	**1**	**1**	**1**	**5.5**
POST	Total	36	42	29	31	30	171
	Mean	**2.57**	**3**	**2.07**	**2.21**	**2.14**	**12.21**
Improvement		1.22%	1.86%	1.07%	1.21%	1.14%	6.71%

Source: Author's result.

From the table 4.3 above, it can be seen that there is growth in the kids speaking capability. The students' average score on the pretest was 1.35 for grammar, 1.14 for vocabulary, and 1 for pronunciation, discourse, and strategy. The students' overall mean score of 5.5 indicates that their speaking proficiency was still lacking. In order to help the experimental group enhance their speaking capability, the researcher used the think-pair-share strategy. The students' mean scores on the post-test are 2.57 for grammar, 3 for vocabulary, 2.07 for pronunciation, 2.21 for discourse, and 2.14 for strategy. So the means of the students' overall score is 12.21.

The pupils' scores improved after receiving the treatments, as seen by the comparison of the posttest and pretest results. The students' scores significantly

increased, indicating that the think-pair-share method helped them become more proficient speakers. Grammar has improved by 1.22%, vocabulary by 1.86%, pronunciation by 1.07%, discourse by 1.21%, and strategy by 1.14%. The students' overall score has improved by 6.71%.

Table 4.4 Total and Mean of Pretest and Posttest Score of control group

Test		G	V	P	D	S	total
PRE	Total	21	18	14	17	14	82
	Mean	1.5	1.28	1	1.21	1	5.85
POST	Total	22	24	15	19	16	115
	Mean	1.57	1.71	1.07	1.35	1.14	8.26
Improvement		0.07%	0.43%	0.07%	0.14%	0.14%	2.41%

Source: Author's result

It is evident from table 4.4 above that the kids' speaking abilities are improving. In pretest, the means of the students' score is 1.5 for grammar, 1,28 for vocabulary, 1 for pronunciation, 1.21 for discourse, 1 for strategic, so the means of the students overall score is 5.85. the students of control group had the same degree of speaking proficiency as the students of experimental group. However, the control group was directed using traditional teaching methods, which are typically employed by teachers, rather than through think-pair-share. meanwhile, the means of the students' postest score is 1.57 for grammar, 1.71 for vocabulary, 1.07 for pronunciation, 1.35 for discourse, 1.14 for strategy, therefore the means of the students total score is 8.26. When the posttest score is compared to the pretest, it indicates that pupils in the control group have likewise improved their speaking abilities. Grammar has improved by 0.07%, vocabulary by 0.43%, pronunciation by 0.07%, discourse by 0.14%, and strategic by 0.14%. The students' overall score has improved by 2.41%.

The standard deviation and average values of 2 classes after estimating the students' pre-test results are shown in the table, namely.

Table 4.5 The mean score and standard deviation in pre-test

No	Class	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
1	Experimental	27.50	3.66
2	Control	29.28	3.71

Source: Author's result

The average pre-test scores for the experimental and control classes were not the same, as shown in Table 5. The average score for the experimental class exceeded that of the control class. The standard deviation for each class was 3.66 for the experimental class and 3.71 for the control class. This shows that the average pre-test scores obtained from the two classes were not the same.

For evaluation materials, the results of the average score and standard deviation of the post-test for students in each class are shown in the table, namely.

Table 4.6 The mean score and standard deviation in post-test

No	Class	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
1	Experimental	61.07	10.03
2	Control	41.07	3,59

Source: Author's result

The average post-test scores in the experimental and control classes differed, as shown in Table 4.6. The average score of the experimental class exceeded the score of the control class. The standard deviations for each class were 10.03 and 3.59, respectively. This is evident from the average post-test scores achieved by the two classes, which indicate an increase after the treatment

Table 4.7 pre test and post test difference

No	Class	Pretest Mean	Post test Mean	Difference Mean
1	Experimental	27.50	61.07	33.57
2	Control	29.28	41.07	11.79

Source: Author's result

Table 7 shows a disparity in pre-test and post-test results between each class. The disparity in the average scores of the experimental class exceeded the average scores of the control class.

Discussion

The results of this research show that students in both the experimental and control groups possessed comparable speaking proficiency before the intervention, with all participants falling into the Fair category. This similarity in their initial ability indicates that the two groups started from an equivalent baseline, which supports an unbiased assessment of how the Think Pair Share (TPS) strategy influenced their speaking performance. Once the TPS strategy was applied, the experimental group demonstrated a remarkable improvement, with every student advancing to the Good category. In contrast, the control group, which continued to receive conventional instruction, exhibited only minor progress and remained within the Fair and Fairly Good classifications.

Further examination of the mean scores for each component of speaking—grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, discourse, and strategy—also highlights a striking contrast between the two groups. The experimental class showed notable improvement across all dimensions, with vocabulary and grammar showing the most substantial gains.

The control group, however, experienced only modest growth. These outcomes suggest that TPS offers a more engaging learning environment, encouraging learners to reflect individually, exchange ideas with a partner, and share their conclusions with the class. This sequence of activities enables students to receive immediate input from peers and refine their speaking skills more effectively.

The findings also align with key principles of cooperative learning, which underscore the role of social interaction in fostering language development. TPS contributes to a learning atmosphere that is both supportive and collaborative, helping students feel more at ease when speaking. Although score variation within the experimental group was broader, the overall trend showed consistent improvement, indicating that the strategy fostered meaningful individual progress. Conversely, the modest gains in the control group illustrate the limitations of traditional teaching practices that do not sufficiently encourage active participation in speaking tasks.

Taken together, the evidence from this study confirms that the Think Pair Share strategy is a highly effective approach for enhancing students' speaking abilities. The results reinforce earlier studies that emphasize the benefits of cooperative learning and provide valuable insights for English instructors, particularly in vocational school contexts. By fostering an interactive and productive classroom environment, TPS emerges as a recommended instructional method for developing students' speaking skills.

CONCLUSION

The overall findings of this research indicate that the Think Pair Share (TPS) strategy plays a substantial role in enhancing students' ability to speak in a more meaningful way. At the outset, both the experimental and control groups possessed a comparable level of speaking proficiency. However, once the TPS strategy was introduced, students in the experimental class experienced a much more pronounced improvement than those in the control class. This progress was evident across every component of speaking, suggesting that TPS fosters a learning atmosphere that is more collaborative and supportive. Through this environment, students gain valuable opportunities to reflect, exchange ideas, and articulate their thoughts with greater assurance. These outcomes suggest that English teachers may view TPS as a communicative and interactive alternative to more conventional teaching methods, especially when the primary objective is to strengthen speaking skills.

Despite the positive results, this study is not without limitations. The number of participants involved was relatively small, the scope of the research was confined to speaking skills alone, and the duration of the study was brief. In light of these constraints, future research is encouraged to include a larger sample, broaden the exploration to encompass affective factors such as motivation or anxiety in speaking, and extend the research period to better understand the long term influence of TPS. Comparative studies involving TPS and other cooperative learning strategies may also provide valuable insights into which approach is most effective for improving students speaking proficiency in diverse educational settings.

REFERENCES

Aji, H. P. A., Widodo, S., Masykuri, E. S., & Nugraheni, I. I. (2023). Students' problems in building up english vocabulary. *Scripta: English Department Journal*, *10*(1), 44–58. https://doi.org/10.37729/scripta.v10i1.2353

Akhter, S. (2021). Exploring the significance of speaking skill for EFL learners. *Sjesr*, *4*(3), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.36902/sjesr-vol4-iss3-2021(1-9)

Amelia, D., Afrianto, A., Samanik, S., Suprayogi, S., Pranoto, B. E., & Gulo, I. (2022). Improving publlic speaking ability through speech. *J. Soc. Sci. Technol. Community Serv*, *3*(2), 322. https://ejurnal.teknokrat.ac.id/index.php/teknoabdimas

Creswell, J. W. (2010). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications

Deutschmann, E. (2022). *Mapping the transnational world: How we move and communicate across borders, and why it matters*.

Donald C. Orlich et al., *Teaching Strategies: A Guide to Effective Instruction*, 9th ed. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2010), 269.

Masuram, J., & Sripada, P. N. (2020). Developing speaking skills through task-based materials. *Procedia Computer Science*, *172*, 60–65. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2020.05.009

Ministry of Education and Culture. (2016). *Panduan Penilaian untuk Sekolah Menengah Pertama (Kurikulum 2013 Revisi 2016).* Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan RI.

Mohamadsaid, A., & Rasheed, S. (2019). Can English Considered to be a Global Language?. *Online Submission*. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED608887

Nunan, D. 1991. Language Teaching Methodology. A Textbook for Teachers. New York: PrenticeHall International, Ltd.

Rahmon, R. (2024). *Challenges and Strategies in Enhancing Oral Communication Skills: A study in understanding challenges students face in developing oral communication skills in English*. https://www.diva-

portal.org/smash/record.jsf?dswid=-1561&pid=diva2%3A1884895

Rao, P. S. (2019). The importance of speaking skills in English classrooms. *Alford Council of International English & Literature Journal (ACIELJ)*, *2*(2), 6–18. www.acielj.com

Ravinder, G., & Mahesh, K. (2023). The Importance Of English In The World. *International Journal of Marketing Management*, *11*(3), 117–124. www.ijmm.net

Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2010). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics* (4th ed.). Pearson Education.

Rivaldo, Y., & Nabella, S. D. (2023). Employee performance: Education, training, experience and work discipline. *Calitatea*, *24*(193), 182–188. DOI: 10.47750/QAS/24.193.20

Rosyada-AS, A., & Apoko, T. W. (2023). Investigating English vocabulary difficulties and its learning strategies of lower secondary school students. *JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, *11*(3), 489–501. DOI**:** https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v11i3.8404

Susanto, H. (2021). A study on students' difficulties in learning vocabulary. *Journey*, *4*(2), 46–50. DOI: 10.33503/journey.v4i2.1413

Wiyono, B. B., Wedi, A., Wahyuni, S., & Valdez, A. V. (2020). Use of online communication media as a student learning tool in college and its effect on the achievement of students. *2020 6th International Conference on Education and Technology (ICET)*, 186–191. DOI: 10.1109/ICET51153.2020.9276562

Zahra, O. F., Amel, N., & Mohamed, K. (2023). Communication Tools and E-Learning: A Revolution in the Research Methodology of Communication for a Pedagogical Scenario. *RA Journal of Applied Research*, *9*(4), 170–177. https://doi.org/10.47191/rajar/v9i4.03