THE COMPARATIVE STUDY OF TEACHING SPEAKING THROUGH THE MODIFIED SHARE STAGE OF THINK PAIR SHARE IN SMA NEGERI 1 WAY PENGUBUAN

Thesis

By:

Diyyah Andika Pratiwi
NPM 2123042021

MASTER OF ENGLISH EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM
DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGE AND ARTS EDUCATION
FACULTY OF TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION
LAMPUNG UNIVERSITY
2025

ABSTRACT

**THE COMPARATIVE STUDY OF TEACHING SPEAKING THROUGH
MODIFIED SHARE STAGE OF THINK PAIR SHARE
IN SMA NEGERI 1 WAY PENGUBUAN**

By
Diyyah Andika Pratiwi

The current research aimed to investigate whether or not i) there was a statistically significant difference of the students' speaking achievement between those taught through the modified share stage of Think-Pair-Share and those taught using the original Think-Pair-Share, and ii) what was the students appraisal of the learning activities through the modified share stage of Think-Pair-Share.

This study employed a true experimental design involving two twelfth-grade classes at SMA N 1 Way Pengubuan, each consisting of 23 students. The experimental class received treatments using the modified share stage based on Cooper et al. (2021), while the control class used the original Think-Pair-Share. Data were collected through a speaking pre-test and post-test, as well as a questionnaire. The speaking test results were analyzed using an independent samples t-test via SPSS 22, while the questionnaire data were analyzed using Microsoft Excel and Cronbach's Alpha.

The results revealed a statistically significant difference in speaking achievement between the two groups, with the experimental class outperforming the control class ($p < 0.05$). The gain score of the experimental group was 18.87, while that of the control group was 10.09. The questionnaire results showed a positive appraisal from students in the experimental class towards the learning activities, with an average score of 3.65 on a 4-point Likert scale. These findings suggest that modifying the share stage of Think-Pair-Share can effectively enhance students' speaking skills and create a more engaging and supportive learning environment.

Keywords: Think Pair Share, Modified Think Pair Share, Speaking Achievement, Students' Appraisal

ABSTRAK

STUDI KOMPARATIF PENGAJARAN BERBICARA MELALUI TAHAP BERBAGI YANG DIMODIFIKASI DARI THINK-PAIR-SHARE DI SMA NEGERI 1 WAY PENGUBUAN

Oleh
Diyyah Andika Pratiwi

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui: (i) apakah terdapat perbedaan yang signifikan secara statistik terhadap pencapaian berbicara siswa antara mereka yang diajar melalui tahap berbagi yang dimodifikasi dari Think-Pair-Share dan mereka yang diajar menggunakan Think-Pair-Share versi asli; dan (ii) bagaimana penilaian siswa terhadap aktivitas pembelajaran melalui tahap berbagi yang dimodifikasi dari Think-Pair-Share.

Penelitian ini menggunakan desain eksperimen sejati yang melibatkan dua kelas XII di SMA Negeri 1 Way Pengubuan, masing-masing terdiri dari 23 siswa. Kelas eksperimen menerima perlakuan menggunakan tahap berbagi yang dimodifikasi berdasarkan Cooper dkk. (2021), sedangkan kelas kontrol menggunakan Think-Pair-Share versi asli. Data dikumpulkan melalui pre-test dan post-test berbicara, serta kuesioner. Hasil tes berbicara dianalisis menggunakan uji t sampel independen melalui SPSS 22, sedangkan data kuesioner dianalisis menggunakan Microsoft Excel dan Cronbach's Alpha.

Hasil penelitian menunjukkan adanya perbedaan yang signifikan secara statistik dalam pencapaian berbicara antara kedua kelompok, di mana kelas eksperimen menunjukkan hasil yang lebih baik dibandingkan kelas kontrol ($p < 0{,}05$). Skor peningkatan pada kelompok eksperimen adalah 18,87, sedangkan pada kelompok kontrol 10,09. Hasil kuesioner menunjukkan penilaian positif dari siswa di kelas eksperimen terhadap aktivitas pembelajaran, dengan skor rata-rata 3,65 pada skala Likert 4 poin. Temuan ini menunjukkan bahwa modifikasi tahap berbagi dari Think-Pair-Share dapat secara efektif meningkatkan kemampuan berbicara siswa dan menciptakan lingkungan pembelajaran yang lebih menarik dan suportif.

Kata Kunci: Think-Pair-Share, Think-Pair-Share yang Dimodifikasi, Pencapaian Berbicara, Penilaian Siswa

THE COMPARATIVE STUDY OF TEACHING SPEAKING THROUGH THE MODIFIED SHARE STAGE OF THINK PAIR SHARE IN SMA NEGERI 1 WAY PENGUBUAN

By:

Diyyah Andika Pratiwi

Thesis

Submitted n a Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements for S-2 Degree

In

Language and Arts Education Department
of Teacher Training and Education Faculty

MASTER OF ENGLISH EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM
DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGE AND ARTS EDUCATION
FACULTY OF TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION
LAMPUNG UNIVERSITY
2025

Research Title : THE COMPARATIVE STUDY OF TEACHING
SPEAKING THROUGH THE MODIFIED
SHARE STAGE OF THINK PAIR SHARE
IN SMA NEGERI 1 WAY PENGUBUAN

Student's Name : Diyyah Andika Pratiwi

Student's Number : 2123042021

Study Program : Master in English Language Teaching

Departmen : Language and Arts Education

Faculty : Teacher Training and Education

APPROVED BY

Advisory Committee

Advisor   Co-Advisor

Prof. Dr. Cucu Sutarsyah, M.A.   **Mahpul, M.A., Ph.D.**
NIP 19570406 198603 1 002   NIP 1965706 199403 1 002

The Chairperson of Department   The Chairperson of Master
of Language and Arts Education   in English Language Teaching

Dr. Sumarti, S.Pd., M.Hum.   **Mahpul, M.A., Ph.D.**
NIP 19700318 199403 2 002   NIP 1965706 199403 1 002

ADMITTED BY

1. Examination
   Committee

   Chairperson   : Prof. Dr. Cucu Sutarsyah, M.A.

   Secretary   : Mahpul, M.A., Ph.D.

   Examiners   : 1. Prof. Dr. Muhammad Sukirlan, M.A.

                        2. Prof. Dr. Ujang Suparman, M.A., Ph.D.

2. Dean of Teacher Training and Education Faculty

   Dr. Albet Maydiantoro, M.Pd.
   NIP 19870504 201404 1 001

3. Director of Postgraduate Program

   Prof. Dr. Ir. Murhadi, M.Si.
   NIP 19640326 198902 1 001

4. Graduated on: **June 2ⁿᵈ, 2025**

LEMBAR PERNYATAAN

Yang bertanda tangan dibahwah ini, saya:

Nama	: Diyyah Andika Pratiwi
NPM	: 2123042021
Program Studi	: Magister Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris
Fakultas	: Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan
Judul Tesis	: The Comparative Study of Teaching Speaking Through Modified Share Stage of Think Pair Share in SMA Negeri 1 Way Pengubuan

Menyatakan bahwa tesis ini adalah karya sendiri. Sepanjang pengetahuan saya, karya ini tidak berisi materi yang ditulis oleh orang lain, kecuali bagian-bagian tertentu yang saya ambil sebagai acuan. Apabila ternyata terbukti pernyataan ini tidak benar, sepenuhnya menjadi tanggungjawab saya.

Bandar Lampung, 2 Juni 2025

Diyyah Andika Pratiwi

CURRICULUM VITAE

Diyyah Andika Pratiwi was born on September 10th, 1998, in Bandar Lampung. She is the only daughter of Agus Andika, S.Pd. and Hj. Sri Lestari, S.Pd. She is married to Maulana Kautsar, S.Pd., and together they are blessed with a wonderful daughter named Kayyisha Nazhifah Kautsar.

Her educational journey began at TK Aisyiyah Bustanul Athfal 2 Kedaton, followed by SD Negeri 3 Labuhan Dalam, SMP Negeri 20 Bandar Lampung, and SMA Negeri 13 Bandar Lampung. In 2016, she pursued her undergraduate studies in English Education at UIN Raden Intan Lampung. Driven by her passion for teaching and language, she continued her academic journey by enrolling in the Master's Program in English Education at the University of Lampung in 2021.

Throughout her career, she has gained valuable experience as an English tutor and as a teacher at a private Islamic junior high school. Her dedication to education and her love for the English language continue to inspire her work as both an educator and a lifelong learner.

DEDICATION

In the name of Allah Subhanahu Wa Ta'ala, the Most Gracious, the Most Merciful, who has guided me with light, strength, and endless mercy throughout this journey.
This thesis is dedicated with deep love and gratitude to the most cherished souls who have stood beside me with their unwavering support, prayers, and encouragement.

To my dearest parents,
Hj. Sri Lestari, S.Pd. and Agus Andika, S.Pd

To my beloved husband,
Maulana Kautsar, S.Pd.,

To my precious daughter,
Kayyisha Nazhifah Kautsar,

To my honorable lecturers at Master's Degree of English Education Study Program,

To my dear friends in the Master's Degree of English Education Program,

To my almamater, University of Lampung,

This thesis is a symbol of love, struggle, growth, and gratitude. May it serve as a reminder that with faith, hard work, and the support of loved ones, all things are possible.

MOTTO

"With love as my strength, knowledge as my path, and faith as my guide, I rise not only for myself—but for those I lead, love, and teach."

(Diyyah Andika Pratiwi)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

All praises be to Allah Subhanahu Wa Ta'ala, the Most Gracious and the Most Merciful, for His endless blessings and guidance that have enabled the writer to complete this graduate thesis entitled "The Comparative Study of Teaching Speaking Through Modified Share Stage of Think Pair Share in SMA Negeri 1 Way Pengubuan." Shalawat and Salaam are upon the Prophet Muhammad SAW, his family, his followers, and all Muslims around the world. This thesis is submitted as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for obtaining a Master's Degree (S-2) in English Education at the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, University of Lampung.

With heartfelt gratitude, the writer would like to extend her deepest appreciation to all those who have provided support, guidance, and encouragement throughout the process of completing this thesis. The writer is especially thankful and respectfully acknowledges:

1. Prof. Dr. Cucu Sutarsyah, M.A., as the first advisor, whose expert guidance, thoughtful input, and steadfast encouragement have significantly influenced the direction of my research and making this accomplishment attainable.
2. Mahpul, M.A., Ph.D., as my second advisor and also academic advisor, whose valuable guidance, insightful suggestions, and support have greatly contributed to the completion of this thesis.
3. Prof. Dr. Muhammad Sukirlan, M.A., as the first examiner who has provided thoughtful suggestions and encouragement that have greatly contributed to the improvement of this thesis.
4. Prof. Dr. Ujang Suparman, M.A., Ph.D., as the second examiner whose constructive feedback and supportive input have played an important role in enhancing this thesis.
5. All the lecturers, who have significantly contributed to expanding and enriching the writer
   understanding throughout the academic journey.
6. My dearest parents, Hj. Sri Lestari, S.Pd. and Agus Andika, S.Pd., your endless sacrifices, unconditional love, and sincere prayers are the reason I stand where I am today.

7. My beloved husband, Maulana Kausar, S.Pd. and my precious daughter Kayyisha Nazhifah Kautsar, thank you for always being my greatest supporter during every challenge.
8. My beloved sisters and brothers in MPBI 2021, especially for Ayu Lucky Widiasari, Nadya Oktarima, Suci Noviyanti, Khafit Royani and Salwa Failasifa — thank you for your
help and all the beautiful memories.
9. To Anyone who cannot be mentioned directly here who has contributed in complementing this thesis, my sincere thanks.

Ultimaltely, the writer hopes that this research may provide valuable insights for readers and serve a useful reference for further researchers conducting related studies.

CONTENTS

TABLES

APPENDICES

I.   INTRODUCTION

This chapter introduces the research by outlining its background, formulating the research questions, stating the research objectives and significance, defining the scope of the study, and clarifying key terms used throughout the research.

1.1   Background

Speaking, according to Nunan (2003), is the productive aural/oral skill that consists of producing systematic verbal utterances to convey meaning. Speaking is one of the most important skills of all the four language skills because individuals who learn a language are referred to as the speakers of that language (Ur, 1996). Pollard (2008) states that speaking is one of the most difficult aspects for students to master. This is hardly surprising when one considers everything that is involved when speaking, i.e. ideas, what to say, language, how to use grammar and vocabulary, pronunciation as well as listening to and reacting to the person he/she communicates with.

For Indonesian learners, English is regarded as a foreign language, which presents particular challenges for students. This aligns with Munisah's (2021) findings, which indicate that differences in language structure and pronunciation can lead to difficulties for learners. Additionally, research conducted by Hamid (2014) states that, in reality, many students who speak formally in public tend to mostly ask only questions. In the application at the classroom, almost no students are able to speak in front of the class or just ask a single question. In fact, there are only one or two pupils who can and dare to speak in front of the class. The classroom atmosphere appears lifeless due to a lack of expected interaction during the learning process. Meanwhile, student engagement plays a crucial role in determining the success of the learning experience. It can be concluded that Indonesian students lack of speaking skill in English.

Think-Pair-Share (TPS) is one of the effective strategies recommended for teaching speaking. Introduced by Lyman from the University of Maryland in 1981, TPS is a cooperative learning method that encourages students to engage both independently and collaboratively. Consistent with this view, Kusrini (2012) notes that the Think-Pair-Share strategy offers students the chance to actively engage in learning through three main phases: thinking, pairing, and sharing. Similarly, Kothiyal et al. (2013) describe TPS as an active learning approach where students initially respond to a question individually, then discuss their ideas in pairs, and finally contribute to a whole-class discussion. This method fosters an interactive classroom environment, making it highly appropriate for developing students' speaking skills.

Furthermore, Lyman (1981) explains that Think-Pair-Share is beneficial as it organizes discussions by guiding students through a specific process, which reduces distractions and encourages responsibility within their pairs. Cahyani (2018) also says that Think-Pair-Share can make the students learn about how to listen, how to respect the others' voices and how to think the ideas together. According to Yanti, et al (2017), Think-Pair-Share gives time for students to think about the topic or problem, upgrade students' oral communication through critical thinking, excellent interaction, and raise democratic situation where the students are free to express their advices and arguments. A study by Al Karim, et al (2022) finds that Think- Pair- Share (TPS) strategy could enhance the students' speaking skill. It could be seen from the improvement of the students' speaking test result. It happened because the students were encouraged to speak in English with the pair and have a discussion in class. It creates positive atmosphere in sharing ideas.

However, as a technique, Think-Pair-Share also has disadvantages. Cited in Fauziyati, et al. (2013), one of the disadvantages of TPS according to Lyman (1981) is that not all students focus on the topic (questions) given. Then, this research follows up an essay about think-pair-share, entitled *Reconsidering the Share of a Think–Pair–Share: Emerging Limitations, Alternatives, and Opportunities for Research by Cooper, Schinske & Tanner (2021)*. The main point of this essay is

that random call in the stage of think-pair- share, which is in the share session made the students panic and not focus on the track. The difficulty of concentrating while studying is caused by anxiety that the students feel. Based on their essay, the weakness of Think-Pair- Share could be covered by modifying the share session. The three ways to modify the share portion of the think–pair–share are optional consent to share, local sharing, and a go- around. This current research aims to follow up the essay by Cooper, et al. (2021) where they modified the share stage in Think-Pair-Share to effectively encourage students to be brave to speak.

One modification to the sharing phase that teachers can apply during random call is obtaining optional consent to share. Alternatively, teachers may pay attention to students' discussions and select a response they wish to be presented to the entire class. In a local share approach, students exchange ideas beyond their pairs, but the discussion is not opened up to the whole class. Then, a go-around is most amenable to smaller class sizes or large class sizes for which students are organized into subgroups or table groups.

The alternative modification offers several advantages: (1) it allows students additional time to get ready before speaking in front of the entire class; (2) it gives students the option to decline sharing if they feel uneasy; (3) it enables students to practice expressing their ideas to a larger group without the pressure of speaking before the whole class; (4) it ensures that every student has the opportunity to contribute; and (5) it can help lessen students' anxiety about being judged negatively.

The focus of this research is to analyze students' speaking achievement based on a modified 'share' stage of the Think-Pair-Share method. This modification aims to enhance students' active involvement during the sharing process and provide equal opportunities for all learners to speak. This research aims to bridge the gap between theory and practice by providing a deeper understanding of how modifications to traditional teaching methods can impact students' speaking achievement and overall language development.

That is why the researcher intends to design a lesson plan based on the modified stage of share in think-pair-share by Cooper, et al. (2021) to create it more interesting and attracting for students so that they put off their anxiety and become brave to speak. It is applied in the stage of share where random call is one of the factors of students' anxiety. Hopefully, this can make the class alive as it deals with the speaking achievement. To make it tangible, the researcher compares the result of students' speaking performance between the modified share stage of Think-Pair-Share with the one of original Think-Pair-Share.

Hopefully, this research can result in increase of students' speaking achievement and show positive appraisal of students towards the learning activities.

1.2 Research Questions

Based on the background of the study above, the research questions of this research are formulated as follow:

1. Is there statistically significant difference of the students' speaking achievement between the students who are taught through the modified share stage of Think-Pair-Share and those who are taught through the original Think- Pair- Share?

2. What is the students' appraisal of the learning activities through the modified share stage of Think-Pair-Share?

The list above is the formulation of the research which is found in this study. That formulation is helpful to decide the objectives of this study.

1.3 Objectives

After formulating the research questions, the objectives of this research can be narrowed down as follows:

1. To find out whether there is a significant difference of the students' speaking achievement between those taught using the modified share stage of the Think-Pair-Share technique and those taught using the original Think-Pair-Share approach.

2. To find out the students' appraisal of the learning activities through the modified share stage of Think-Pair-Share.

After proposing the objectives, the research can be done easier. Furthermore, it is also needed to know what exactly the uses of this research are, that will be explained in the following sub-chapter.

1.4   Uses

This research hopefully can give people advantages in the field of education, especially in teaching English. The uses of this research are:

1. Theoretically, this research makes contributions to the technique in the field of teaching method, especially Think-Pair-Share.
2. Practically, the use of product, i.e. the modified share stage of think-pair-share, is expected to be able to be applied at class by teachers to increase students' speaking achievement
3. Objectively, this research could be a reference for further researchers to conduct similar researches.

After being conducted, it is essential that the research can give new knowledge or information for people. Furthermore, it is better if this research can trigger many researchers to conduct further researches with respect to this research.

1.5   Scope

This study aims to investigate whether a significant difference exists in students' speaking performance between those instructed using the modified share stage of the Think-Pair-Share strategy and those taught using the original version of the method. The research builds upon the work of Cooper et al. (2021), titled *"Reconsidering the Share of a Think–Pair–Share: Emerging Limitations, Alternatives, and Opportunities for Research."* Additionally, this study explores students' perceptions of the learning activities conducted through the modified share stage of the Think-Pair-Share technique.

1.6   Definitions of Terms

There are some definitions of terms based on the theories used in this research as follows:

1. *Think-Pair-Share* is a cooperative learning strategy that allows students additional time to reflect, respond, and engage collaboratively with their peers.

2. *Random Call* is a method that involves selecting a student or group of students at random to present their ideas to the entire class.

3. *Speaking* is an interactive activity that involves creating meaning through the production, reception, and processing of information.

4. *Achievement* is the outcome of a series of tasks, indicating how successfully individuals have completed them, typically represented by a score.

5. *Appraisal* is the act of evaluating or assessing something or someone, involving judging the value, quality, or performance based on certain criteria.

The definitions of some words mentioned above are the commonly used terms that are often mentioned as the important concepts of this current research. Those points above include the its background, formulating the research questions, stating the research objectives and significance, defining the scope of the study, and clarifying key terms used throughout the research. Thoroughly, this chapter consists of the explanations that are prior to give more information to the next chapter.

II. LITERTURE REVIEW

This chapter serves some theories which are discussed in a framework, that consists of speaking, aspects of speaking, teaching speaking, anxiety, discussion text, think-pair- share, advantages and disadvantages of think-pair-share, modifying the share stage of think- pair-share, relevant research studies, theoretical assumption, and hypothesis.

2.1 Speaking

According to Nunan (2003), speaking is a productive skill that involves creating systematic verbal expressions to convey meaning. Burns and Joyce (1997), as cited in Torky (2006), describe speaking as an interactive process of constructing meaning through producing, receiving, and processing information. The form and meaning of speech are influenced by the context, participants, and the communicative purpose. Among the four language skills, speaking is considered the most essential, as learners of a language are primarily identified as its speakers (Ur, 1996). Pollard (2008) highlights that speaking is often the most challenging skill for students to master, given the complexity of generating ideas, selecting appropriate language, applying grammar and vocabulary correctly, managing pronunciation, and simultaneously listening and responding to their interlocutors.

Hamid (2014) emphasizes that a classroom atmosphere feels lifeless when the expected interactions during the learning process do not take place. Harmer and Jeremy (2001) add that for students to achieve fluency in English speaking, they must master correct pronunciation of phonemes, appropriate use of stress and intonation, and connected speech. However, effective speaking involves more than just these elements. Particularly for English learners using it as a second language, they must be capable of communicating across various genres and contexts, employing a range of conversational strategies and repair mechanisms. Additionally, they need to manage typical functional exchanges to navigate everyday communication successfully.

2.2   Aspects of Speaking

According to Brown (2004), speaking is a multifaceted skill that can be evaluated through several critical aspects, each contributing to a speaker's overall communicative competence. These aspects include: (1) Grammar, which involves the correct use of language structures such as verb tenses, sentence formation, and subject-verb agreement, ensuring that the speaker's message is clear and unambiguous. (2) Vocabulary, referring to the range and appropriateness of words used by the speaker; a broad and precise vocabulary enables more effective and nuanced expression of ideas. (3) Comprehension, which is the ability to understand spoken language, including questions, instructions, or conversational cues, allowing the speaker to respond accurately and appropriately in interaction.(4) Fluency, defined as the smooth and effortless flow of speech with minimal hesitation, pauses, or self-corrections, which supports natural communication and listener engagement. Finally, (5) Pronunciation, encompassing the accurate articulation of sounds, stress patterns, intonation, and rhythm, is essential for intelligibility and effective delivery of the message. Together, these aspects provide a structured framework that informs both the assessment and development of speaking skills, highlighting the complexity of oral communication in language learning contexts.

2.3   Teaching Speaking

Teaching speaking in the context of English as a Second Language (ESL) is a crucial component of language education that aims to develop learners' communicative competence, enabling them to interact effectively and confidently in various real-life situations. Celce-Murcia (2001) defines teaching speaking as the process of helping learners develop the ability to produce and comprehend spoken language that is appropriate to different communicative contexts. This definition underscores the importance of not only accuracy in language production but also the functional use of language, where learners are encouraged to use English for practical purposes such as requesting information, expressing opinions, negotiating meaning, and socializing. Richards (2008) highlights that teaching speaking addresses two main dimensions: accuracy, which involves the

correct use of grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation, and fluency, which refers to the ability to maintain a natural and coherent flow of speech without excessive hesitation. Both dimensions are vital, as learners need to be understood clearly while also engaging in smooth, spontaneous conversations.

Furthermore, Nunan (1999) emphasizes that the ultimate goal of teaching speaking is to prepare learners for authentic communication outside the classroom, where the ability to negotiate meaning, handle turn-taking, and respond appropriately in conversations is essential. Unlike traditional approaches that focused on rote memorization or isolated drills, modern speaking instruction prioritizes interactive and meaningful practice. This includes activities such as role-plays, group discussions, problem-solving tasks, and presentations, which simulate real-world communication and encourage active learner participation.

Additionally, teaching speaking involves developing related sub-skills such as listening comprehension, pronunciation, and discourse management, as these are integral to successful oral interaction.

In summary, teaching speaking for ESL learners is not merely about language form but also about function. It seeks to empower learners with the confidence and competence to use English effectively across social, academic, and professional contexts. By focusing on both accuracy and fluency, and by providing learners with opportunities for authentic communication, teaching speaking plays a fundamental role in enabling ESL learners to become proficient and autonomous language users.

2.4 Discussion Text

A discussion text is designed to explore a controversial issue by presenting contrasting viewpoints before reaching a conclusion or taking a stance. As explained by Pitrianti (2017), such texts highlight both supporting and opposing arguments, which should be substantiated with credible sources such as data, factual evidence, personal experiences, and expert opinions.

Similarly, Derewianka, as cited in Safara (2017), emphasizes that discussion texts aim to inform readers by laying out both sides of an argument objectively, allowing the writer to later state their position. Engaging with this genre encourages students to delve deeper into the topic, promotes critical and creative thinking, and enhances their ability to formulate reasoned solutions to real-world issues. As cited in Safara (2017), Anderson outlines that a discussion text is typically structured into three main components:

1. Statements of issue, which give readers boundaries about what is going to discuss
2. Arguments, which are divided into two sides, arguments for and against
3. Recommendation, which sums up all the arguments and allows writer to decide his/her position in the subject.

Discussion text in this research is used as a reference for students as it is included in the curriculum of that school. Hopefully they can highlight what they want to analyze.

2.5 Think-Pair-Share

Think-Pair-Share becomes the teaching method that the researcher chooses to conduct this current research. As the researcher decides speaking as the aspect that needs to be considered, the researcher assumes that upon all the problems that arise within the class, especially in Indonesia, Think-Pair-Share is suitable to be applied at class, dealing with the active class that is hoped to occur.

Originally introduced by Lyman in 1981, TPS is a collaborative learning approach that encourages students to reflect on a given topic, discuss their ideas with a partner, and then share their conclusions with the larger group. This structured process helps students organize their thoughts, stay focused, and remain accountable during discussions (Lyman, 1987, as cited in Kaddoura, 2013). Over time, TPS has been widely adopted in cooperative learning due to its ability to promote critical thinking and communication skills. Ibrahim, as cited in

Sukelasmini (2019), defines TPS as a learning model that provides learners with additional time to process information, respond thoughtfully, and collaborate with peers. Similarly, Kagan, in Aprianti et al. (2020), outlines the three essential stages of this technique—thinking individually, pairing with a classmate, and sharing ideas—each of which plays a crucial role in developing students' interaction and reasoning abilities.

Think-Pair-Share (TPS) consists of three main stages: thinking individually, pairing up with a partner, and sharing ideas with others. According to Kagan (as cited in Aprianti et al., 2020), this technique is structured into these three sequential steps to guide student interaction effectively.

1. **Think**: At this stage, students are expected to reflect individually. The teacher presents a question and allows students a brief period—typically around one minute—to independently formulate their thoughts on the topic. The key benefit of this phase is that it provides students with the opportunity to develop their own responses before hearing answers from their peers.

2. **Pair**: During this phase, students are paired to exchange and discuss their ideas. This interaction enables them to express their own thoughts while also considering their partner's perspective. The discussion is conducted orally, allowing each student to communicate and reflect on their opinions through dialogue with a peer.

3. **Share**: At this stage, the teacher may choose students at random to present their ideas to the entire class using a clear and audible voice. This requires students to share the results of their discussion with other groups, promoting public speaking and active participation.

These are the procedural stages of the Think-Pair-Share technique used to facilitate the teaching and learning process.

2.6   Advantages and Disadvantages of Think-Pair-Share

Every teaching technique has its strengths and limitations, and Think-Pair-Share (TPS) is no exception. As cited in Fauziyati et al. (2013), Lyman (1981) explains that TPS, a cooperative learning strategy, presents both advantages and disadvantages when applied in classroom settings.

The advantages of TPS include its simplicity and minimal preparation requirements, making it practical for classroom use. It enhances the quality of class discussions by allowing students to reflect individually before sharing ideas, thus encouraging thoughtful participation. The strategy fosters the development of higher-order thinking skills through peer collaboration and helps build students' confidence when presenting ideas to the class. The pair stage ensures inclusivity, providing each student with an opportunity to participate in the dialogue. Furthermore, TPS gives students time to mentally and verbally rehearse their responses, increasing overall student engagement. Both teachers and students benefit from richer discussions and more reflective thinking. Additionally, TPS is versatile and can be effectively applied across different grade levels and class sizes.

Despite its benefits, TPS also has some limitations. Students may become distracted and deviate from the assigned topic during the pair stage, which can reduce the effectiveness of the discussion. Moreover, students with lower comprehension of the material may be tempted to rely on or copy the responses of their peers, limiting their individual learning and critical engagement.

One contributing factor to students' lack of focus during the share phase of the Think-Pair-Share technique is the random call that used in the share stage of think-pair-share. According to Copper (2021), When students worry about whether they are going to be called on in front of the whole class, they often spend extra mental energy on their fear of needing to share their responses instead of focusing on the science learning at hand. To address this challenge, Cooper et al. (2021) suggest alternative strategies, which will be discussed in detail in the subsequent subchapter.

2.7 Modifying the Share Stage of Think-Pair-Share
Cooper et al. (2021) highlight several innovative adaptations instructors have developed to encourage equitable participation and reduce students' anxiety during the share phase of the Think-Pair-Share technique. These modifications

aim to create a more supportive environment where students feel comfortable expressing their ideas in front of the entire class. Below is a discussion about three ways to modify the share portion of the think– pair–share: optional consent to share, local sharing, and go-around.

To foster equitable participation and support students in building confidence during class discussions, instructors can implement several thoughtful modifications to the "share" phase of Think-Pair-Share. One such approach is the use of optional consent to share, which offers students the opportunity to choose whether or not to contribute to the larger group. Instructors may either randomly select a student during group discussions or identify a contribution they overheard and would like to be shared more broadly. In either scenario, the instructor invites the student to share only after obtaining their consent. This method can be effectively applied in both small and large classes where instructors are able to interact directly with students. By seeking explicit permission, instructors not only respect students' autonomy but also reduce the pressure associated with mandatory participation. This sense of agency allows students to opt out on days they feel unprepared, while also reinforcing the instructor's respect for individual readiness and boundaries. Compared to traditional volunteering, this consent-based model may offer a more inclusive and equitable environment, as it does not depend on students' initiative to speak up. Moreover, asking for consent signals that the instructor values students' ideas, which can help alleviate fear of judgment and promote a psychologically safe learning atmosphere. Providing students with advance notice to prepare for sharing further enhances the likelihood of clear and confident articulation. In large classrooms, practical tools like name tents can support this strategy; one side of the tent shows only the student's name, while the other side includes a marked box. Students can signal their preference not to participate on a given day simply by turning the box side toward the instructor (Brame, 2019).

In addition to optional consent, other modifications to the share phase include local sharing and the go-around approach. Local sharing allows students to engage in small-group discussions that go beyond pairs but stop short of

addressing the entire class. For instance, students seated at the same table may exchange ideas, or in lecture halls, pairs from nearby rows can briefly join together. This offers a less intimidating environment for practicing verbal expression while increasing the number of students who participate in the discussion. Meanwhile, the go-around strategy requires every student in a group or class to contribute a response. This method works particularly well in small classes or large classes organized into smaller subgroups. When framed around open-ended questions that permit multiple valid responses, the go-around reduces students' anxiety about being judged and ensures that every voice is heard (Tanner, 2013).

Together, these adaptations—optional consent to share, local sharing, and go-around—are designed to enhance both equity and effectiveness during the share phase of Think-Pair-Share. Importantly, they preserve the original structure of the strategy by maintaining the initial think and pair stages, ensuring that all students have adequate time to reflect and prepare before engaging in broader classroom dialogue (Tanner, 2009). The next section provides a more detailed examination of each of these approaches.

Table 2.1 the Modification of Share Stage

Alternatives	Description
Optional consent to share	During the pair, the instructor privately asks individual students if they would be willing to share their ideas with the whole class before calling on them.
Local share	Students exchange ideas beyond their pairs (e.g., with another pair of students or with their table mates), but the discussion is not opened up to the whole class.
Go-around	The instructor poses a question with many possible ways to answer and then goes around the class so that each student can contribute an idea to the discussion.

These ways are inserted in the stage of share in think pair share technique. The alternatives are made to give a solution towards the anxiety, unfocused and being afraid of the students when they call randomly. Hopefully they want to share their ideas, even though not to the whole class. Instead, they contribute to share idea privately with the teacher.

2.8   Relevant Research Studies

Cooper et al. (2021) conducted an in-depth examination of the share component within the Think-Pair-Share (TPS) strategy, proposing various modifications, alternative approaches, and even the possibility of omitting the share phase entirely in certain contexts. They emphasize that instructional decisions, including adjustments to the TPS method, should be guided by the specific teaching environment, the instructor's objectives, and the learning goals for students, rather than adhering to a one-size-fits-all model.

Complementing this perspective, Waugh et al. (2020) discuss the use of random call in undergraduate biology classes, noting its effectiveness in increasing student accountability and amplifying diverse voices in the classroom. However, they also caution that this practice may have unintended negative effects on some students, underscoring the importance of carefully analyzing which elements of random call contribute to desired educational outcomes and for which student populations.

Several empirical studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of TPS in improving students' speaking abilities. Cahyani (2018), through a preliminary study at MTS 2 Banda Aceh, identified that students initially exhibited low speaking proficiency, partly due to unsuitable teaching methods. After implementing the TPS technique, students showed significant improvement in their speaking performance, indicating the method's potential as an effective instructional strategy. Similarly, Yanti et al. (2017) employed Classroom Action Research to explore techniques for enhancing speaking skills and found that TPS not only provides students time to thoughtfully consider topics but also fosters critical thinking, enhances oral communication, encourages active interaction, and

promotes a democratic classroom atmosphere where students feel free to express their opinions.

In addition, Brillianzha (2020) conducted classroom action research with eighth-grade students in Kupang, revealing that the TPS technique increased students' opportunities to speak English and encouraged active participation throughout the learning process. Data collected through observations, interviews, and tests confirmed that TPS contributed positively to students' engagement and speaking skill development.

Together, these studies affirm that while instructional adaptations to TPS may vary depending on context, the technique consistently supports the enhancement of students' speaking abilities and classroom involvement.

2.9 Theoretical Assumption

Based on the review of relevant theories, several theoretical assumptions can be formulated. Think-Pair-Share is a good technique to apply at class, although it has disadvantages. One of the weaknesses of Think-Pair-Share is that the students lack of focus in the learning activity. One of the factors is because they feel anxiety and afraid when they wait for being randomly called to speak up to the class. This research is a follow-up research based on the essay by Cooper, et al. (2021) that modifies the share stage in Think-Pair-Share where the random calling happens. Based on their alternative ways to replace the sharing session to the whole class with private sharing between a student and their teacher, the researcher inserts the alternative ways to the share stage of Think-Pair-Share in the whilst-activities in the lesson plan. It is anticipated that this adjustment will lead to a significant improvement in students' speaking achievement and gain a positive appraisal from the students.

2.10 Hypothesis

In order to answer the research question, the hypothesis which is proposed in this research is:

There is a significant difference of the students' speaking achievement between the students who are taught through the modified share stage of Think-Pair- Share and those who are taught through the original Think-Pair-Share.

The researcher formulates the hypothesis presented above based on the theories and previous studies discussed in this chapter. This chapter has reviewed relevant theories from various sources to provide a comprehensive theoretical foundation. In summary, the framework elaborated here serves as the underlying basis that will guide the discussion in the subsequent chapter.

III. METHODS

This chapter continues by outlining the research design, describing the population and sample, detailing the research procedures, explaining data collection methods, discussing validity and reliability, presenting data analysis techniques, and addressing hypothesis testing.

3.1 Research Design

Research design refers to the systematic procedure for collecting and analyzing data chosen by the researcher to carry out the study. According to Setiyadi (2018), research design is a plan or steps prepared to collect data in a research. This study employs a true experimental design using a quantitative approach. The primary objective is to determine whether there is a significant difference in students' speaking achievement between those taught using the modified share stage of the Think-Pair-Share technique and those taught using the original Think-Pair-Share. Additionally, this research aims to explore students' perceptions and evaluations of the learning activities conducted through the modified Think-Pair-Share. The research utilizes a Pre-test Post-test Class Design, which is outlined in detail as follows:

Table 3.1 Research Design

G1: T1 X T2
G2: T1 O T2

G1 = Experimental class	G2 = Control class
X = Modified Think-Pair Share	O = Original Think-Pair Share
T1 = Pre-test	T2 = Post-test

The figure above depicts the research procedure, beginning with the administration of a pre-test to assess students' speaking ability before the treatment. Following this, the researcher implements the treatment by teaching

speaking skills using the original Think-Pair-Share technique in the control group and the modified version in the experimental group. Subsequently, a post-test is conducted to evaluate the progress in students' speaking achievement resulting from the treatments. In addition, a questionnaire is given to the students to gain their appraisals towards the implementation of the designed lesson plan in the teaching and learning activities at the experimental class.

3.2 Population and Sample

3.2.1 Population

The population for this study comprises twelfth-grade students at SMA Negeri 1 Way Pengubuan, Central Lampung. There are a total of 92 students in this grade, distributed across four separate classes. This particular grade level was selected because the curriculum content aligns with the research objectives, specifically requiring students to engage with discussion texts.

3.2.2 Sample

The sample for this study consists of two twelfth-grade classes at SMA Negeri 1 Way Pengubuan, with each class comprising 23 students. Purposive sampling was employed to select these classes, based on an interview with one of the English teachers at the school. It was identified that the students in these classes exhibited low speaking proficiency and were classified at the beginner level of English. This selection aims to observe potential improvements in their speaking skills.

3.3 Research Procedure

In conducting this research, there are some steps applied to make sure that the research runs well in a good chronological order. The steps of the procedure of the research are as follows:

1. Determining Problem

    This research originated from problems that occurred during the learning process at a school in Lampung. The majority of the English teachers were stuck using conventional teaching methods without any modifications. Most of the EFL teachers are stuck in giving only grammar materials to the

students. Within the lesson plan, the teacher may design instructional steps by incorporating a modified teaching technique. In this research, Think-Pair-Share was chosen because it had been proven to increase students' speaking achievement.

2. Determining the Subjects

The subjects of this research were students in SMA N 1 Way Pengubuan. It involved two classes, each consisting of 23 twelfth-grade students.

3. Developing lesson plan

The researcher constructed the activities of the Think-Pair-Share technique, especially in the share stage where random call was implemented. This was inserted into the lesson plan during the whilst-activities. The teaching and learning process was based on the school's syllabus, *Kurikulum Merdeka*.

4. Administering the trial test

The students in experimental class were given a trial test to make sure no constraints occurred when collecting the data before the pre-test. The students were asked to read and analyze the text as well as share their solutions. The result shows that the students got difficulties in doing the test. First, they were not familiar with the topic. Then, their speaking ability was very low. It's proven from the data that the researcher got when they were speaking. Only about two students could be considered adequate in speaking English. The results show a low average score in that class, which was 24.17. Of the difficult topic and their ability, the researcher decided not to use this test to obtain the scores of students for this research.

5. Administering the pre-test

The pre-test was administered to the control and experimental classes at the first meeting before the treatments began in order to determine the students' prior speaking ability. The pre-test consisted of an instruction as a subjective test. Each class was given a text with limited time, and they were asked to read and analyze the text as well as share their solutions. The test followed the senior high school's curriculum, *Kurikulum Merdeka*, which was regarded as appropriate for their level in terms of discussion text.

6. Conducting the treatments

   The treatments were given three times, with each meeting lasting 90 minutes, using a lesson plan that had been designed with alternatives to random call for the experimental class. For the control class, the treatment was conducted using a conventional lesson plan based on the original Think-Pair-Share.

7. Administering the post-test

   After implementing the treatments, a post-test was administered. The post-test instruction was the same as the pre-test instruction with similar topic of discussion text. The instruction was: *Please read, analyze the problem and give your solutions!*

8. Distributing the Questionnaire

   Following the post-test, a closed-ended questionnaire was administered to the experimental class to gather students' feedback regarding the implementation of the modified Share stage in the Think-Pair-Share.

9. Transcribing

   Some of the students' utterances from the pre-test and post-test were transcribed. These were selected based on the average scores.

10. Scoring

    In this study, two raters were involved in assessing the students' speaking performance. The researcher served as the first rater (R1), while the second rater (R2) was an English teacher from the same school. This dual-rating approach was employed to determine whether there was any improvement in students' speaking achievement by comparing the scores obtained before and after the treatment.

11. Processing via SPSS

    The pre-test and post-test scores were analyzed using SPSS with an Independent Samples T-Test to examine whether a significant difference exists in students' speaking achievement between the experimental group and the control group following the implementation of the treatments.

12. Overviewing the Questionnaire

The appraisals in the questionnaire were rated using a 4-point Likert scale to determine whether the result was positive or not.

13. Analyzing the result

After evaluating the students' performances, the researcher compared the pre-test and post-test scores to determine if there was an improvement in the post-test results. Additionally, the post-test scores of the control and experimental groups were compared. The data for the first research question were analyzed using an independent samples t-test in SPSS 22, while the second research question was addressed through manual calculations using Microsoft Excel 2010 to assess whether the outcomes were favorable.

Those are the steps of doing this research to ease the researcher in conducting this research.

3.4 Data Collecting Technique

The researcher employed two instruments to collect the data, i.e., a speaking test and a questionnaire. The elaboration was as follows:

1. Speaking test

Test is valuable measuring instrument for educational research. Therefore, the role of the test is important in collecting data. The researcher administered a pre-test prior to the treatments and a post-test following the treatments. Also, the students in the experimental class were administered a trial test before the pre-test, to ensure no constraints occurred during data collection. The three tests were in terms of speaking achievement. The instructions were equal, which was: *Please read, analyze the problem and give your solutions!*

a. Pre-test

The pre-test was administered during the initial meeting before the treatment began. This aimed to assess the students' speaking skills prior to their participation in the lesson plan developed around the Think-Pair-Share method. The pre-test was to ask the students to share

their solutions towards the problem contained in the discussion text. The kind of speech was monologue. It was assessed with the rubric of speaking by Brown (2001). The test was a subjective test which required an inter-rater.

b. Post-test

After the treatments were conducted, the students were administered a post-test. The post-test had the same instructions as the pre-test but with different text. This was carried out to determine if there was a significant difference in students' speaking achievement between those taught using the modified Think-Pair-Share and those taught with the original Think-Pair-Share.

c. Trial test

The trial test was just the same as the pre-test and post-test. It was only conducted in experimental class before the pre-test. The purpose was to make sure that there was no constraint occurring when the pre-test in experimental class began.

2. Questionnaire

The appraisal questionnaire was used to measure students' appraisals towards the implementation of the modified Think-Pair-Share. It was distributed after the post-test in the experimental class. This questionnaire was adapted from the theory of Richards (2005). Students were instructed to select their responses on a 4-point scale, from strongly disagree to strongly agree, reflecting their evaluations of the learning activities.

Above were the instruments used and how the data were collected in this research.

3.5 Validity

Validity refers to the appropriateness of the interpretations and uses of assessment results. For instance, when concluding that students have met the intended learning objectives based on an assessment, it is necessary to ensure that the tasks accurately represent and measure those objectives (Gronlund & Waugh, 2009). Validity is generally categorized into two types: content validity and construct validity. In the context of achievement tests, content validity holds significant

importance. Gay et al. (2011) emphasize that a test cannot reliably indicate a student's achievement unless it reflects the material that the student has been taught and is expected to have learned.

On the other hand, construct validity pertains to the extent to which a test accurately measures the theoretical concept or skill it is intended to assess. Therefore, this study examined both content and construct validity to ensure the accuracy and appropriateness of the tests used.

3.5.1 Validity of Speaking Test

Content validity refers to the extent to which a test adequately represents and covers the material it is intended to assess (Hatch & Lazaraton, 1991). In this study, the instrument aims to collect data on students' speaking performance both before and after the treatment, aligning with the English curriculum for senior high school students under *Kurikulum Merdeka.*

Furthermore, the tests are designed based on the materials taught by the school's English teacher, focusing specifically on discussion texts, which are part of the students' learning topics. The assessment of speaking skills uses a rubric adapted from Brown (2001) as cited in Karlina et al. (2020), which evaluates five key components: grammar, vocabulary, comprehension, fluency, and pronunciation.

Above all are done to merely attain the content and construct validity. Below is the elaboration of content validity and construct validity of the test.

3.5.1.1 Content Validity

Setiyadi (2018) states that, a measuring instrument is considered to have content validity when it comprehensively covers all relevant concepts or domains associated with the material being assessed. In making the final test for English subjects, content validity is related to the extent to which the items in the test are prepared based on the existing curriculum. Here, the researcher correlated the speaking tests with the Senior High School curriculum. SMA NEGERI 1 Way

Pengubuan, Central Lampung used *Kurikulum Merdeka* to conduct the teaching and learning process. Below was the elaboration that included the learning goals based on the syllabus of SMA N 1 Way Pengubuan.

By the end of this unit, you are expected to be able to:

1. Identify the communicative purposes and the schematic structures of discussion text.

2. Identify some of the linguistic features of discussion text: generic participants, simple present, thinking verb, modality, contrastive conjunction, and passive voice.

3. State explicit and implicit information, main ideas and detailed information from discussion text.

4. Categorize facts and opinions based on discussion text given.

5. Do a group presentation that focuses on discussion text

3.5.1.2 Construct Validity

The aspects are in line with the aspects of rubric by Brown (2001). Since the test involves monologue speaking, the construct validity only covers the aspects of the rubric based on the theory, it will be documented through SPSS, and the score is elaborated below:

Table 3.2 Rubric of Speaking by Brown (2001)

	Grammar	Vocabulary	Comprehension	Fluency	Pronunciation
1	Error in grammar are frequent, but speaker can be understood by a native speaker used to dealing with foreigners attempting to speak his language.	Speaking vocabulary inadequate to express anything but the most elementary needs.	Within the scope of his very limited language experience, can understand simple questions and statements if delivered with slowed speech, repetition, or paraphrase.	(No specific fluency description. Refer to other four language areas for implied level of fluency).	Error in pronunciation are frequent but can be understood by a native speaker used to dealing with foreigners attempting to speak his language.
2	Can usually handle elementary constructions quite accurately but does not have thorough or confident control of the grammar.	Has speaking vocabulary sufficient to express himself simply with some circumlocutions.	Can get the gist of most conversations of non-technical subject (i.e., topics that require not specialized knowledge).	Can handle with confidence but not with facility most social situations, including introductions and casual conversations about current events,	Accent is intelligible though often quite faulty.

				as well as work, family, and autobiographical information.	
3	Control of grammar is good. Able to speak the language with sufficient structural accuracy to participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, and professional topics.	Able to speak the language with sufficient vocabulary to participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, and professional topics. Vocabulary is broad enough that he rarely has to grope for a word.	Comprehension is quite complete at a normal rate of speech.	Can discuss particular interests of competence with reasonable ease. Rarely has to grope for word.	Errors never interfere with understanding and rarely disturb the native speaker. Accent may be obviously foreign.
4	Able to use the language accurately on all levels normally pertinent to professional needs. Errors in grammar are quite rare.	Can understand and participate in any conversations within the range of his experience with a high degree of precision of vocabulary.	Can understand any conversation within the range of his experience.	Able to use the language fluently on all levels normally pertinent to professional needs. Can participate in any conversation within the range of this experience with a high degree of fluency.	Error in pronunciation are quite rare.
5	Equivalent to the of an educated native speaker.	Speech non all levels is fully accepted by educated by educated native speakers in all its features including breadth of vocabulary and idioms, colloquialisms, and pertinent culture references.	Equivalent to that of an educated native speaker.	Has complete fluency in the language such that his speech is fully accepted by educated native speakers.	Equivalent to and fully accepted by educated native speakers.

There are 5 scales for each element in which the number 5 is the highest score. The first element is grammar. It is to evaluate the correct grammar that the students used in speaking. It's very important, because it is known that Indonesian students often speak ungrammatically. The second one is vocabulary. It is to measure how many vocabularies that the students have. The third is comprehension. It is to figure out whether the students understand what the instruction asks them to, and to make sure what they speak is according to the instruction. It can be obtained from the points that the students elaborate. The fourth element is fluency. It is to measure how fluent they are speaking, without several pauses. The last is pronunciation. It is to measure how exact they pronounce the words and their accents are like natives or not.

3.5.2 Validity of Questionnaire

The validity of the questionnaire relates to the extent to which it accurately reflects the underlying theoretical framework. Given that the questionnaire is

intended to generate data, the researcher ensures its validity by aligning it with the principles of the modified share stage in the Think-Pair-Share strategy as outlined in the developed lesson plan. Content validity specifically refers to the consistency between the treatment applied and the items in the questionnaire. To strengthen this aspect of validity, the questionnaire was adapted based on Richards' theory (2005).

Construct validity is necessary for measuring instruments that have multiple indicators to assess a single aspect or construct (Setiyadi, 2018). Below is the table containing specification of the questionnaire item number in order to ease the grid of questionnaire items that include 'teaching' stated in statements that describe the teacher and 'course' asked in questions that describe the teaching method.

Table 3.3 Specification of Questionnaire

No	Questionnaire Items Category	Items
1	Teaching	1 - 5
2	Course	6 - 10
TOTAL		**10**

3.6   Reliability

Reliability refers to the extent to which a test produces stable and consistent results when administered under comparable conditions. Regardless of the data type gathered, it is essential that the data be dependable and trustworthy (Hatch & Lazaraton, 1991).

3.6.1 Reliability of Speaking Test

The test employed as the instrument in this research is a subjective test with an instruction and the researcher measures the reliability by using inter-rater. The inter- rater measurement is used by the researcher to determine the consistency. This is computed through Pearson product moment correlation in SPSS version 22. The inter-rater correlation is described below:

Table 3.4 Inter-rater Correlation

Inter-rater Correlation of the Pre-test in the Experimental Class

Correlations

		R1	R2
R1	Pearson Correlation	1	$.720^{**}$
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	23	23
R2	Pearson Correlation	$.720^{**}$	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	23	23

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2- tailed).

Inter-rater Correlation of the Post-test in the Experimental Class

Correlations

		R1	R2
R1	Pearson Correlation	1	$.969^{**}$
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	23	23
R2	Pearson Correlation	$.969^{**}$	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	23	23

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2- tailed).

Inter-rater Correlation of the Pre-test in the Control Class

Correlations

		R1	R2
R1	Pearson Correlation	1	.775**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	23	23
R2	Pearson Correlation	.775**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	23	23

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2- tailed).

Inter-rater Correlation of the Post-test in the Control Class

Correlations

		R1	R2
R1	Pearson Correlation	1	.951**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	23	23
R2	Pearson Correlation	.951**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	23	23

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2- tailed).

Setiyadi (2018) reveals the degree of correlation interpreted by the value of r as elaborated below:

Table 3.5 Interpretation of r

Value of r	Interpretation
0.00 – 0.20	Very low
0.21 - 0.40	Low
0.41 – 0.60	Medium
0.61 – 0.80	High
0.81 – 1.00	Very high

Based on the collected data, the pre-test scores for the control and experimental groups are 0.720 and 0.775, respectively, both classified as high. Meanwhile, the post-test correlation coefficients (r) for the control and experimental groups are 0.969 and 0.951, respectively, which are considered very high. All these values are significant at the 0.000 level, which is below the 0.05 threshold. This indicates a strong correlation between the scores given by Rater 1 and Rater 2. Therefore, it can be concluded that the speaking test used in this research is reliable.

In relation with the inter-rater, the first rater is the researcher herself, a master degree student of English Department in University of Lampung. The second rater is the English teacher of SMA NEGERI 1 Way Pengubuan. Thus, the researcher believes that the scores that appear are valid and reliable.

3.6.2 Reliability of Questionnaire

In this study, Cronbach's Alpha is employed to assess the internal consistency reliability of the questionnaire. The value of the alpha coefficient varies from 0 to 1.The formula of alpha reliability is presented below:

$$r_{11} = \left(\frac{n}{n-1}\right)\left(1 - \frac{\sum \sigma_t^2}{\sigma_T^2}\right)$$

Notes:

r_{11} = Alpha reliability coefficient

n = Number of items

$\sum \sigma^2$ = Number of item variants

σ^2 = Total variants

The interpretation of reliability is based on the criteria developed by Guilford in Ardani, et al (2020):

Table 3.6 Interpretation of Reliability

r11	Interpretation of Reliability
0.80 to 1.00	Very High
0.60 to 0.80	High
0.40 to 0.60	Intermediate
0.20 to 0.40	Low
< 0.20	Very Low

For this research, the reliability of the questionnaire was determined using SPSS software to facilitate the calculation of Cronbach's Alpha. The results are presented below.

Table 3.7 Reliability of Questionnaire Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.910	10

In this study, Cronbach's Alpha is utilized to evaluate the internal consistency reliability of the questionnaire, with the alpha coefficient ranging from 0 to 1. The criteria for interpreting the reliability test results are as follows:

➢ If the cronbach's Alpha value is> 0.6 then the questionnaire is declared reliable or consistent

➢ If the cronbach's Alpha value is <0.6, the questionnaire is declared unreliable or inconsistent

As shown in the table above, the Cronbach's Alpha value for the questionnaire is 0.910, exceeding the threshold of 0.6. According to Guilford's theory, this indicates a very high level of reliability. Therefore, it can be concluded that the questionnaire is reliable.

3.7 Data Analysis

To analyze the gained data, the researcher treated the data through the following steps:

1. Scoring the data of speaking test.

    The results of the pre-test and post-test speaking tests were scored. The speaking test scores were computed using SPSS version 22 to determine the improvement through an independent samples t-test for both classes, in order to answer Research Question 1.

2. Scoring and analyzing the questionnaire appraisals towards the designed lesson plan implemented in the learning activities, manually through Microsoft Excel 2010 for answering Research Question 2. And it also used SPSS 22 to check the reliability with Cronbach's Alpha. To make statistical analysis easier, the items on the questionnaire are scored. The numerical scores are provided for the elements of 4-Likert-specific questionnaire. Pimentel (2019) in Doria (2024) developed a 4- point Likert scale as follows:

Table 3.8 Interpretation of Intervals

Value	Mean Range	Adjectival Rating	Interpretation	Category
1	1.00 – 1.75	Strongly disagree	Very Low	Negative
2	1.76 – 2.51	Disagree	Low	Negative
3	2.52 – 3.27	Agree	High	Positive
4	3.28 – 4.00	Strongly Agree	Very High	Positive

All are then interpreted, described and drawn into conclusion.

3.8 Hypothesis Testing

A hypothesis testing is a way for determining whether or not the hypotheses proposed in a research are accepted. The following is the hypothesis of this current research:

There is a significant difference in the students' speaking achievements between the students who are taught through the modified think-pair-share and those who are taught through the original think-pair-share.

The hypothesis is tested using an Independent Samples T-Test with a significance level set at $p < 0.05$. The hypothesis (H1) will be accepted if a significant difference is found in students' speaking achievements between those taught using the modified Think-Pair-Share method and those taught with the original Think-Pair-Share. Conversely, the null hypothesis (H0) will be accepted if no significant difference in speaking achievement is observed between the two groups.

That is the hypothesis by the researcher to be assumed as the answers of the research question. As a whole, this chapter elaborates the methods used in this research. This chapter has provided explanations related to the research design, population and sample, research procedures, data collection techniques, validity, reliability, data analysis, and hypothesis testing.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

This final chapter consolidates the conclusions drawn from the research findings and provides practical suggestions for future applications and studies based on the conducted analyses.

5.1 Conclusions

Based on the finding and discussions presented in the previous chapter, it can be concluded that the implementation of the modified share stage of the Think Pair Share significantly improved students' speaking achievement. The statistical analysis confirmed a substantial taught using the modified version and those taught using the original Think Pair Share method. This indicates that the proposed modification such as optional consent to share, local sharing and go around approaches were effective in minimizing students' anxiety and enhancing their willingness to participate. The researcher believes that one of the critical elements in the success of this method lies in how it addresses students' psychological barriers, particularly the fear of being randomly called in front of the class. By allowing more flexibility and offering alternative ways to share ideas, students felt more respected, comfortable, and confident to speak. Moreover, students gave positive appraisals toward the modified technique, indicating their preference and support for this learning model.

The researcher believes that modifying teaching techniques especially those that involve student interaction and participation should be seen as a necessity rather than an option in 21st century classrooms. It bridges the gap between theory and practice, empowering students to develop language competence in a supportive and less intimidating environment.

5.2   Suggestions

Despite the success of this study, several obstacles emerged during the implementation process. One of the main obstacle faced during treatment was that some students still exhibited hesitation in expressing their opinion even in smaller sharing groups. This hesitation often stemmed from a lack of vocabulary or fear of making grammatical errors, despite the less pressuring environment. Furthermore, in the early stages, the students were unfamiliar with the discussion text format, making it difficult for them to formulate coherent arguments. Additional time was needed to help them understand the text structure and the purpose of the discussion. Based on the observation, the researcher offers the following suggestion:

1. For teachers:

   When applying the modified Think Pair Share Technique, especially in speaking classes, it is important to build students' confidence gradually. Pre-activities such as vocabulary review and grammar reinforcement can help students perform better during the sharing stage.

2. For further researchers:

   It is recommended to explore the use of modified Think Pair Share in various contexts and subjects, or combine it with other strategies such as visual aids or digital tools to further reduce student anxiety and increase engagement.

In conclusion, modifying interactive teaching technique based on student needs plays a vital role in increasing learning outcomes. The researcher encourages continued research and innovation in teaching speaking, as it remains one of the most challenging but essential skills in language education.

REFERENCES

Al Karim, M. A., Suharjito, B., & Bilqis, M. (2022). Enhancing the students' speaking skill through Think-Pair-Share (TPS) at SMAN 4 Jember. *EFL Education Journal*, 9(1), 141–150.

Aprianti, D., & Ayu, M. (2020). Think-Pair-Share: Engaging students in speaking activities in classroom. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning (JELTL)*, 1(1), 13–19.

Brillianzha, A. (2020). A study of Think-Pair-Share technique to improve speaking skill of the eighth grade students in Kupang. *LECTIO*, 1(1).

Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices*. New York: Longman.

Cahyani, F. (2018). The use of Think-Pair-Share technique to improve students' speaking performance. *Research in English and Education (READ)*, 3(1), 76–90.

Cooper, K. M., Schinske, J. N., & Tanner, K. D. (2021). Reconsidering the Share of a Think–Pair–Share: Emerging limitations, alternatives, and opportunities for research. *CBE—Life Sciences Education*, 20(fe1), Spring 2021.

Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Damayanti, M. E., & Listyani, L. (2020). An analysis of students' speaking anxiety in academic speaking class. *ELTR Journal*, 4(2), 152–170.

Doria, J. D. A. (2024). Factors influencing employees' information security behavior in the telework environment: An empirical study of the Philippines. *IJRP*, 156(1), 37–55.

Fauziyati, D. R., & Istianah, W. (2013). The effect of using Think-Pair-Share technique on the eight grade students' reading comprehension achievement at SMPN 3 Bangsalsari Jember. *Pancaran*, 2(2), 41–48.

Gardner, R. C., & MacIntyre, P. D. (1993). A student's contributions to second language learning. Part II: Affective variables. *Language Teaching*, 26(1), 1–11.

Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. W. (2011). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications*. USA: Pearson Higher Ed.

Gregersen, T. S. (2003). To err is human: A reminder to teachers of language-anxious students. *Foreign Language Annals*, 36(1), 25–32.

Gronlund, N. E., & Waugh, C. K. (2009). *Assessment of student achievement* (9th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

Hamid, L. (2014). Peningkatan kemampuan berbicara bahasa Inggris melalui media gambar berseri. *Bahtera: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra*, 13(1), Januari 2014.

Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language teaching*. Great Britain: Pearson Education Limited.

Hatch, E. M., & Lazaraton, A. (1991). *The research manual: Design and statistics for applied linguistics*. United States of America: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70(2), 125–132.

Kaddoura, M. (2013). Think-Pair-Share: A teaching learning strategy to enhance students' critical thinking. *Educational Research Quarterly*, June 2013.

Karlina, & Sudirman, A. (2020). The effect of application guessing game PicPow strategy towards students' speaking mastery at the first class of SMA Mathla'ul Anwar Menes. *JEES: Journal of English Education Studies*, 2(2).

Kusrini, E. (2012). Teaching speaking for senior high school students using cooperative learning "Think-Pair-Share". *Jurnal Aktif*, 18(3), 1–8.

Kothiyal, A., Majumdar, M., Murthy, S., & Iyer, S. (2013). Effect of Think-Pair-Share in a large CS1 class: 83% sustained engagement. *Proceedings of the Ninth Annual International ACM Conference on International Computing Education Research*. San Diego: ACM.

Lyman, F. (1981). Strategies for reading comprehension. Retrieved from http://www.teachervision.fen.com/groupwork/cooperativelearning/48547.html (Accessed November 8, 2024).

Munisah, E. (2021). Peningkatan kemampuan bahasa Inggris siswa sekolah dasar melalui program Teras Belajar. *Jurnal Elsa*, 19(1), April 2021.

Nunan, D. (1999). *Second language teaching and learning*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Nunan, D. (2003). *Practical English language teaching*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Pitrianti, S. (2017). The implementation of problem-based learning in writing discussion text on Indonesian language learning. *IJAEDU – International E-Journal of Advances in Education*, 3(9), December 2017.

Pollard, L. (2008). *Guide to teaching English: A book to help you through your first two years in teaching*. London: Oxford University Press.

Richards, J. C. (2005). *Curriculum development for language teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C. (2008). *Teaching listening and speaking: From theory to practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Safara, A., Rozimela, Y., & Fitrawati. (2017). The quality of generic structure of discussion text written by the XII grade students of SMA N 1 Lubuk Alung. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 6(1) Serie E.

Sukelasmini, I. G. A. M. (2019). The implementation of Think-Pair-Share (TPS) type of cooperative learning model to improve student's motivation and nutrition science learning achievement. *Journal of Education Action Research*, 3(1).

Setiyadi, A. B. (2018). *Metode penelitian untuk pengajaran bahasa asing*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.

Torky, S. A. E. F. (2006). *The effectiveness of a task-based instruction program in developing the English language speaking skills of secondary stage students* (Thesis). Ain Shams University.

Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Waugh, A. H., & Andrews, T. C. (2020). Diving into the details: Constructing a framework of random call components. *CBE—Life Sciences Education*, 19(ar14), Summer 2020.

Yahya, M. (2013). Measuring speaking anxiety among speech communication course students at the Arab American University of Jenin (AAUJ). *European Social Sciences Research Journal*, 1(3), 229–248.

Yanti, M., Rufinus, A., & Regina. (2017). Improving students' speaking skills through Think-Pair-Share technique. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran Khatulistiwa*, 6(5).