THE INFLUENCE OF *THINK-PAIR-SHARE* TECHNIQUE (TPS) TO TEACH READING COMPREHENSION TO THE TENTH GRADE STUDENTS

Sri Ariski[1], Tri Rositasari[2], Dwi Rara Saraswaty[3]

[1],[2],[3] English Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Muhammadiyah Palembang, Indonesia
[1]sriariski.sa@gmail.com, [2]ita_rasyid11@ymail.com, [3] rara_filan89@ymail.com

Abstract

The objective of this study was to find out the influence of TPS to teach reading comprehension to the Tenth Grade Students at SMA Negeri 1 Sekayu. The subject of this study was the tenth-grade students at SMA Negeri 1 Sekayu in academic year 2019/2020 which amounted to 64 students' representatives of 193 populations. This study was a quantitative research. This study used quasi-experimental method. The research design used *two groups pretest posttest design*. The test consisted 30 items in multiple choices. The result of test was calculated by using SPSS Software22. The alternative hypothesis (Ha) was examined through the test. Based on the criteria of testing hypotheses, the alternative (Ha) 5% significance level was t- obtained of the test. It means that teaching reading comprehension by using TPS technique to the Eighth-Grade students of SMA Negeri 1 Sekayu in the academic year 2020 was effective.

Keywords: think-pair-share, reading comprehension

Introduction

English is an international language. Almost all countries have adapted English used as a compulsory subject at school. In learning English language, four skills that should be taught to students. They are listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Among those four skills, reading is one of the four language skills that should be mastered by students. Mastering reading skill also becomes a must for all of the students who are researching English as a foreign language.

Reading is an important skill to be mastered by students because it deals with other skills such as listening, speaking and writing. According to Medina (2012), for academic purposes, reading is important because it is one of the most frequently used language skills in everyday life to get information. (p.81). Unfortunately, most of the teaching reading comprehension in senior high school is still conducted as teacher centered approach. In this case, teacher-centered approach led students the opportunity to develop ideas, comprehend text, and create discussion in learning is so limited. As that fact, the consequence is the students get bored to learn reading.

The researchers also did an observation and interview in pre-research at SMA Negeri 1 Sekayu, there are many students thought that reading was the most difficult part when learning English because they had problems when they read English text. The students' motivation to follow reading activity was low. The students were not enthusiastic and interested in learning reading. Moreover, they looked sleepy and bored during the lesson. Most of the students still got difficulties in comprehending English texts. They found it difficult in comprehending a text when finding many new words. The students also tended to be passive during the teaching

and learning process. They did not actively engage in the learning activities.

One of the strategies to implement cooperative learning is through Think-Pair Share (TPS). It provokes students to think about what they were going to share then asked them to conduct a discussion. TPSis a cooperative discussion strategy developed by Frank Lyman and his collogues in Maryland. TPS technique is one of the Cooperative Learning Strategies. Sugiarto and Sumarsono (2014) explained the implementation of Think-Pair-Share model to improve students' ability in reading narrative texts. Think-Pair-Share technique should develop the thinking of cooperative learning in terms of knowledge, skills, and problem solving of each student. In most of the studies conducted by Bataineh (2015); Martha, Emmanuel, and Seraphim (2015); (Tint and Nyunt, 2015); Bamiro (2015) has found the significant effect of TPS on achievement, self-esteem, to promote active learning, to promote higher quality cognitive skills and problem-solving skills in students. Deshpande and Salman (2016); Raba, (2017); Mohmoud, (2013); Lee, C. et.al. (2018) TPS offers great potential to improve collaboration and communication between peers. It can also be used to improve student engagement in the learning process

In other words, TPS is a group discussion which students would listen, or they would be given a question of presentation. Then, they have time to think individually, talk with each other in pairs, and finally share responses with the larger group. TPS technique gives the student time to think about an answer and activates prior knowledge. TPS technique enhances students' communication skills as they discuss their ideas with their classmates. Students also had the opportunity to discuss with other students about their

response before being asked to share ideas. By applying TPS strategy, the researchers expects the students would be able to acquire language easier based on the material given. The researchers is interested in conducting research, and in making students more active in comprehending the material. That is why the researchers is interested in conducting this research. Therefore, the problem of this study formulated, as follow "How is the influence of Think Pair Share to teach reading at the tenth grade of SMA Negeri 1 Sekayu?"

Literature Review

1. Definition of Teaching

There are many various definitions of teaching. According to Sulaiman (2017), teaching is such a verbal interaction among the teacher and the students in a good learning sequence or atmosphere. The teacher should have good skills and competencies in teaching, such as making interesting lesson to the students. (p.1). While others regard teaching as educating and habit formatting to make good learners. Brown (2006), teaching is guiding and facilitating learning, enabling the learner to learn, setting the condition for learning (p.19). Based on that theory, the researchers thinks that teaching is the process of transfer and receive the knowledge by doing the activity inside the room. It handled by the teacher and followed by the students.

2. Reading

Reading is the one important skill in English, and it helps the students get more information by reading activity. While reading not only read the text without not knowing the meaning of the text, if it happens, the reader would get hard to understand to catch the main point of the text itself. According to Trihoran (2012), reading is one of the

language skills and concurrently of the basic subjects of the English department and reading is a private, it is a mental, or cognitive, a process which involves a reader in trying to follow a respond to a message from a researchers who is distant in space and time (p.1). Based on the definition stated, the researchers concludes that reading is the process of understanding the meaning and the researchers idea about the topic.

Wallace (1966: 4) describes that reading has three main objectives, they are: a). Reading for survival It means reading a text that is very crucial for life, for example an instruction sign. Survival reading serves immediate needs; b). Reading for learning It is expected to be exclusively school-related. Reading is intended to support learning. The reader needs to "translate" the text literally or metaphorically, to learn vocabulary, to identify "useful" structure or collocations, to use a text as a model for writing and to practice pronunciation, for example, one reads a text loudly, then analyzes it and makes the same kind of text; c). Reading for pleasure Reading for pleasure is reading to get happiness. The reader wants to enjoy the sound and rhythm or rhyme of the text. The text being read is written originally to offer enjoyment. For example, read the recount text.

From the purposed of reading above, the researchers used to read for learning in SMA Negeri 1 Sekayu. It is intended to support learning. The students need to "translate" the text, to learn vocabulary, to identify "useful" structure or collocations, to use a text as a model for writing and to practice pronunciation, for example, one reads text loudly, then analyzed it and makes the same kind of text. It is expected to solve the reading's problem of the students.

3. Definition of Reading Comprehension

Reading is a complex, purposeful, interactive, comprehending, and flexible activity that takes considerable time and resources to develop. Bojovic (2010) states that reading comprehension is a process of getting meaning from and bringing meaning to a text (p.1). It means that reading comprehension is the ability to read text, process it, and understand its meaning. Reading comprehension is defined as the level of understanding of a text/message.

Meanwhile, Smith and Johnson (1980) states that reading comprehension means the understanding, evaluating utilizing of information and gained through the interaction between reader and author. Reading comprehension means understanding what has or have been read. Reading is a complex process in which the reader uses mental content to contain the meaning from written materials it means that the reader is supposed to recognize the meaning of printed words. It can be said that reading comprehension is the capability to understand or grasp it ideas of one passage.

From some definitions above can be simply that reading comprehension relates to understanding and thinking process to get the message from the reading materials. In other words, the reader understands all or most of the thoughts the author intended to communicate. Thus, reading comprehension involves other skills such recalling word meaning, finding answer to questions answered explicitly or in paraphrase, drawing inference from the context, and grabbing idea in the content.

4. Level of Reading Comprehension

According to Heilman (1988: 246), there are four types of reading comprehension often distinguished based

on the reader's purpose and types of reading used. These are the level of reading comprehension, as follows:

a. Literal comprehension. This level of comprehension represents the minimum of involvement on the part of the reader. It is the simple understanding of the words and ideas of author. The author's massage is received but not examined, evaluated, or utilized in any way.

b. Interpretive comprehension. At this level the reader not only knows what the author said but goes beyond that simple knowledge. It involves an effort to grasp relationship, compare facts with personal experiences, understand sequences. see cause and effect relationship, and generally interpret the massage. It requires a more active participation on the part of the reader.

c. Applied comprehension. At this level reader does more than merely receiving and interpreting the massage. The reader evaluates the author's ideas, either accepting or rejecting them or applying then to some new situation.

d. Critical comprehension. At this level reader analyzing, evaluating, and personally reacting to information presented in a passage.

From the statement above, to achieve comprehension in reading, in literal comprehension the readers have to know the information explicitly. In interpretative comprehension the reader has to retain the information implicitly. The last, in the critical comprehension, the reader has to be able to evaluate the information by giving a question and critique the information.

5. TPSTechnique

As already mentioned, TPS strategy was developed by Prof. Frank Lyman in 1981 at University of Maryland. Further developed by Kagan (1994) to provide the teacher flexible ways to implement cooperative learning. It has been adopted by many writers in the field of cooperative learning since then. McTighe & Lyman (1988) defined the Think-Pair-Share technique as a multi-mode discussion cycle that is divided into three stages: (1) Think: Students are given time to think individually after a question is posed; (2) Pair: Discuss the ideas with each other within a paired setting to produce a final answer; and finally (3) Share: Each pair share their new improved answer with the rest of the class. Millis and Cottel (1998) believe that the use of TPS provides all students with opportunities to discuss their thoughts and ideas; i.e. they start to construct their knowledge in these discussions and also to discover what they do and do not know. This active process is not normally available to them during the traditional lecture. According to Jones (2006: online) in this strategy teacher ask a question which can generate discussion and higher order thinking among students. Emmanuel, (2016) and Raba (2017) clarify that three constituents of TPS, namely, time for thinking, time for sharing with a partner, and time to share among peer to a larger group. The use of the strategy unites the cognitive and social aspects of learning, promote the development of thinking and the construction of knowledge.

6. Procedures of Applying TPS Technique

In teaching reading, the researchers taught the experimental group by using TPSstrategy and for the control group was taught by using the common ways. The activities for teaching the experimental group were

divided into three activities. They were: pre-activities, whilst activity, and post activity. These are the explanations of those three activities:

a. *Pre-Activities*
1) Teacher opens the class by greeting the students, students answer teachers greeting.
2) Teacher checks the student's attendance list; students listen their name carefully.
3) Teacher attracts students' attention through interesting question such as "have you ever read biography text about someone?". The students answer teachers question and share their answer

b. *Whilst-Activities*
1) Teacher explains the generic structure in recount text, students listen carefully and pay attention to the teacher's explanation.
2) Teacher gives reading material and asks students to read it and answer it those comprehensive question individually (Think Activities). The students read the reading material individually and get the information from the text (Think Activities)
3) Teacher asks the students into the pair to discuss their answers with their partners (Pair Activities). Students find their partners and discuss it together (Pair Activities).
4) Teacher asks students to share their idea and discussing the answer with other pairs in group.

Students share their opinion in pairs.
5) Students share their ideas and answer into the whole of the class randomly (Sharing Activities). Some students share their opinion randomly in the whole of the class (Sharing Activities).
6) Teacher rechecks students answer generally, students listen and pay attention to the teacher's explanation.
7) Teacher improves students answer generally, students make some notes after teacher explains it.

c. *Post-Activities*
1) Teacher asks the students "Do you have any questions?", students raise his/her hands and ask a question.
2) Teacher answer students' question, students pay attention to teacher's explanation and make some notes.
3) Teacher gives posttest to the students, students answer posttest.
4) Teacher ask students to give summary what they have learned today, students give summary to teacher and note it.
5) Teachers closing material and say good bye, students say good bye too

Methodology

This research was a quantitative research. This research is a process to find knowledge that uses data in the form of numbers as a tool to analyze information about what you want to know. This study used a Quasi-Experimental method design and this

design was "two groups pretest posttest design". There were two variables in this study, namely the independent variable and the dependent variable. The independent variable was the TPS and the dependent variable was the student's ability in comprehending reading text.

In this study, researcherss used pre-test and post-test for the control group without doing special treatment, while for the experimental group using pre-test and post-test coupled with special treatment using the *TPS*. For more details, see Table 1 below:

Table 1. Research Subject

Subject	Pretest	Treatment	Posttest
X.IPA 6	O_1		O_2
X.IPA 5	O_1	X	O_2

Remarks:
S   : Research Subject (S Control /
               S Experiment)
X   : Treatment
O_1 : Giving Pretest
O_2 : Giving Posttest

Technique for Collecting the Data
Test
The test used by researcherss is to contain student learning achievements tests, while the form of the test is a multiple-choice question, which are used to find out the progress of the students' reading comprehension scores before and after treatment. The researchers used recount texts for reading comprehension test, which covers four options, namely (a,b,c,d).
Non-Test
 a. Observation
     Observation is the direct observation of an activity carried out in order to find out the condition or a condition that would be observed.
 b. Documentation
     The documentation used to obtain data, directly from the research site, discusses the teaching material used, the class learning process before the study, photographs during the

research, videos, where all of this data is relevant to the research.

Technique for Analyzing the Data
To analyze the data of this study, researcherss conducted several stages; first, data from the pre-test and post-test results were analyzed to find averages obtained from the control and experimental group. Second, the data obtained by the control and experimental group were compared statistically to determine differences in the results between the two groups using paired sample tests. Third, the data obtained from the second step, were compared statistically to find out the significant differences in the results between the two groups using paired sample t-tests; to find significant differences from each criterion measured from the value of the test results obtained by each group, and in order to find out which criteria affect the achievement of understanding of reading comprehension using paired sample t-tests. The last step taken by the researcherss was to find a significant difference from the results obtained by each group using paired sample t-test, in order to prove how significant, the difference is and whether the difference was caused by the treatment given. All calculations were analyzed using SPSS 22.0 for windows.

In this study, researcherss used the t-test statistical procedure. This t-test formula was used to prove the hypothesis in this study, to find out whether there was a significant increase between the pre-test scores and post-test students.

Result and Discussion
The statistical result given is categorized into two parts:

Description of the Score Pretest and Posttest of the Experimental Group

This is described as a Statistical result with regards to the score of student learning result before treatment (pretest) of a student in the experimental group. The class was treated in the form of the application of TPS technique and the value of student learning result after the treatment (posttest) can be seen in the following table 2 below:

Table 2. Description of the Score Pretest and Posttest Student Learning Achievements of the Experimental Group

		Pretest					Posttest		
		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent			Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	50	11	34.4	34.4	Valid	63	1	3.1	3.1
	53	5	15.6	50.0		70	4	12.5	15.6
	60	8	25.0	75.0		73	1	3.1	18.8
	63	2	6.3	81.3		76	9	28.1	46.9
	66	2	6.3	87.5		80	7	21.9	68.8
	70	1	3.1	90.6		83	4	12.5	81.3
	73	2	6.3	96.9		86	3	9.4	90.6
	76	1	3.1	100.0		90	1	3.1	93.8
						93	1	3.1	96.9
						96	1	3.1	100.0
	Total	32	100.0			Total	32	100.0	100.0

Source: Research Data of 2020

Based on the table above, it was known that the result of pretest in experimental group of highest score was 76 and the lowest score was 50. There were two students (6.3%) who got 73, one student (3.1%) who got 70, two students (6.3%) who got 66, two students (6.3%) who got 63, eight students (25.0%) who got 60, and five students (15.6%) who got53. Then, it was known that the result of Posttest in experimental group of highest score was 96 and the lowest score was 63. There was one student (3.1%) who got 93, which was considered as the highest score, one student (3.1%) who got 90, three students (9.4%) who got 86, four students (12.5%) who got 83, seven students (21.9%) who got 80, nine students (28.1%) who got 76, one student (3.1%) who got 73, and four students (12.5%) who got 70. It showed the reading comprehension learning by using the TPS technique can affect learning achievements.

Description of the Score Pretest and Posttest of the Control Group

Statistical result with regards to the value of the original test (pretest) of student in the control class, which is the class that is not given treatment in the form of the implementation of TPS technique and the value of student learning result after being given treatment (posttest) can be seen in the following table 3:

Table 3. Description of the Score Pretest and Posttest Student Learning Achievements of the Control Group

		Pretest					Posttest		
		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent			Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	46	3	9.4	9.4	Valid	50	6	18.8	18.8
	50	10	31.3	40.6		53	1	3.1	21.9
	53	8	25.0	65.6		60	9	28.1	50.0
	60	4	12.5	78.1		63	5	15.6	65.6
	63	2	6.3	84.4		66	2	6.3	71.9
	66	3	9.4	93.8		70	2	6.3	78.1
	70	1	3.1	96.9		73	2	6.3	84.4
	73	1	3.1	100.0		76	4	12.5	96.9

		Pretest					Posttest		
		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent			Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
							80	1	3.1	100.0
	Total	32	100.0			Total	32	100.0	100.0

Source: Research Data of 2020

From the table above, it was known that the result of pretest in control group of the highest score was 73 and the lowest score was 46. There was one student (3.1%) who got 70, three students (9.4%) who got 66, two students (6.3%) who got 63, four students (12.5%) who got 60, eight students (25.0%) who got 53, ten students (31.3%) who got 50. Then, it was known that result of Posttest in Control Group of the highest score was 80 and the lowest score was 53. There four students (12.5%) who got 76, two students (6.3%) who got 73, two students (6.3%) who got 70, two students (6.3%) who got 66, five students (15.6%) who got 63, nine students (28.1%) who got 60 and one student (3.1%) who got 53. It showed that reading comprehension without special treatment (without using the TPS technique) then the results were very little difference or in other words the pre-test and post-test values were almost the same.

To find out whether learning by using the TPS technique can contribute to student reading comprehension learning achievements can be seen in table 4 below this:

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics of Variables Based on Pretest and Posttest results

	THINK-PAIR-SHARE TECHNIQUE (TPS)			
	Experimental Group		Control Group	
	Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest
Mean	57.66	79.03	55.28	62.81
SD.	7.938	7.005	7.323	8.935
Df	31		31	
t-table	1.684		1.684	
t-obtained	12.096		4.390	
Significance	0.000		0.000	

The table above showed a very significant difference in student reading comprehension. It could be seen that the acquisition for the experimental group was 12,096 with a significance level of 0,000. Because t-obtained is higher than t-table ($t_{obtained}$ 12.096 > t_{table} 1.684) with a significance level of $p < 0.05$, Therefore, it showed that H_0 was rejected. It means that there was significant influence in student reading comprehension before treatment and after treatment using the TPS technique.

Based on the data analysis in the previous section it could be concluded that the TPS strategy was effective in teaching reading comprehension by using TPS strategy to the Tenth-Grade students of SMA Negeri 1 Sekayu. The result of the research showed that the students who were taught reading comprehension through the TPS strategy got better achievement than who were not taught in experimental class, when the mean in the experimental group of pretests was lower score, while the mean of posttest the higher score. The result of mean of posttest the higher score. It could be concluded that there were differences between students' scores in the pretest and the students score in the posttest of experimental class.

In additional, the mean result from pretest and posttest in the control group revealed that there were differences between the students pretest score and posttest score but not significance as the experimental group. Based on the statistics analysis of independent sample t-test, the result of the students' scores in experimental group and control group that the value of t-obtained 6.148.

The alternative hypothesis (Ha) was examined through the test. Based on the criteria of testing hypotheses, the alternative (ha) 5% significance level was obtained of the test. It means that teaching reading comprehension by using TPS technique to the tenth-grade students of SMA Negeri 1 Sekayu in academic year 2020 was effective.

Conclusion

From descriptive statistical analysis demonstrates the use of the *Think-Pair-Share* Technique (TPS) in the experimental class on student learning results which is superior to the control class. The result of inferential statistics in the hypothesis test obtains that H_0 was rejected. The null hypothesis (H_0) which was rejected was concluded that there was an influence of the implementation of the *Think-Pair-Share* Technique (TPS) on the enhancement of statistical learning as a result of tenth-grade students of SMA Negeri 1 Sekayu. Also, it is expected that the implementation of the *Think-Pair-Share* Technique (TPS) can enhance student statistical learning results in data interpretation material.

The suggestions that can be presented are as follows; 1) The *Think-Pair-Share* Technique (TPS) can be used to improve reading comprehension learning achievements, 2) It is expected that further research could use this learning technique for other subjects, 3) For further research, it is expected that the researcherss really understand how the concept of the *Think-Pair-Share* Technique (TPS) so that research can be carried out maximally and get more satisfying results.

References

Bamiro, A, O. (2015). Effects of guided discovery and think-pair-share strategies on secondary school students'' achievement in chemistry. SAGE Publishing, 1-7.

Bataineh, M, Z. (2015). Think-Pair-Share, Co Op-Co Op and Traditional Learning Strategies on Undergraduate Academic Performance. *Journal of Educational and Social Research MCSER Publishing*, Rome-Italy, 5(1), 217-226.

Bojovic. (2010) Reading Skills and Reading Comprehension in English for Specific Purposes. *The International Language Conference on the Importance of Learning Professional Foreign Languages for Communication between Cultures*, Celje, Slovenia.4,1.

Brown, H. Douglas. (2006). Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy, Second Edition. New York: Pearson Education, Inc.

Deshpande. A & Salman. B. (2016). Think-Pair-Share: Application of an Active Learning Technique in Engineering and Construction Management Classes. *Annual International Conference Proceedings (52th AICP) the Associated Schools of Construction*

Emmanuel, A.A. (2016). Effect of think-pair-share learning strategy on students' achievement in chemistry. Retrieved from:http://nairastudent.com/effect-of-thinkpair-share-learning-strategy-on-students-achievement-in-chemistry/

Heilman, A, et.al. (1988). *The Principles and The Practices of Teaching Reading*. Ohio: Charles E. Merill Publishing Co.

Jones, Raymond, C. (2006). *Think - Pair - Share*. Retrieved on 20/9/2011 from www. Readingquest.org/start/tps.htm.

Kagan, S. and Kagan, M. (1994). *The Structural Approach: Six Keys to Cooperative Learning*. In Handbook of cooperative learning methods, ed. S. Sharan, 115-133.

Lee, C., Li, H., & Shahrill, M. (2018). Utilising the think-pair-share technique in the learning of probability. *International Journal on Emerging Mathematics Education*, *2*(1), 49-64.http://dx.doi.org/10.12928/ijeme.v2i1.8218.

Lyman, F.T. (1981). *The Responsive Classroom Discussion: The Inclusion of All Students*. College Park: University of Maryland Press, pp. 109 – 113.

Mahmoud, K. (2013). Think-Pair-Share: A Teaching Learning Strategy to Enhance Students' Critical Thinking. *Educational Research Quarterly, 36*(4).

Martha, M. I., Emmanue, l. & Seraphina, M. (2015). Effect of think- pair –share strategy on secondary school mathematics students" achievement and academic selfesteem in fractions. *American International Journal of Contemporary Scientific Research (AIJCSR), 2*(2), 141-147.

Tighe, J., & Lyman Jr, F. T. (1988). Cueing thinking in the classroom: The promise of theory-embedded tools. *Educational Leadership, 45*(7), 18-24.

Medina, S. L. (2011). Effect of strategy instruction in a EFL reading comprehension course. *A Case Research. Profile journal 14*(1): p.79-89.

Millis, B.J., and Cottell, P.G., (1998). *Cooperative Learning for Higher Education Faculty*. Phoenix Ariz: American Council on Education and the Oryx Press.

Raba, A. A. A. (2017). The Influence of TPSon Improving Students' Oral Communication Skills in EFL Classrooms. *Scientific Research Publishing, 8*, 12-23.

Smith, Richard J. and Johnson, Dale D. (1980). *Teaching Children to Read. Second Edition*. USA: Addison-Wesley Publishing.

Sugiarto, D & Sumarsono, P. (2014). The Implementation of Think-Pair-Share Model to Improve Students' Ability in Reading Narrative Texts. *International Journal of English and Education, 3*(3), 206-215.

Sulaiman M. (2017). *Teach the Students Not the Books (A Handbook Of TEFL)* (1st ed). Palembang.

Tint, S. S. & Nyuut. E. E. (2015). Collaborative learning with Think-pair-share Technique. *Computer Applications: An International Journal (CAIJ), 2*(1), 1-11.

Trihoran. (2012). *Reading 1 Basic Reading Skill*. Serang: Loquen Press.

Wallace. (1966). *Reading*. New York: Cambridge University Press.