The Effect of Using Think-Pair-Share in Teaching Present Tense to Second Semester Students of Indonesia Prima University

Dolli Rotua Sinaga¹, Kresna Ningsih Manik², Merry Susanty Br Tarigan³, Ermina Waruwu⁴

1,2,3Universitas Prima, 4Sekolah Tinggi Pastoral St. Bonaventura Delitua Medan, Indonesia

E-mail: dollirotuasinaga@unprimdn.ac.id

Article Info	Abstract
	The objective of this study was to discover the significant effect of using think-pair-share in teaching present tense. The population of this research was the second semester students of Indonesia Prima University, academic year 2020/2020. The sample was 40 students; 20 students in the experimental group and 20 students in the control group. The data was collected by using a test. The instrument consisted of 40 items. The data were analyzed by using T-test formula. The findings indicate that using think-pair-share showed positive effect on the students' learning achievement. It was proved from the result of the post test for the experimental group (78.5) is higher than the control group (55.25) and the result of t-test (4.42) was higher than the t-table (2.021) and level of significance (0.05) which means that the hypothesis stating that the students' achievement taught by using think-pair-share was higher than the conventional method in teaching present tense was accepted. The conclusion is the t-observed is higher than t-table (4.42 > 2.021; p = 0.005). It means that students' learning achievement taught by using think-pair-share is higher than the conventional method. So, English teachers/lecturers are suggested to apply think-pair-share in teaching present tense.

Artikel Info	Abstrak
	Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui pengaruh yang signifikan dari penggunaan think-pair-share dalam pengajaran present tense. Populasi dalam penelitian ini adalah mahasiswa semester dua Universitas Prima Indonesia tahun ajaran 2020/2020. Sampelnya adalah 40 siswa; 20 siswa pada kelompok eksperimen dan 20 siswa pada kelompok kontrol. Pengumpulan data dilakukan dengan menggunakan tes. Instrumen terdiri dari 40 item. Data dianalisis dengan menggunakan rumus T-test. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa penggunaan think-pair-share berpengaruh positif terhadap prestasi belajar siswa. Hal ini dibuktikan dari hasil post test kelompok eksperimen (78.5) lebih tinggi dari kelompok kontrol (55.25) dan hasil t-test (4,42) lebih tinggi dari t-tabel (2,021) dan tingkat signifikansi. (0,05) yang berarti hipotesis yang menyatakan bahwa prestasi belajar siswa yang diajar dengan menggunakan think-pair-share lebih tinggi daripada metode konvensional dalam mengajar present tense diterima. Kesimpulannya adalah t hitung lebih besar dari t tabel (4,42 > 2,021; p = 0,005). Artinya prestasi belajar siswa yang diajar dengan metode think-pair-share lebih tinggi dibandingkan dengan metode konvensional. Oleh karena itu, guru/dosen bahasa Inggris disarankan untuk menerapkan think-pair-share dalam mengajar present tense.

I. INTRODUCTION

The English curriculum has been changed periodically. However, it has not been maximally implemented. Teaching English in the Junior High School is still oriented to the language structure. English should be well-mastered by the students. Students have to master the four language skills, namely listening, speaking, reading, and writing that have equal rank of importance in the mastery of English with grammar and vocabulary within the four skills. Many educators believe that they are using cooperative learning. In fact, they are missing its essenoductce. A crucial difference exists between simply putting students in groups to learn and in structuring cooperation among students. Cooperation is not having students sit side by side at the same table to talk with each other as they do their individual assignments. It is not assigning a report to a group of students where one student does all the work and the others put their names on the product as well. It is not having students do a task individually with instructions that the ones who finish first are to help the slower students. Cooperation is much more than being physically near other students, discussing material with them, helping them, or sharing material among students, although each is important in

cooperative learning. In cooperative learning, there are may techniques and one of them is Think-Pair-Share.

Think-Pair-Share is one of the cooperative learning techniques that is developed by Lyman (1987) and Kagan (1994) in order to improve teaching quality in order to bring the effectiveness of learning English. Think-Pair-Share is one of the teaching techniques which is assumed to be able to increase students' learning achievement. There are three steps of cooperative structure in think-pair-share. In the first step, individual think silently about a question showed by the teacher, individual pair up during the second step and exchange their thought. And in the third step, the pairs share their responses with other pairs, other teams, or entire group. The problem of this study is formulated in the form of a question as the following,"Is there any significant effect of using Think-Pair-Share in teaching Present Tense towards students' learning achievement?". The objective of this study is to find out the significant effect of using Think-Pair-Share in teaching present tense. There are 16 tenses in English, but this study only focused on present tense. In the teaching learning process, students are the main subject and the teacher as the facilitator of importing knowledge to the students. In teaching English, the teacher uses the acts teaching so that it will find the students' interest and stimulate their minds and also encourage the to participate in the learning process. The use of active learning strategies, such as cooperative learning, is growing at a remarkable rate. Kagan (1989) states that cooperative learning is a method where teachers place students in small teams with of different learning levels. There are 9 techniques of cooperative learning, each is explained as follows: 1) Jigsaw: Groups with five students are set up. Each group member is assigned some unique material to learn and then to teach to his group members. To help in the

Learning students across the class working on the same sub-section get together to decide what is important and how to teach it. After practising in these "expert" groups the original groups reform and students teach each other. 2) Think-Pair-Share: This is a four-step discussion strategy that incorporates time and aspects of cooperative learning. Students (and teachers) learn to LISTEN while a question is posed, THINK (without raising hands) of a response, PAIR with a neighbor to discuss responses with the whole class. Time limit and transition cues and help

discussion move smoothly. Students are able to rehearse responses mentally and verbally, and all students have an opportunity to talk. Both students and teachers have increased opportunities to think and become involved in group discussion. 3) Three-Step Interview: Each member of a team chooses another member to be a friend. During the first step individuals interview their friends change roles. For the final step, members share their friend's response with the team. 4) Round Robin Brainstorming: The class divided into small groups (4 to 6) with one person appointed as the recorder. A question is posed with many answers and students are given to think about answers. After the "think time", members of the team share responses with another round robin style. The recorder writes down the answers of the group members. The person next to the recorder starts and other person in the group in order to give an answer until time is over. 5) Three-minute Review: Teachers stop any time during a lecture or discussion and give the team three minutes to review what has been said and ask for claryfing questions or answer questions. 6) Numbered Heads: A team of four is established. Each member is given numbers of 1, 2, 3, 4. Questions are asked of the group. Groups work together to answer the question so that all can verbally answer the question. Teacher calls out a number (two) and each two is asked to give the answer. 7) Team Pair Solo: The students do problems first as a team, then with a friend, and finally on their own. It is designed to motivate students to tackle and suceed at problems which initially are beyond their ability. It is based on a simple notion of mediated learning. Students can do more things with help (mediation) than they can do alone. By allowing them to work on problems they could not do alone, first as a team and then with a friend, they progress to a point they can do alone that which at first they could do only with help. 8) Circle the Sage: The teacher polls the class to see which students have a special knowledge to share. For example the teacher may ask who is in the class was able to solve a difficult math homework question, who had visited Mexico, who knows the chemical reactions involved in how salting the streets help dissipate snow. Those students (the sages) stand and spread out in the room. The teacher then has the rest of classmates each surround a sage, with no two members of the same team going to the same sage. The sage explains what they know while the classmates listen, ask questions, and

take notes. All students then return to their teams. Each in turn, explains what they learned. Because each one has gone to a different sage, they compare notes. If there is disagreement, they stand up as a team. Finally, the disagreements are aired and resolved. 9) Partners: The class divided into teams of four. Partners move to one side of the room. Half of each is given an assignment to master to be able to teach the other half. Patrners work to learn and can consult with other partners working on the same material. Teams go back together with each set of partners teaching the other set. Partners quiz and tutor teammates. Team reviews how well they learned and taught and how they might improve the process.

In this research, the writer emphasis on Think-Pair-Share technique. Think-Pair-Share is a strategy designed to provide students with "food for thought" on a given topic enabling them to formulate individual ideas and share these ideas with another students. This is a relatively low risk and short collaborative learning structure, and is ideally suited for instructors and students who are new to collaborative learning. It was proposed by Lyman (1981) to encourage students classroom participation. Rather than using a basic recitation method in which a teacher poses a question and one student offers a response, Think-Pair-Share is a cognitive rehearsal stucture that can be used to help the students; a) recall events, b) make a summary. c) stimulate thinking, d) share responses, feelings, and ideas. Kagan (1994) suggests using this structure/strategy for developing thinking skills, promoting communication skills and encouraging information sharing. He considers this tools taht access verbal or linguistics and interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligence. Listening skills, communication skills, using appropriate stuctures and features of spoken language, effective note taking and cooperative skills are most effectively assessed when using this strategy. It is a cooperative discussion strategy where students are given the opportunity to talk about the content and discuss ideas before sharing with a whole group. It introduces the elements of "think time" and peer interaction, which are two important features of cooperative learning. Think-Pair-Share's is aimed to assist students to process information, develop communication skills, and refine their thinking.

This strategy is directed to the teacher in order to: a)pose an open-ended question or problem. b) give students a minute or two to think about their answer, c) pair students to discuss the answer and share ideas and d) give opportunities for students to share their response with a small group or the whole class. There are some steps of Think-Pair-Share technique that have to be applied in class. Abraham & Simone (1995: 57) divide it into four steps, namely: a) pose a question; teacher poses a thought-provoking question to the class for solution, b) think individually where students are given a limited of time to think their own answers or solutions to the problematic question, c) work in a pair (follow student) where together each pair of the students can reformulate a common answer based on their collective insight to possible solutions to the problem. At times, the process can go one step farther by regroup into foursome. The pair step in the model also promotes much more conversation among students about the issue entailed by the questions, and d) share the answer with the whole class; where pair of students have constructed displays of their answer as in a chart or diagram. The final step of think-pair-share has several benefits to all students. They see the same concept expressed in several ways as a different individual finds some unique expression for an answer to the question. Hornby (1987) states that tense is a verb form that shows time; present or past, etc. Tenses are formed either by changing the verb (e.g: know-knew-known, work-worked-worked), or by adding auxiliary verbs (e.g: will know, had worked). There are 16 tenses in English; oneof them is the present continuos tense that will be discussed in this chapter.

The Present Simple Tense is used to explain about things in general. It is used to say that something happens all the time or repeatedly or that something is true in general. It is not important whether the action is happening at the time of speaking. Example: The earth goes round the sun. It is important to a teacher to remember the infinitive form (-s, -es, -ies). Examples: pass = passes, watch= watches, do = does, go = goes. The present simple tense is used to explain how often are done. Example: I usually go to school by bus but I sometimes walk. Used do/does in present simple. The word order in these questions; Do/Does + Subject + Infinitive. Example: Does Chris play tennis? Yes, he does. The hypothesis of the research is formulated such as "the students' achievement in learning present tense taught by using think-pair-share was higher than those taught by using conventional method."

II. METHOD

This research was an experimental research. To collect the data, two groups of students were involved. Experimental group was the group which was taught by using Think-Pair-Share; while the control group was the group which was taught by using conventional method. All the treatment and tests were given by using online teaching learning process. The research design can be seen in the table:

Table 1. The Research Design

Group	Pre test	Treatment	Post test
Experimental	√	Using Think-Pair-Share	√
Control	√	Using Conventional Method	√

The population of this research were the students of second semester students of Teacher Training Faculty in Prima University, academic year 2019/2020. There are two classes taken; class 2B and 2A. Each of the classes consists of 20 students. So, total number of the students is 40 students. From the population of the second semester students of Teacher Training Faculty in Prima University, academic year 2020/2021, a sample of students (15%) was applied. This is accordance with Arikunto's (1993:190) states if the subject of population consists of large number, the sample can be taken between 10%-15% or 20%-25% of population or more. It depends on the researcher's time, energy, and fund. The sample was selected by using cluster random sampling technique. The class was taken randomly, this technique was used by writing the name of classes in a piece of paper that was placed in a box, and then the writer selected one of the classes as an experimental group, and the other one as a control group. In the preparation of the data collection, the writer made a test, which consisting of 40 items. The students' seats had to be arranged in such a way to prevent the students from cheating and the time for doing the test was only 45 minutes. The test was administered both before and after the treatment was completed. The experimental group was given a treatment by using Think-Pair-Share while the control group was given a treatment by using conventional way. These are the treatments given both in Experimental Group and Control Group.

1. Validity

The validity of a test is the extent to which the test measures what is intended to measure (Harrison, 1983:11). It means that the test which was valid given the appropriate information that is need by the case. In this study, the writer applied content validity which concerned with how well the test measure the subject matter and learning out comes covered during the instructional period. The tests were used primarily to describe the students' performance on a given domain of achievement by giving the sample of items adequately as the major concern. In this case, for the best result of test validity, the items of the test were constructed in such way that the items were representative to both curriculum content and behavioral objectives.

2. Reliability

Reliability of a good test refers to the consistency of the measurements. It means if the test is repeated in different occasion and to different people, the outcome should not fluctuate too much. Therefore, to find out whether the test is reliable, the test used the formula of Richard Kuderson (KR-21) as follows:

$$R = \frac{K}{K-1}\left[1 - \frac{M(K-M)}{KS^2}\right]$$

Where:
R = reliability
K = the number of the items in the tests
M = the means of the test scores
S = standard deviation

To obtain the reliability of the test, firstly the mean (M) and the standard deviation should be counted. The value of the reliability as the following:
0.0-0.40 = the reliability is low
0.041 – 0.70= the reliability is fair
0.71 – 1.00 = the reliability is very good

3. Technique for Analyzing Data

In order to know the difference between the result of using think-pair-share and without using think-pair-share, t-test formula was applied:

$$t = \frac{Ma - Mb}{\sqrt{\left[\frac{da^2 + db^2}{(Na+Nb)-2}\right]\left[\frac{1}{Na} + \frac{1}{Nb}\right]}}$$

Where:
Ma = Mean of experimental group
Mb = Mean of control group
da^2 = The standard deviation of experimental group
db^2 = The standard deviation of control group
Na = Total sample of experimental group

Nb = Total sample of Control Group

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSIONS

1. Reliability of the Test

In order to find out the reliability of the test, Richard Kuderson 21 was used and the calculation of the reliability is presented.

K = 20

M = 67.2

S = 20.4

$$R = \frac{K}{K-1}\left[1 - \frac{M(K-M)}{KS^2}\right]$$

$$R = \frac{20}{20-1}\left[1 - \frac{67.2(20-67.2)}{20(20.4)^2}\right]$$

$$R = \frac{20}{19}\left[1 - \frac{67.2(-47.2)}{20(416.6)}\right]$$

$$R = 1.4$$

The calculation shows that the coefficient reliability of the test is 1A. This coefficient is considered very high.

2. Data Analysis

To find out the differences result between the students' achievement in the experimental group and control group, it is important to know the scores of the students of both groups. Result of the students' scores in the experimental group.

Table 2. Result of the students' scores in the experimental group

No.	Students' initial name	Pre test	Post test
1.	NI	70	90
2.	TI	45	70
3.	DE	55	80
4.	AN	55	75
5.	FI	60	85
6.	ES	55	75
7.	WI	55	85
8.	YO	55	75
9.	PR	50	70
10.	JU	60	80
11.	AR	60	80
12.	JO	50	75
13.	FI	70	90
14.	JI	65	85
15.	RA	70	90
16.	DA	50	75
17.	DE	40	60
18.	HO	60	80
19.	UT	55	75
20.	DI	55	75
	Total number	1135	1570
	Means	56.75	78.5

The table above shows that in the control group, the lowest score for pre-test was 40 and the highest score was 70, while the lowest score for the post test was 60 and the highest score was 90. In this case, the students' mean scores in the pre-test was 56.75 and in the post-test was 78.5. Result of the students' scores in the Control Group.

Table 3. Result of the Students Score in the Control Group

No.	Students' initial name	Pre test	Post test
1.	KR	60	60
2.	AN	45	60
3.	LA	45	40
4.	KI	40	50
5.	KU	45	40
6.	RI	45	50
7.	EK	40	60
8.	IV	40	50
9.	TI	45	65
10.	FO	45	60
11.	HA	50	60
12.	AL	50	55
13.	KH	50	60
14.	RA	55	45
15.	CH	60	50
16.	HA	65	65
17.	LI	50	40
18.	PO	50	70
19.	AL	60	65
20.	RI	40	60
	Total number	975	1105
	Means	48.75	55.25

The table above shows that in the control group, the lowest score in the pre-test was 40 and the highest score was 60, while the lowest score in the post test was 40 and the highest score was 70. In this case, the students' mean scores in the pre-test was 48.75 and in the post-test was 55.25. Based on the students' scores in the pre-test and post-test in both groups, the calculation of the t-test can be seen below:

Table 4. Calculation of the t-test for the experimental group

No.	Pre test	Post test	T2-T1	d-m (da)	da²
1.	70	90	20	-1.75	3.06
2.	45	70	25	3.25	10.56
3.	55	80	25	3.25	10.56
4.	55	75	20	-1.75	3.06
5.	60	85	25	3.25	10.56
6.	55	75	20	-1.75	3.06
7.	55	85	30	8.25	68.06
8.	55	75	20	-1.75	3.06
9.	50	70	20	-1.75	3.06
10.	60	80	20	-1.75	3.06
11.	60	80	20	-1.75	3.06
12.	50	75	25	3.25	10.56
13.	70	90	20	-1.75	3.06
14.	65	85	20	-1.75	3.06
15.	70	90	20	-1.75	3.06
16.	50	75	25	3.25	10.56

No.					
17.	40	60	20	-1.75	3.06
18.	60	80	20	-1.75	3.06
19.	55	75	20	-1.75	3.06
20.	55	75	20	-1.75	3.06
Total	1135	1570	435		163.7

The table shows the standard deviation of the test in the experimental group. The highest score was 30 and the lowest score was 20. The result of standard deviation of experimental group was 163.7. Man of experimental group (Ma) = 435/20 = 21.75.

Table 5. Calculation of t-test for the control group

No.	Pre test	Post test	T2-T1	d-m (db)	db^2
1.	60	60	0	-10.25	105.06
2.	45	60	15	4.75	22.56
3.	45	40	-5	-15.25	232.56
4.	40	50	10	-0.25	0.06
5.	45	40	-5	-15.25	232.56
6.	45	50	5	-5.25	27.56
7.	40	60	20	9.75	95.06
8.	40	50	10	-0.25	0.06
9.	45	65	20	9.75	95.06
10.	45	60	15	4.75	22.56
11.	50	60	10	-0.25	0.06
12.	50	55	5	-5.25	27.56
13.	50	60	10	-0.25	0.06
14.	55	45	-10	-20.25	410.06
15.	60	50	-10	-20.25	410.06
16.	65	65	0	-10.25	105.06
17.	50	40	-10	-20.25	410.06
18.	50	70	20	9.75	95.06
19.	60	65	5	-5.25	27.56
20.	40	60	20	9.75	95.06
Total	975	1105	205		241.37

The above table shows the standard deviation of the test in the control group. The highest score was 20 and the lowest score was -10. The result of standard deviation of control group was 241.37. Mean of the control group (Mb) = 205/20 = 10.25. The mean of the control group was 10.25. From the data above, it can be concluded that:
a) Mean of the experimental group (Ma) = 21.75
b) Mean of the control group (Mb) = 10.25
c) Standard deviation of experimental group (da^2) = 163.7
d) Standard deviation of control group (db^2) = 2413.7
e) Total sample of experimental group (Na0 = 20
f) Total sample of control group (Nb) = 20

The t-test formula:

$$t = \frac{21.75 - 10.25}{\sqrt{\frac{163.7 + 2413.7}{20 + 20 - 2} \cdot \frac{1}{20} + \frac{1}{20}}}$$

$$t = \frac{11.5}{\sqrt{\frac{2577.4}{38} \cdot \frac{2}{20}}}$$

$$t = \frac{11.5}{2.60}$$

$$t = 4.42$$

3. Testing the Hypothesis

The testing of hypothesis was aimed at showing the result of the analysis. In this case, the null hypothesis was rejected because $t_{observed}$ (t_o) 3.14 was higher than the value of t-table at the level of significant of 0.05 (2.021). It means that $t_{observed}$ is higher than t_{table} or 4.42 > 2.021; p = 0.05. As a result it can be concluded that the students' achievement in learning present tense taught by using think-pair-share was higher to those taught by using conventional method.

4. Findings

Based on the data, the result of data analysis that using think-pair-share significantly effect to the students' learning achievement. It means that the result of the study shows that the students' learning achievement in experimental group is higher than in the control group. Based on the tables above, it can be concluded that using think-pair-share significantly effect students' learning achievement.

5. Discussion

Since think-pair-share technique was given to the experimental group, the students' learning achievement in experimental group was higher than the control group. Think-pair-share gives significantly effect to the students' learning achievement. It is proved from the result of the post test for experimental group 78.5 which is higher than control group 55.25 and result of t-test which is higher than t-table. The score in the experimental group shows the students' learning achievement increase in high level. The highest score from the result of the post test in the experimental group is 90, while in the control group is 70. The lowest score from the result of the pre-test in the experimental group is 60, while in the control group is 40. The score in the experimental group was higher than the control group. It is influenced by the explanation and the application of think-pair-share toward students' learning achievement

in mastering of the tense. In control group, students' score can be influenced by the explanation the material because in the control group applied conventional teaching method.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

A. Conclusion

After conducting the research and analyzing the data, the writer concludes that the use of think-pair-share strategy gives positives effect on the students' learning achievement. Based on the research findings and data analysis, using think-pair-share is effective in increasing students' learning achievement in mastering the form of tense in oral and written forms. Hypothesis states that there is significant effect of using think-pair-share in teaching present tense toward students' learning achievement. In conclusion, students' learning achievement that taught by using think-pair-share was higher than that taught by using conventional method.

B. Suggestions

Based on the conclusion above, to improve students' learning achievement in learning the present tense, the writer suggests that:
1. Teaching by using think-pair-share is effective in increasing students' learning achievement in mastering the form of tense in oral and written.
2. Using think-pair-share can provides an opportunity for students to share their ideas with other students before being asked to share their ideas in the whole class or group.
3. The practice of think-pair-share will give a different environment to the teaching learning process and students will find that learning English is fun and enjoyable.

DAFTAR RUJUKAN

Abraham, J and Simone, A. 1995. Classroom Connections Understanding and Using Cooperative Learning. Canada: Harcourt Brace Company.

Arikunto, S. 1993. Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktek. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Harrison, R. 1983. Research, London: Heneinmann International.

Hartman, P. 1984. Tense Situation: Tense in Contrast and Context, New York: CBC College Publishing.

Hornby, A.S. 1987. Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Karyawetti, Y. 1995. A Comparative Study on the Results of the Direct Method and the Audio-Lingual Method in Teaching Passive Voice. Medan: Medan Unpublished

Kagan, S. 1987. Cooperative Learning. San Juan Capistrano, CA: Kagan Cooperative Learning.

Lyman, F. 1987. Think-Pair-Share: An Expanding Teaching Technique: MAA-CIE Cooperative News, v.l.p.1-2

Richard, J.C and Theodore S.R. 1991. Approaches and Method in Language Teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thomson, A.J. and Martinet A.V. 1986. A Practical English Grammar, New York: Oxford University Press.