The Use of the Think-Pair-Share Method to Improve the Tenth Grade of Culinary Arts Students' Speaking Skill

Hamida Pusparani[1], Mochtar Marhum[2], Maghfira[3], Zarkiani Hasyim[4]

Corresponding Email: hamidapuspa.24@gmail.com

Abstract. This research focuses on effectiveness of Think-Pair-Share (TPS) method for developing speaking or communicating skills of SMK Negeri 1's tenth-grade culinary arts students. This research applied a quasi-experimental design with a pair of different kinds of groups: experimental and control. The experimental group was obtained treatment by implementing Think-Pair-Share method, while the conventional approach was used to teach the control group. Pre and post-tests assessed students' speaking skills regarding accuracy, fluency, and comprehensibility. The findings revealed that TPS (Think-Pair-Share) method significantly increased students' speaking proficiency, as seen by a mean score increase in the experimental group from 40.15 to 51.50. The Mann-Whitney test proved major differences between each of the groupings ($p < 0.05$). Indicating the TPS improves speaking proficiency. The data indicate that TPS (Think-Pair-Share) is such a successful cooperative learning strategy which increases student engagement, reduces speaking fear, and improves communicative competence in English.

Keywords: Think-Pair-Share, Speaking Skill, Culinary Arts

Introduction

Language education is a particular kind of education which is implemented from an early age in schools and home settings due to the fact that language is such a crucial thing in daily existence. Sharing and receiving messages or information are two distinct ways that people can communicate with one another (Sari, 2019). Aside from that, language allows people to communicate their emotions to others, develop expressions, and constantly improve their intellectual ability. Language education is meant to allow students to speak effectively in kinds of contexts.

The direction of language education in schools is about to develop communicating, thinking, and reasoning. It focuses on four essential skills: speaking, writing, listening, and reading. These skills can be classified into to two classifications: receptive skills (understanding) and productive skills (usage). Reading and listening are the two components of receptive skill while productive skill comprises of two components: speaking and writing (Babayeva & Ildirimzade, 2024).

Speaking is often seen as an essential part of learning foreign language among other skills. Speaking is important for pupils since it assists them to communicate their minds, emotions, and opinions. During learning English, students must actively participate, especially in speaking. The physical, social, and cultural aspects of the learning environment are all essential for learning English (Zhang, 2023). Those who reside in English-speaking countries or it is known as a second language have a better chance of learning. Students from other countries, in Indonesia, English is considered as non-native language and is rarely spoken in everyday life, may experience additional challenges. Therefore, the objective of learning

English in this country is to gain communicative skills, and so oral practice is a crucial element of the process of learning.

Many pupils still struggle with speaking English, including a lack of vocabulary, limited grammar knowledge, limited classroom interaction, fear when speaking in front of people, low motivation, and lack of practice chances. According to Wulandari et al., (2020), Internal and external factors are two of the many reasons why speaking English has bad learning results. Internal factors starting with the students themselves include learning methods, self-confidence, and a lack of enthusiasm to communicate in English. Scared of speaking, especially facing others, is one of the most difficult components in learning another language. This fear may cause students to avoid communicating in English or participating in class discussions. As a result, students miss out on significant opportunities to improve their speaking skills.

SMK Negeri 1 Palu, as one of educational institutions, struggles similar problems when it comes to students' speaking skills. The researcher's pre-observations revealed that students had trouble in speaking. Firstly, most of students had trouble communicating their thoughts. They had no idea how to structure words to express their ideas. Second, they lacked interest to practice English. As a result, they did not participate in any speech learning activities. Third, they had a small vocabulary and grammar. Consequently, they felt incapable to convey their thoughts orally.

Various methods can help reduce challenges and improve students' speaking skills. The researcher uses cooperative learning, an interactive approach that engages students in the learning process. Some of the methods are Think-Pair-Share (TPS), Round Robin, Jigsaw, Numbered Heads Together, Inside-Outside Circle, Gallery Walk, Group Investigation, Peer Tutoring, STAD, Three-Step Interview, and Fishbowl.

TPS method can assist pupils with their challenges in speaking. There are three stages: think about the topic, communicate to someone, and deliver it to the rest of class. It promotes speaking practice in a relaxed setting, improves engagement, lowers nervousness, and improves participation. According to Putri et al., (2020), with this method, students get actively participating in the learning process, which leads them to enhance their skills. Besides that, Annisa et al., (2023) stated that students' speaking skills were sucessfully enhanced by implementing the Think-Pair-Share method. Students' scores got significantly higher.

Some previous studies which adressed the implementing of TPS (Think-Pair-Share) method for the context in communicating. First, a journal research from Yohana Puspita Dewi (2023), entitled "Improving students' speaking ability in expression opinion through Think-Pair-Share Method" where the researcher applied a classroom action research (CAR) method. The instruments used in the above research were observation, sheet, and tests. Students were from class VIII F at SMP Negeri 1 Sukabumi. According to the researcher's findings, applying the TPS strategy helped students' speaking proficiency in expressing their opinions.

Second, a research journal by Rizqa Zidnia (2024), entitled "The application of Think-Pair-Share technique and students' attitude on students' speaking skill" where the research used qualitative as a method. The design in this research was the team of students, both the pre- and post-tests. The subject was people from Faculty of Economy and Busines, university of Muhammadiyah Prof. DR. HAMKA. According to results of the study, TPS is kind of method that able to help pupils improving their speaking proficiency. Researcher also proved that applying TPS (Think-Pair-Share) to teach speaking provided students with good results, such as motivation to study. It was enjoyable and interesting.

Third, a research journal from Muhammad 'Abduh Al Karim (2022), entitled "Enhancing the students' speaking skill through Think-Pair-Share (TPS) at SMAN 4 Jember" where the researcher used CAR (classroom action research), with thirty pupils to gather the whole data. XI Social 2 students were the focus of this study. The researcher collected data through a speaking exam, observation during the first and second meetings, and documentation (student name list and recording). Based on the findings, TPS method could improve students' proficiency in SMAN 4 Jember. This situation occurred because the pupils

enjoyed the speaking and learning process. The students become more engaged in the discussions, answering the teacher's spoken questions and asking questions for the teacher.

After seeing and analyzing the findings of certain studies, the researcher discovered that TPS method was highly successful method for improving speaking skills, whether through classroom action (CAR) research or qualitative. Similar findings between this research and the research before by Dewi Y.P (2023), Zidnia R (2024), and Al Karim et al., (2022) discuss an improvement of speaking ability by using TPS method in schools. To gather the data, this design is similar to the research of Dewi Y.P (2023), namely speaking/oral test. The distinctions between the earlier research and this research are location and design. The research design for this research is quasi-experimental design. Then, differences of location, where this research will be conducted in SMK Negeri 1 Palu, while Yohana Puspita Dewi (2023) research was in SMPN 1 Sukabumi, Rizqa Zidnia (2024) research was in Muhammadiyah DR Hamka University, and Muhammad 'Abduh Al Karim (2022) research was in SMAN 4 Jember.

Therefore, this research will apply the different design of using Think-Share-Pair method and focus on the grade ten of culinary arts at SMK Negeri 1 Palu. This research will use a quasi-experimental design and apply a treatment to the experimental group, pre and post-tests. The research data will be collected using speaking/oral test. Then, the data will be calculated through statistical analysis.

Theoretical Framework

Definition of Speaking

Speaking is a useful language skill that facilitates oral communication between both the listeners and the speakers for a purpose in giving ideas and making connection. Speaking is seen as a process that involves interaction since speaking represents conversation among multiple people in a specific situation (Guebba, 2021). Fan & Yan (2020) defined that speaking is an essential linguistic ability for communicating with others, expressing ourselves, and presenting our identity. Besides that, Ork et al., (2024) also stated that speaking is a valuable language ability that allows speakers and listeners to communicate and convey information, make connections, and share thoughts.

Basic Types of Speaking

Brown stated in Cahyani (2018) that there are five principal categories of speaking. To begin with, imitation speaking is saying words, phrases, or sentences again with a focus on how they sound and how they are said. Second, intensive speaking pushes students to do short oral activities that show they have mastered certain grammatical, phonological, or lexical parts. Third, fast conversations like greetings, small talk, or simple requests are part of responsive speaking. Fourth, interactive speaking is all about two-way communication, when both the speaker and the audience share what they know. Lastly, prolonged speaking means giving long speeches, lectures, or stories with little or no input from the audience.

Cooperative Learning Definition

A student-centered, teacher-facilitated method known as cooperative learning (CL) engages a couple groups of students to work together in taking responsibility for their own and other people's learning. Maghfira (2020) stated that groups of students work together rather than competing to complate a task, activity, or project as a part of the cooperative learning. This method creates interaction among group members, providing that the success of the group as a whole is correlated with each student's performance.

TPS (Think-Pair-Share) Definition

TPS (Think-Pair-Share) method is a team-based technique based on group discussions in the classroom. According to Lyman in Ardan et al., (2024) journal first proposed

TPS is a cooperative teaching strategy. This teaching method involves learners in thinking about a specific problem or subject during a limited time, organizing their thoughts, and formulating their ideas and solutions. Then students move on to the next level, where they collaborate in pairings to address their responses. Morever, TPS (Think-Pair-Share) technique increased pupils' confidence in discussing ideas with their peers.

In this research, the researcher adapted the teaching steps into 3 based on the teaching stages from Maulani et al., (2020).

Material and Method

To get the data, the researcher employed a quantitative design. Then a quasy-experimental method was used to assess the treatment's efficiency. It involved two: experimental and control. This research's population consisted of the grade ten of culinary arts from SMK Negeri 1 Palu. Class X in culinary arts consists of two groups classes, each with 33-34 students. The researcher used purposive sampling. Djamba & Neuman (2002) stated that as a non-random sampling technique, purposive sampling involves the researcher uses their knowledge to select cases that are especially informative or have certain characteristics. Thus, the researcher preferred the tenth grade Tata Boga I as the experimental group while tenth grade Tata Boga II as the control class according to the teacher's suggestion. Besides that, pre-observation showed that the tenth-grade of culinary arts students had difficults in speaking English such as lack of vocabulary, grammar, and motivation. Speaking comprehension test was the primary tool used to collect quantitative data, and it serves as both pre- and post-tests. This research had three main indicators: accuracy, fluency, and comprehensibility. After collecting the pre and the post-tests data, researcher applied SPSS for calculating the whole data. The benefits from using SPSS for data analysis are significant, since it allows for faster and more accurate data processing. SPSS provides a variety of statistical analyses, including the normality test and the homogeneity test, to help with hypothesis testing while providing reliable and consistent results.

Results and Discussion
Result

The researcher presents the findings according to the data analysis. The pre- and post-test findings, which were provided to both the experimental and control groups, served as the basis for the analysis. The researcher gave both the experimental and control groups a pre-test before to starting the treatments.

Pre-test Results of the Experimental and Control Groups

The researcher divides the data into two parts: the results from pre-test by the experimental group and control group. Considering these results, data can be specified using standard deviation and mean score calculated using SPPS 24. The results are shown below:

Table 1.
Pre-test Results of Experimental Group

No	Name	Accuracy	Fluency	Comprehensibility	Total
1	AN	1	1	1	33
2	AM	1	1	1	33
3	AO	3	2	3	88
4	BP	1	2	1	44
5	DK	1	1	1	33
6	DE	3	3	3	100
7	FL	1	1	1	33

8	HE	1	1	1	33
9	HJ	1	1	1	33
10	HH	1	1	1	33
11	HU	1	1	1	33
12	IG	1	1	1	33
13	IMV	1	1	1	33
14	IWC	1	1	1	33
15	IL	1	1	1	33
16	KD	1	2	2	55
17	KN	1	1	2	44
18	MI	1	1	2	44
19	MF	1	2	2	55
20	NL	1	1	1	33
21	NMN	1	1	1	33
22	NNA	1	1	1	33
23	NPM	1	1	2	44
24	NK	1	1	2	44
25	RA	1	1	1	33
26	RM	1	1	1	33
27	RK	1	1	1	33
28	RN	1	1	1	33
29	SQ	1	1	1	33
30	SL	1	1	2	44
31	ZM	1	1	1	33
32	TA	1	1	1	33
33	ZMH	1	1	2	44
34	RD	1	1	1	33

Table 2.
Pre-test Results (Control Group)

No	Name	Accuracy	Fluency	Comprehensibility	Total
1	AI	1	1	1	33
2	AM	1	1	1	33
3	AL	1	1	1	33
4	AM	1	2	2	55
5	AN	1	1	1	33
6	FA	2	2	2	66
7	FAN	1	2	2	55
8	FI	1	1	1	33
9	FIR	1	1	1	33
10	FIT	1	2	2	55
11	IF	1	1	1	33
12	JI	1	1	1	33
13	KA	1	2	2	55
14	LE	1	1	1	33
15	ME	1	2	2	55

16	MA	1	2	2	55
17	MB	3	3	3	100
18	MZ	1	1	1	33
19	MH	1	1	1	33
20	MHA	3	3	3	100
21	NA	1	1	1	33
22	NAG	1	1	1	33
23	NF	1	1	1	33
24	NAI	2	1	2	55
25	NU	1	1	1	33
26	QH	1	1	2	44
27	RA	3	2	3	88
28	RI	1	1	1	33
29	SA	1	1	1	33
30	SAH	1	1	2	44
31	SAS	1	1	1	33
32	TH	1	1	1	33
33	WA	1	1	1	33

Table 3.
Descriptive Statistics of the Results in the Pre-test

No	Class	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Standard Deviation
1.	Experimental Group	40.15	33	100	15.168
2.	Control Group	45.06	33	100	19.302

According to the previously mentioned data, the experimental group's mean pre-test was 40.15. Then, 100 was the maximum score, and 33 was the minimum score. Furthermore, the experimental group's standard deviation was 15.168. In the control class, the mean was 45.06. Then, 100 was the maximum, and 33 was the minimum.

Post-test Results of the Experimental and Control Groups

The post-tests were provided by researcher to a group of experimental following the treatment. The researcher divides the data into two parts: result from the post-test for experimental and control groups. According to these results, data can be described using the mean, minimum, maximum scores, and standard deviation calculated with SPPS 24. The post-test results are below:

Table 4.
Post test results from experimental group

No	Name	Accuracy	Fluency	Comprehensibility	Total
1	AN	1	2	2	55
2	AM	1	1	1	33
3	AO	3	3	3	100
4	BP	2	2	2	66
5	DK	2	2	2	66
6	DE	3	3	3	100

7	FL	2	2	2	66
8	HE	2	2	2	66
9	HJ	1	1	2	44
10	HH	1	1	2	44
11	HU	1	1	2	44
12	IG	1	1	1	33
13	IMV	1	1	2	44
14	IWC	1	1	2	44
15	IL	1	1	2	44
16	KD	2	3	3	88
17	KN	2	2	3	77
18	MI	2	1	2	55
19	MF	1	1	1	33
20	NL	1	1	2	44
21	NMN	1	1	1	33
22	NNA	1	1	2	44
23	NPM	1	1	2	44
24	NK	1	1	2	44
25	RA	1	1	1	33
26	RM	1	1	2	44
27	RK	1	1	2	44
28	RN	1	1	2	44
29	SQ	1	1	2	44
30	SL	1	2	2	55
31	ZM	1	1	1	33
32	TA	1	2	2	55
33	ZMH	1	1	2	44
34	RD	1	1	2	44

Table 5.
Post test results from control group

No	Name	Accuracy	Fluency	Comprehensibility	Total
1	AI	1	1	1	33
2	AM	1	1	1	33
3	AL	1	1	1	33
4	AM	1	1	1	33
5	AN	1	1	1	33
6	FA	1	1	1	33
7	FAN	1	1	1	33
8	FI	1	1	2	44
9	FIR	1	1	1	33
10	FIT	1	2	2	55
11	IF	1	1	1	33
12	JI	1	1	1	33
13	KA	1	2	2	55
14	LE	1	1	1	33

15	ME	1	1	1	33
16	MA	1	1	1	33
17	MB	3	3	3	100
18	MZ	1	1	1	33
19	MH	1	1	1	33
20	MHA	2	2	2	66
21	NA	1	1	1	33
22	NAG	1	1	1	33
23	NF	1	1	2	44
24	NAI	1	1	1	33
25	NU	1	1	1	33
26	QH	1	1	1	33
27	RA	3	3	2	88
28	RI	1	1	1	33
29	SA	1	1	1	33
30	SAH	2	2	2	66
31	SAS	1	1	1	33
32	TH	1	1	1	33
33	WA	2	2	3	77

Table 6,
Descriptive Statistics of the Results in the Post-test

No	Class	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Standard Deviation
1.	Experimental Group	51.50	33	100	17.864
2.	Control Group	42.03	33	100	17.807

According to the previously provided data, the mean score from post-test in the experimental group was 51.50. The minimum score was 33, and a maximum score was 100. Furthermore, the standard deviation was 17.864. Additionally, the control group's mean score was 42.03. Then, 33 was the minimum, and the maximum score was 100. The standard deviation of the control group was 17.807.

Normality Test

In this research, the Shapiro-Wilk was used to obtain the test of normality results for both the experimental and control groups, either as pre- or post-test scores. The normality criterion was based on p-value. The data is considered normal if the p-value is above 0.05. Nonetheless, the data is not normally distributed if the p-value is below 0.05. For additional analysis, a non-parametric test needed to be applied. The result of the normalcy test are as follows:

Table 7.
Normality Test

No	Class	Sig	Normal
1	Pre-test Experimental Group	0.00	No
2	Post-test Experimental Group	0.00	No
3	Pre-test Control Group	0.00	No
4	Post-test Control Group	0.00	No

The previously described normality test shows the experimental and control groups' pre-test and post-test sig. values were both 0.00. It indicates that the data was not distributed according to a normal distribution because the probability value was less than 0.05.

Homogeneity Test

The researcher conducted homogeneity test by using the Levene Statistic Test from IBM Statistics SPSS version 24 (sig > 0.05). This is the result that was obtained from the test:

Table 8.
Homogeneity Test

No	Class	Sig.	Status
1	Pre-test and Post-test from Experimental and Control Groups	0.873	Homogen

Table 4 above indicates that the sig. was 0.873 in accordance with the homogeneity test results by the Levene Statistic SPSS 24 version. The fact that the data was higher than 0.05 shows that it was homogeneous. Furthermore, the homogeneity test result suggested that the variance of the sample data was homogeneous.

Students' Speaking Skills Achievement

The test of Mann-Whitney was utilized in examining the data in this research. In order to determine if the data from two independent samples were not normally distributed, the researcher conducted the test of Mann-Whitney test. If the Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) value is less than 0.05, the hypothesis is considered statistically significant and is accepted. The test of Mann-Whitney provided the following results:

Table 9.
Test Statistics of Mann-Whitney

No	Class	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
1	Pre-test and Post-test from Experimental and Control Groups	0.000

The table above presents the test statistics of the Mann-Whitney test from the experimental and control groups. It shows that the test from Mann-Whitney got the Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) of 0.000. This indicates 0.000 < 0.05. The conclusion is that there was a large distinction between the experimental and control groups. So the Ha or alternative hypothesis was accepted, while the Ho or null hypothesis was rejected. As a result, it indicates the research question can be answered. "There is a considerable effect on enhancing the tenth-grade culinary arts students' speaking skills by using the Think-Pair-Share method in SMK Negeri 1 Palu".

Testing of Hypothesis

The Mann-Whitney test provided the Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) value of 0.000 below 0.05, indicating an evident difference in students' performance prior to and thereafter implementing the TPS method. Therefore, Ho (null hypothesis) was rejected, and Ha (alternative hypothesis), which stated that TPS significantly improved students' performance, was accepted.

Discussion

The findings of this research revealed significant improvements in students' speaking proficiency after implementing Think-Pair-Share method. It is clear that the experimental group's mean went risen from 40.15 in the pre-test to 51.50 in the post-test. According to the result of test statistics by using Mann-Whitney, it demonstrated that the Asymp. Sig (2-tailed)

was 0.000 which was less than 0.05. It indicates that the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted. It was confirmed that implementing the Think-Pair-Share method had a statistically significant positive effect on students speaking skills.

This research discovered that the TPS (Think-Pair-Share) method could be an effective method for developing students speaking or communicating proficiency. The results of this research helped the pupils of the tenth grade of culinary arts at SMK Negeri 1 Palu in developing their speaking skills. During the experimental group's treatment, most students improved their concentration and enjoyed the learning process. The students also enjoyed participating in small groups, discussing their assigned topics, and presenting their opinions in front of the entire class. This condition supports the theory from Ardan et al., (2024) stated that Think-Pair-Share (TPS) method encouraged students' participation and reduced their fear of makin mistakes during the speaking activity. However, most students found it difficult to become fluent in English; they can communicate, but at a very slow pace. They also sometimes hesitated when trying to speak or pronounce unfamiliar words. This is consistent with the findings of Maulani et al., (2020) and Tuanany (2019), who indicated that while TPS enhances participation, it necessitates careful coordination to make sure the equal contributions and enough time allocation for each phase.

The researcher also used conventional techniques to treat the control group, and the pre-test score was lower than the post-test score. In comparison to the experimental group, most students were less attentive, spoke Indonesian more frequently than English, and knew fewer words. However, some students in the control group enjoyed the learning process and frequently enquired about the meaning of English words.

This research also supports prior research by Dewi (2023) found that using the think pair share method improved students' speaking skills when expressing their opinions. The score went up because of how well the students did and how well the teachers did. Zidnia (2024) also remarked that employing Think-Pair-Share (TPS) method in speaking sessions made it easy to see how students were doing. Al Karim et al., (2022) believed that the TPS (Think-Pair-Share) method might enhance SMAN 4 Jember students' speaking skill. It could be shown through the development of the students' speaking exam results.

The tenth grade of culinary arts students in SMK Negeri 1 Palu who implemented the TPS method become better at speaking. The researcher asked the students to practice more often. By thinking about the topic, talking with friends, and sharing with the class, students were able to learn step by step and practice speaking. But several students did not seem to be able to communicate clearly. They sometimes had trouble saying the words and putting them together in a way that made sense grammatically. Furthermore, when they tried to talk, they thought too much and hesitated to share their opinions. It's because English still sounds unfamiliar to them. The control group, however, which received instruction through conventional method, was less active and did not show the same improvement. According to these findings, TPS not only helps students learn English more easily but also makes the students feel more

Conclusion

The research entitled "The Use of Think-Pair-Share Method to Improve the Tenth Grade of Culinary Arts Students' Speaking Skill" showed that the TPS (Think-Pair-Share) method developed students' speaking proficiency. The experimental class was taught applying TPS (Think-Pair-Share) had a significant rise in post-test scores, from 40.15 to 51.50, compared to the control class using conventional methods. TPS improved students' accuracy, fluency, and comprehensibility by fostering independent thinking, collaboration, and active class participation. The study confirmed TPS as a successful cooperative learning method in improving speaking skills.

Acknowledgement

References

Al Karim, M. 'Abduh, Bilqis, M., & Suharjito, B. (2022). Enhancing The Students' Speaking Skill through Think-Pair-Share (TPS) at SMAN 4 Jember. *EFL Education Journal*, *9*(1), 141. https://doi.org/10.19184/eej.v9i1.29925.

Annisa, N., Arifiatun, A., & Mufaridah, F. (2023). The Implementation of Think – Pair – Share Technique to Improve Students' Ability in Speaking English at the Tenth Grade of Senior High School 1 Jember. *Pubmedia Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris*, *1*(2), 10. https://doi.org/10.47134/jpbi.v1i2.53.

Ardan, M., & Dkk. (2024). The Use Of Think Pair Share Strategi To Enhance Speaking Skill Of The Students Of The Pesantren DDI Baruga, Majene. *IJoBEC*, *2*(1), 37–42.

Babayeva, R., & Ildirimzade, L. (2024). Language skills overview. *Filologiya Məsələləri Journal of Philological Issues*, *01*, 349. https://doi.org/10.59849/2224-9257.2024.1.349.

Cahyani, F. (2018). *The Use of Think Pair Share Technique to Improve Students' Speaking Performance*. *6*(1), 1–15. file:///C:/Users/Asus/Downloads/9237-19057-1-PB-1.pdf.

Fan, J., & Yan, X. (2020). Assessing Speaking Proficiency: A Narrative Review of Speaking Assessment Research Within the Argument-Based Validation Framework. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *11*(February), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00330.

Guebba, B. (2021). The Nature of Speaking in the Classroom: An Overview. *Middle East Research Journal of Linguistics and Literature*, *1*(1), 9–12. https://doi.org/10.36348/merjll.2021.v01i01.002.

Maghfira, M. (2020). The Implementation of Think-Pair-Share Technique in Improving Students' Speaking Skill. *Jurnal Studi Guru Dan Pembelajaran*, *3*(3), 511–517. https://doi.org/10.30605/jsgp.3.3.2020.495.

Maulani, M. N., Romansyah, H. K., & Atiyawati, M. I. (2020). Using Think Pair Share Teaching Strategy To Students in Teaching Speaking. *The Journal of English Literacy Education: The Teaching and Learning of English as a Foreign Language*, *6*(2), 101–106. https://doi.org/10.36706/jele.v6i2.9951.

Ork, Y., Chin, P., Ban, T., & Em, S. (2024). Factors Causing Students' Challenges in Learning English Speaking Skills: A Review. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, *January*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4806990.

Puspita Dewi, Y. (2023). Improving Students' Speaking Ability in Expressing Opinion through Think Pair Share. *Journal of English Development*, *3*(01), 29–37. https://doi.org/10.25217/jed.v3i01.3078.

Putri, H., Fahriany, & Jalil, N. (2020). The Influence of Think-Pair-Share in Enhanching Students'. *Journal of Education, Teaching and Learning*, *5*(1), 67–72.

Sari, F. M. (2019). Patterns of Teaching-Learning Interaction in the EFL Classroom. *Teknosastik*, *16*(2), 41. https://doi.org/10.33365/ts.v16i2.139.

Tuanany, N. (2019). The Advantages and Disadvantages of Think-Pair Share and Jigsaw in Teaching Writing Skill Nurlaila Tuanany Institut Agama Kristen Negeri Ambon. *Tangkoleh Putai*, *16*(1), 73–86.

Wulandari, C., Surtikanti, M. W., & Agung, A. S. S. N. (2020). a Case Study of Internal and

External Factors on the Difficulties in Learning English. *JOEEL: Journal of English Education and Literature*, *1*(2), 43–48. https://doi.org/10.38114/joeel.v1i2.81.

Zhang, J. (2023). The Impact of the Learning Environment on English Language Learning. *Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences*, *23*, 69–72. https://doi.org/10.54097/ehss.v23i.12737.

Zidnia, R. (2024). *The Application of Think-Pair-Share Technique and Students ' Attitude on Students ' Speaking Skill*. 7, 16135–16141.