

# **THE IMPLEMENTATION OF MODEL COOPERATIVE LEARNING TPS (THINK PAIR SHARES) TO IMPROVE SPEAKING SKILL AT THE EIGHT GRADE STUDENTS OF MTS KARYA BANGSA SOLEAR**

**Nina Eftiyana Sari**  
Mahasiswa STKIP Banten

**ABSTRACT:** The researcher has observed in Mts Karya Bangsa from December 2013 to February 2014 and the result of pre test showed that students' score under minimum score criteria (KKM) standard. It can be seen from the average student's score in pre test is 47,20%. It was far from KKM's score. KKM's score is 75. And for post test I the average of students is 64,10%. It is improve but it can reach KKM'S score. And post test II is 82,10%. It is improve speaking skill and can over the KKM'S score.

**Keywords:** *Model Cooperative Learning, Speaking Skill*

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

English is tool or way to convey for someone or to communicate with other people. Without language we can't communicate with other people. Therefore, language is very important to communicate with the others. Many states have different language. And they speak with their own language. So that the English language as an international language in the set, which is the language used to communicate with the other state. Besides that, English is also facilitate various countries communicate with the other state. By English communication with a variety of information the state of science ,culture, technology, tribes and tribal. Therefore, the ability to speak English is a requirement or necessity in this era and globalization today, ranging from the high school, junior high, elementary, kindergarten and even then, English has become the subject in their schools, given the importance of English language. So, expected when graduated studies, they can develop the English language into their daily lives.

But these efforts can not be as expected, it is in because many factors such as :

1. They have low vocabulary
2. The low motivation of their parents
3. The bad environmental
4. The teachers are monotonous

## **2. THEORY DESCRIPTION**

### **2.1. Definition of Learning Model**

According Toeti Soekamto and Winaputra defines 'learning model as a conceptual framework that describes the procedure in organizing systematic learning experience for the students to achieve learning goals and serve as guidelines for the designers of learning and the teachers in planning and implementing activities teaching and learning.

Kinds of learning model are :

- Jigsaw II
- NHT (Numbered Heads Together)
- TGT (Team Game Tournament)
- TSI (Three Step Interview)
- TMR (The Review Three Steps)
- Reciprocal Teaching
- TPS (Think Pair Shares)

- TPC (Think Pair Check)
- TPW (Think Pair Write)
- LT (Learning Together)

## **2.2. Definition of TPS Model**

Learning model Think-Pair-Share (TPS) was developed by Frank Lyman et al from the University of Maryland in (1985). Learning model Think-Pair-Share (TPS) is a simple model of cooperative learning. This technique gives the opportunity for students to work independently and in collaboration with others. The advantages of this technique is the optimization of student participation (Lie, 2004)

Think Pair Share (TPS) is a simple technique with great advantage. Think Pair Share (TPS) can increase a student's ability to recall information, and a student can learn from other students as well as communicate with each other ideas for discussion before being submitted to the class. In addition, Think Pair Share (TPS) can also improve self-confidence and all students are given the opportunity to participate in the class. Think Pair Share (TPS) as a cooperative learning method which consists of three stages, namely thinking, pairing and sharing. Teachers are no longer the only source of learning (teacher-oriented), but rather the students are required to be able to discover and understand new concepts (student oriented).

## **3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The researcher used qualitative research. The main of qualitative research is to search the information and implemented the model cooperative learning TPS. The term qualitative research according to Kirk and Miller (Lexy J. Moleong, 2002) was originally derived on qualitative observations as opposed to quantitative observations. Qualitative observation involves measuring the level of a particular trait. To better understand the significance of the qualitative research would need to put forward some definitions.

### **3.1. Population**

Prof. Dr. Sugiyono stated “ Populasi adalah wilayah generalisasi yang terdiri atas : objek atau subjek yang mempunyai kualitas dan karakteristik tertentu yang di tetapkan oleh peneliti untuk di pelajari dan kemudian ditarik kesimpulannya”.(Sugiyono, 2002:80).

Population in this research was all the students of eight grade of Mts Karya Bangsa Solear. It has been taken from the students of eight grade that totally 160 of population which consists 4 classes are VIII A, VIII B, VIII C, VIII D, where it has 40 students per class.

### **3.2. Sample**

Prof. Dr. Suharsimi Arikunto Stated “Sample adalah sebagian atau wakil population yang di teliti” (Arikunto, 2002:109). Based on the statement above, the researcher has the sample of their research in Speaking skill that consisted of 40 students. The research has taken class VIII C because the writer got the information that class has low competence in speaking, so the writer research was interested to take this class as sample.

### **3.3. Technique of Collecting Data**

Qualitative research can be a person or object. While this type of data was in the form of spoken words and writings and actions. Lexy J Maliong associated with it (2002) divided the type of data in qualitative research into the words and actions, the source data is written, photos and statistics.

### **3.4. Technique of Analysis Data**

The collecting data that is the researcher has got the data from the students VIII grade of Mts Karya Bangsa in Solear. The researcher attended the data, which are result of TPS.

The Scoring System is :

$$P = \frac{F}{N} \times 100 \%$$

~~N~~

P = Percentage Calculation

F = Student's Result Frequency

N = Sample

#### 4. RESEARCH ACHIEVEMENT

##### 4.1. Data of Analysis

From the Classroom Action Research researcher used two cycles method is :

**Table Cycle 1**

No	Teacher's Activities	Student's Activities
1	The Teacher divided the groups to the students and explained about the TPS model. And asked to the students to fill the conversation text.	The students with their groups cooperated and discussed about the answering of the empty conversation text.
2.	The teacher also asked to the students to make the conclusion of the conversation text.	The students with their groups discussed to made conclusion.
3.	The teacher asked to the students to memorize the conversation and presented in front of the class.	The students with their groups memorized and presented the conversation text with spirit with their friend.
4.	The teacher evaluated the student's presentation based on pronunciation, fluency, grammar and content accuracy.	The students have presented their performance with their groups.

**Table Cycle II**

No	Teacher's Activities	Student's Activities
1.	The teacher explained again about the TPS model to the students. And asked the students to fill the empty of conversation text which is different with their groups.	The students with their groups cooperated and look more spirit to fill the conversation text.
2.	The teacher asked to the students to make conclusion of conversation text.	The students with their groups made conclusion happily.

3.	The teacher gave example how to pronounce the conversation text and asked to the students to follow and concern to the teacher said.	The students were very enthusiasm to follow and really concentration what the teacher said.
4.	The teacher asked to the students to memorize the conversation and presented in front of the class and read the conclusion.	The students memorized with their groups very spirit.
5.	The teacher evaluated the students based on pronunciation, fluency, grammar, content accuracy.	The students have presented very interesting with their groups.

<b>Table Pre Test Score</b>						
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Pronunciation (0-30)</b>	<b>Fluency (0-20)</b>	<b>Grammar (0-20)</b>	<b>Content (0-30)</b>	<b>Score (0-100)</b>
<b>Groups I</b>						
1	Alda .R.A	11	13	14	12	50
2	Ali Nurdin					
3	Annisa .T.					
4	Basirotn					
<b>Groups II</b>						
5	Chaca .S.S	10	15	12	15	52
6	Danis .C.A					
7	David .T.M					
8	Devina .L.G					
<b>Groups III</b>						
9	Egi .M.I	9	13	16	10	48
10	Eli .S.A					
11	Eka W.P					
12	Endah .T.M					
<b>Groups IV</b>						
13	Fundy .N.I	11	13	8	13	45
14	Gilang .R.					
15	Henny .I					
16	Heru .S					

<b>Groups V</b>						
17	Manda .S.A	9	11	16	11	47
18	Melly .C					
19	M. Arief					
20	M. Ridwan					
<b>Groups VI</b>						
21	Nindi .H.C	12	11	13	11	47
22	Nunung .B					
23	Nurul .W.D					
24	Opick .S.A					
<b>Groups VII</b>						
25	Ririn .R	13	10	9	14	46
26	Rita .A.P					
27	Rizka .U.P					
28	Rosita .H					
<b>Groups VIII</b>						
29	Salsabila .A	11	13	10	12	46
30	Siska .B.S					
31	Sita .D.W					
32	Sita Aliah					
<b>Groups XI</b>						
33	Sumartono .S	10	12	14	9	45
34	Suheri .G.A					
35	Sri Hastuti					
36	Supinah					
<b>Groups X</b>						
37	Trirahmanto	9	15	13	9	46
38	Uswatun .H					
39	Wynda .A.P					
40	Windi .H.F					
<b>Average</b>						<b>47.20</b>
<b>Percentage</b>						<b>48%</b>
<b>Minimum Score</b>						<b>45</b>
<b>Maximum Score</b>						<b>52</b>

**Table Post Test I Score**

No	Name	Pronunciation (0-30)	Fluency (0-20)	Grammar (0-20)	Content (0-30)	Score (0-100)
<b>Groups I</b>						
1	Alda .R.A	13	14	13	22	62
2	Ali Nurdin					
3	Annisa .T.					
4	Basirotnun					
<b>Groups II</b>						
5	Chaca .S.S	14	17	10	23	64
6	Danis .C.A					
7	David .T.M					
8	Devina .L.G					
<b>Groups III</b>						
9	Egi .M.I	13	16	15	20	64
10	Eli .S.A					
11	Eka W.P					
12	Endah .T.M					
<b>Groups IV</b>						
13	Fundy .N.I	17	14	12	21	64
14	Gilang .R.					
15	Henny .I					
16	Heru .S					
<b>Groups V</b>						
17	Manda .S.A	11	20	14	21	66
18	Melly .C					
19	M. Arief					
20	M. Ridwan					
<b>Groups VI</b>						
21	Nindi .H.C	20	10	11	24	65
22	Nunung .B					
23	Nurul .W.D					
24	Opick .S.A					
<b>Groups VII</b>						

25	Ririn .R	10	13	14	25	62
26	Rita .A.P					
27	Rizka .U.P					
28	Rosita .H					
<b>Groups VIII</b>						
29	Salsabila .A	20	10	10	23	63
30	Siska .B.S					
31	Sita .D.W					
32	Sita Aliah					
<b>Groups IX</b>						
33	Sumartono .S	23	10	12	20	65
34	Suheri .G.A					
35	Sri Hastuti					
36	Supinah					
<b>Groups X</b>						
37	Trirahmanto	18	14	15	19	66
38	Uswatun .H					
39	Wynda .A.P					
40	Windi .H.F					
<b>Average</b>						<b>64.1</b>
<b>Percentage</b>						<b>65%</b>
<b>Minimum</b>						<b>62</b>
<b>Maximum</b>						<b>66</b>

<b>Table Post Test II Score</b>						
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Pronunciation (0-30)</b>	<b>Fluency (0-20)</b>	<b>Grammar (0-20)</b>	<b>Content (0-30)</b>	<b>Score (0-100)</b>
<b>Groups I</b>						
1	Alda .R.A	25	15	14	27	81
2	Ali Nurdin					
3	Annisa .T.					
4	Basirotn					
<b>Groups II</b>						
5	Chaca .S.S	23	17	17	26	83
6	Danis .C.A					

7	David .T.M					
8	Devina .L.G					
<b>Groups III</b>						
9	Egi .M.I	24	18	16	25	83
10	Eli .S.A					
11	Eka W.P					
12	Endah .T.M					
<b>Groups IV</b>						
13	Fundy .N.I	25	17	14	24	80
14	Gilang .R.					
15	Henny .I					
16	Heru .S					
<b>Groups V</b>						
17	Manda .S.A	24	15	17	26	82
18	Melly .C					
19	M. Arief					
20	M. Ridwan					
<b>Groups VI</b>						
21	Nindi .H.C	20	18	18	24	80
22	Nunung .B					
23	Nurul .W.D					
24	Opick .S.A					
<b>Groups VII</b>						
25	Ririn .R	27	13	18	23	81
26	Rita .A.P					
27	Rizka .U.P					
28	Rosita .H					
<b>Groups VIII</b>						
29	Salsabila .A	27	15	20	22	84
30	Siska .B.S					
31	Sita .D.W					
32	Sita Aliah					
<b>Groups XI</b>						
33	Sumartono.S	26	14	17	25	82
34	Suheri .G.A					



35	Sri Hastuti					
36	Supinah					
<b>Groups X</b>						
37	Trirahmanto	30	15	14	26	85
38	Uswatun .H					
39	Wynda .A.P					
40	Windi .H.F					
<b>Average</b>						<b>82.10</b>
<b>Percentage</b>						<b>80%</b>
<b>Minimum</b>						<b>80</b>
<b>Maximum</b>						<b>85</b>

Note : The result of pre test is 47,20 or 48% it is showed that the students' score under the minimum score criteria (KKM) standard. And the post test I is 64,10 or 65%, it is improve but it can reach KKM's score. And post test II is 82,10 or 80%. It is over the KKM's score. Post test I is 65% and post test II is 80% it is showed that improve 15%.

## 5. Conclusion And Suggestion

### 5.1. Conclusion

The model of cooperative learning think pair share has been implemented and had improved the speaking skill of students' Mts Karya Bangsa in Solear for VIII C grade. Because there was alteration in each cycles. The students showed a good progress in their speaking skill through the model cooperative learning think pair share. This is the one of method to improved speaking skill. The researcher divided the groups. Cycle 1 and cycle II has been implemented were proven in the oral test. Cycle I was 64.10 or 65% and cycle II was 82.10 or 80%. So the students' score from cycle I to cycle II was improved around 15%. It means reached from the target.

### 5.2. Suggestion

Based on the result of the research, finally the researcher would like to give the suggestion to the English teacher, the students and the other researcher for better in the future. The researcher hoped will be benefit for them. Especially, teaching learning process in the class. The suggestions as follows:

#### 1. For the teacher:

1. Teachers should be selective in choosing appropriate teaching methods for students in teaching learning process and suitable with the material.
2. Teachers must be able to create a comfortable learning atmosphere, interesting, and fun. So that students have high motivation to learned, and didn't get bored with the monotony of teacher methods.
3. Teachers must be good example by using English during teaching. So the students can get many vocabularies from the teachers and can apply in the class with their friends. For the students:
  1. The researcher hoped the students have high motivation to improve speaking skill. They have high willingness to learn English.
  2. The researcher hoped the students applied the English with their friends and practiced English with their friends.

3. The researcher hoped the students to be serious to learn English. And can develop their English in the future and can speak English fluency.

## **2. For the other researcher:**

1. The researcher hoped to use this research as reference their researching to improve the student's speaking skill.
2. The researcher hoped this research will benefit to the other researcher.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Anita,Lie.2004.*Cooperative Learning Practice Cooperative Learning in Space Classroom*. New York : Scholastic : Wdiasma.

Arends,Richard L.2008.*Learning to teach*. Yogyakarta : Pustaka Pelajar.

Arikunto,S.2002.*Prosedur Penelitian ,Suatu Pendekatan Praktek*.Jakarta : PT Rineka Cipta.

Depdiknas.2006.*Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan (KTSP)*.Jakarta : Departemen Pendidikan.

Finocchiaro,Mary,Bonomo Michael.1973.*The Foreign Language Learner :A guide for Teacher*. New York : Regent Publishing Company,Inc.

<http://arieffadholi.blogspot.com./2012/02/bab-1-berkenalan-dengan-ilmu-kimia.html>.

<http://mtk2012unindra.blogspot.com/2012/10/definisi-model-pembelajaran-menurut.html>.

<http://penelitianindakankelas.blogspot.com/2013/02/tipe-model-pembelajaran-kooperatif.html>.