A COMPARATIVE STUDY BETWEEN GROUP DISCUSSION AND THINK PAIR SHARE STRATEGY TO ENHANCE STUDENTS' SPEAKING ABILITY

Sri Wahyuni[1)] and Jumaina[2)]
[1)]STKIP Bina Bangsa Getsempena
[2)]SMA Inshafuddin Banda Aceh
Email: sri.wahyuni.sw837@gmail.com

Abstract
The aim of this study is to find out if there is any significant difference in students' ability enhancement between those who were taught using Group Discussion strategy and those who were taught using Think Pair Share strategy. This study is a quantitative research method using comparative design by using pre-test and post-test. This study was designed to find out the answer to the following question: Is there any significant difference in students' speaking ability enhancement between those who were taught by using Group Discussion strategy and those who were taught using Think-Pair-Share strategy. The sample of this study were two classes of grade X SMA Inshafuddi Banda Aceh. Grade X IPA 1 was taught using Group Discussion and grade X IPS were taught using Think-Pair-Share. The instrument used for this study was a speaking test, which contained a Congratulation topic. The result of this study showed from the mean score that both classes had an enhancement in their speaking ability. In addition, there was no significant difference between those who were taught using Group Discussion and those who were taught using Think Pair share strategy. However, it meant that both strategies were efficient in enhancing students' speaking ability.

Keywords: *Think Pair Share, Group Discussion, Speaking Ability*

INTRODUCTION

Learning a language means using it in communication in oral or written form and being able to express feelings, thoughts, and experiences in various contexts.Carrel (2012:54) says that one of the aims of the language programs is to develop spoken language skills that integrate both spoken and written language. Therefore, to know the language is to use or practice, as stated by Cruickshank (2011:51). He adds that the students do not know a sentence until he can speak it. Thus, the students should practice their English through speaking to have mastered the language.

Speaking is an interactive process in order to construct meaning. Florez (2010:1) defines that speaking is an interactive process of constructing meaning that involves producing, receiving, and processing information". Therefore, the students have to interact and creative in speaking class, which are involves producing, receiving, and processing the information. They can not get anything if they do not communicate with another student. So,Speaking is a productive skill because we produce the language when we speak, and the students have to construct the meaning.

Furthermore, speaking is the process of building and sharing meaning through the use of verbal and non-verbal symbols in a variety of contexts. Speaking is an importanat part toward the second language learning and teaching. Despite its importance, English language teachers have continued to teach speaking just as a repetition of drills or memorization of dialogues in teaching speaking that has been undervalued. Nevertheless, today's

world requires that the goal of teaching speaking should improve student's communicative skills. Then, students can express themselves and learn how to follow the social and cultural rules that appropriate in each communicative circumstance if they can master the speaking skill.

Brown (2001:271) adds in teaching oral communication; micro-skills are fundamental. One implication is the importance of focusing on both the forms of language and the functions of the language. He also mentions that the pieces of language should be given attention for more than makeup to the whole.According to Thornbury and Slade (2006:7), speaking in social is the sense that established rapport and mutual agreement**,** maintain and modifies social identify, and involves interpersonal skill. This social element is expressed through wishes, feelings, attitudes, opinions, and judgments, which can clash with the precise nature of the classroom when teaching speaking. It means that speaking in the social context is a contradiction with speaking in the school.

Similarly, Thornbury (2005:9) pointed that speaking is also multi-sensory activity because it involves paralinguistic features such as eye-contact, facial expression, body language, tempo, pauses, voice quality changes, and pitch variation which affect conversational flow.

From the definition above, it can be concluded that speaking is one of the most important roles in people's communicating life among one and another.By communicating, they can create a relationship, inform, share, and find information. In this case, speaking is the most important part of expressing the students' ideas, opinions, thoughts, or feelings, and they can communicative with others by doing some activities in the classroom.

Speaking has some characteristics to learn. According to Brown (2012:326), “characteristics of spoken language can make oral performance easy as well as, in some case difficult: clustering, redundancy, reduce forms, performance variables, colloquial language, and rate of delivery, stress, rhythm, intonation, and interaction."

The same characteristics must be taken into account in the productive generation of speech, but with a slight twist in that, the learner is now the producer. Bear in mind that the following characteristics of spoken language can make vocal performance easy as well as, in some cases, difficult.

First, clustering is phrasal as a fluent speech, not only word by word. EFL learners can organize their output both cognitively and physically (in-breath groups) thorough such clustering.

Second, redundancy is the speaker has an opportunity to make meaning clearer though the redundancy of spokelanguage. Learners can capitalize on this feature language.

Third, reduced forms are a contraction, elisions, reduced vowels, etc., these problems in teaching spoken English, for instance, students who do not learn colloquial contractions can sometimes develop a stilted, bookish quality of speaking that in turn stigmatized them.

Fourth, performance variables are one of the advantages of spoken language; its the process of thinking as you speak allows you to manifest several numbers of performances, such as hesitation, backtracking, pauses, and corrections. Learners should be taught how to pause and hesitate. For example, in English, our "thinking time" is not silent; we insert

certain "fillers" such as uh, um, you know, well, like, I mean, etc. Thus, one of the most salient differences between native and nonnative speakers of a language is in their hesitation phenomena.

Fifth, colloquial language is making sure your students are reasonably well acquainted with the words, idioms, and phrases of colloquial language and those they get practice in producing these forms.

Sixth, the rate of delivery is another salient characteristic of fluency is the rate of delivery. So, one of students tasks in teaching spoken English is to help learners achieve an acceptable speed along with other attributes of fluency.

Seven, Stress, rhythm, and intonation these are the most important characteristic of English pronunciation, as will be explained below. The stress-timed rhythm of spoken English and its intonation patterns convey an important message. Eight, interaction, as noted in the previous section, learning to produce waves of language in a vacuum-without interlocutors-would rob speaking skill of its richest component: the creativity of conversational negotiation.

Speaking also has other characteristics. In order words, speaking characteristic is called characteristics of communicative competence. It includes linguistic competence, a range of other sociolinguistic, and conversational skills. According to Nunan (2013:226), communicative competence includes linguistic competence. Then he adds a variety of other sociolinguistic and conversational skills that enable the speaker to know how to say what to whom, and when.

Speaking is a way to say spontaneously about what a person feels, and it can perform linguistic knowledge in communication. Therefore, to speak English is not easy, because a speaker should be able to master the elements of its' such as grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, intonation,fluency, body language, and gesture. If the students can master these elements, they will become the best speakers and can use this language in many opportunities, as it is known that if they look for a job.

Moreover, speaking as a skill that should be applied in our life and every student can measure their ability and develop their own knowledge. They must practice more in order to improve their speaking skills. Then, they can learn about speaking not only at the school but also at their homes, such as read books or newspapers, access the internet, watch the movie, and listen to Englishsongs or others that can help them.

Walker (2014:30) states that teaching technique as a combination of students' activities is supported by the use of appropriate resources to provide a particular learning experience (process) and/or to bring about the desired learning (product). It means that teachers should give more benefits to students in the learning process; the teacher should help students by providing written texts to be learned to enrich their knowledge. A good learning situation should be created in making students happy, interested, and motivated.

In teaching second language learners, teacher should know how to speak in a best and creative way, some speaking activities canbe used, suchasrole-play orsimulation, group discussion, think pair share, debate,storytelling, interview, etc. Those activities can be applied to ESL and EFL classroom setting, together with suggestions for teachers who teach oral

language. In this study, the researcher used group discussion and thought pair to know the students' speaking ability.

A group discussion can be held for various reasons. When doing a discussion, the students can share ideas, find solutions, and arrive at a conclusion. Generally, the purpose of discussing activity is set by the teacher. In this way, the discussions are relevant to the purpose, then students did not spend their time in chatting with each other about irrelevant things. According to Harmer (2001:272), discussion range is divided into several stages from highly formal, whole-group staged events to informal small-group interactions.

It is essential that speaking should be equally divided among group members. In the end, the speaking class determine on the winning group who pleaded the ideas in a good way. Thus, the activity can be fosters critical thinking, give quick decision making, and students can learn how to express and justify themselves in polite ways while disagreeing with the others. The teacher can both assign the group members, or the students may determine it by themselves. Still, groups should be put in every discussion activity so that students can work with various people and learn to be open to different ideas. Lastly, in class or group discussions, the students should always be encouraged to ask questions, paraphrase ideas, express support, check for clarification, and so on.

Moreover, think-Pair-share is a strategy that encourages the students to think personally and give the students time to discuss in pairs. So, they have a chance to help each other during the discussion then share their ideas in class as a whole so that all students can listen to their friends and get new knowledge. Think-Pair-Share is one of cooperative language learning (CLL) approach, which is used to teach cooperative activities such as pairs and small groups of learners in the classroom. Cooperative learning becomes a way of promoting communicative student-student, student-teacher interaction, as stated by Wallace, Stariha, and Walberg (2004: 14) that working together in twos, threes, or larger groups can facilitate more frequent and insightful communication. In a group of two students, students might speak for half a time and listen for half of the time. Both the speaking and listening can be concentrated on what students need to know or desire to investigate; with practice, students can correct one another and themselves.

Think-pair-share was developed by Frank Lyman in 1981 (Huda, 2011: 132). It gets its name from the three stages of students' actions, with emphasize on what students should do at each of those stages. 1) the teacher poses a question that usually uses a low consensus of the question; 2) students think of response; 3) students discuss their answers with a partner; 4) students share their partner's responses with the class. This strategy can be applied in teaching speaking to give the time for the students to think about the problem/topic, enhance students' oral communication through critical thinking and meaningful interaction where the students are free to suggest and give their opinion. As stated by Kusrini (2012:3) that Think-Pair-Share builds a democratic situation where the students are free to suggest and give their argumentation. By giving the discussion section to the students, this technique could get the students actively involved in speaking activities. As stated by Ledlow (2001:1) that this technique encourages a high pupil response and can help students on task.

Think-Pair-Share is one of the techniques that can be applied in teaching speaking. It also has some advantages such as gives the time for the students to think about the problem/topic, enhance students' oral communication through critical thinking and meaningful interaction and build a democratic situation where the students are free to suggest and give their argument. It is also useful to encourage students to interact with each other orally. Think Pair Share is a combination of language and fun. Students can practice and do activities with their friends.

Based on the explanation above, the researcher would like to discuss there any significant difference in students' ability enhancement between those who were taught using Group Discussion strategy and those who were taught using Think Pair Share strategy.

METHOD

Themethod appliedinthisresearchwasdescriptive comparative. Therewere twoclassesused in applying group discussion and think pair share. The population of this research was the grade X students at SMA Inshafuddin Banda Aceh. The sampling technique used random cluster sampling, where the chosen class was grade X IPA 1 (used group discussion) and grade X IPS (used think pair share).

The procedure of data collection is used in the congratulation topic. For the first class or X IPA I, the researcher asked them to sit in the large group by discussing the topic, and at the end of the meeting, they should perform it in front of the class, while the other group should pay attention and give the feedback to each other. For the second class or X IPS, the researcher divided them into two students in each group and discussed the material, then perform it in front of the class, while the other students must give them the feedback.

The data took the result of the student speaking frequency, which is consisted of how many times the students ask questions, answer the questions, and give their comments. Then, the researcher also categorizesthe students' activity according to Munir (2000), itconsists of very activeis 5,activeis 4,fairlyactiveis 3,lessactiveis 2, and notactiveis 1. The datawere collectedbyusingtheformulaP=Fq/N(Gay,Mills,&Airasian,2012)andwereanalyzedbyusingtheSPSSProgram.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

The following tables were the result of the research are as follow:

Table 1. Group Discussion

Response	*Frequency*	*%*
Very Active	10	31.25
Active	9	28.125
Fairly Active	3	9.375
Less Active	8	25
Not Active	2	6.25
Total	**32**	**100**

The table above shows about the students response: first, 10 frequency who were *very active* or its about 31.25%, second, 9 frequency who were *active*

(28.125%), third, 3 frequency who were *fairly active* (9.375), fourth, 8 frequency who were *less active* (25%) and fifth, only 2 frequency who are *not active* (6.25).

Table 2. Think Pair Share

Response	***Frequency***	***%***
Very Active	9	28.125
Active	9	28.125
Fairly Active	3	9.375
Less Active	8	25
Not Active	3	9.375
Total	**32**	**100**

Whilethe table.2 shows that in think pair share, the students' responses for *very active* were about 9 (28.125%), *active* were 9 (28.125%), *fairly active* were 3 (9.375), less active 8 (25%) and *not active* were 3 (9.375%).

Discussion

From the result of the data, it showed that there is a quite similar frequency of the students' response toward group discussion and think pair strategy in teaching students' speaking ability. It means both strategies are applicable and good proven by the previous data shown in Tables 1 and 2.

The data from group discussion for the first item of student's response is *very active* with 10 frequency or about 31.25%, while for think pair share is 9frequency or 28.125%. For this category, both of groups is different only in small frequency, it less 1 number of think pair class comparing to group discussion class. It can be said that the frequency of both classes for *very active* is different in students' speaking ability for group discussion class and also for think pair share class. Thus, the group discussion class performed well for this activity.

The second item is *active*, in which the frequency is 9 (28.125%) for group discussion class and 9 (28.125%) for think pair share class. In this activity group discussion class and think pair share class have the same frequency in an *active* category. So, both of the class were achieved well in enhancement students' speaking ability between those who were taught through group discussion and think pair share.

The third activity is*fairly active*, which the frequency of group discussion class and think pair share class is the same frequency; it was 3 (9.375%). Thus, this activity of both class shares frequency similarly in doing this activity. Thus, there is no significant difference for each student in enhancing their speaking ability in using group discussion or think pair share strategy.

The fourth activity is *less active*, which the frequency of both classes shown the same number; it was 8 or 25% of each group. In this activity group discussion class and think pair share class have the same frequency in *the less active* category. So, both of the class have the same activity in enhancement students' speaking ability between those who were taught through group discussion and think pair share for *less active* category.

The last category is *not* active, the data from group discussion for this item of students response is 2 or about 6.25%, while

for think pair share is 3frequency or 9.375%. For *not active* item, both of groups is different only in small frequency; it was one number of think pair class comparing to group discussion class. It can be said that the frequency of both classes for *not active* is different in students' speaking ability for group discussion class and also for think pair share class. Thus, group discussion class performed well for this activity rather than think pair share class.

CONCLUSION

Based on the result finding and discussion above, there is no significant differences in the comparative of students' speaking ability enhancement between group discussion and think pair share strategy of students grade X IPA 1 and X IPS at SMA Inshafuddin Banda Aceh. For 5 categories of activity, both groups shared the same frequency for *active, fairly active,* and *less active.* While for *a very active* category, group discussion is higher for only one number rather than think pair share. Moreover, for *a not active* category, group discussion is less one number compares to think pair share class. Thus, both of the strategies can perform well by the students during speaking class.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We would like to extend my gratitude to the Minister of Research, Technology and Higher Education of the Republic of Indonesia that has sponsored this program (PDS) and thanks to the subject of this research, SMA Inshafuddin Banda Aceh. We also profoundly express our greatest to PDS teams' of STKIP Bina Bangsa Getsempena Banda Aceh.

REFERENCES

Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by Principles:An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy.* New York : Longman.

Florez, S. (2010). *Learner Training in Foreign/Second Language Learning.* London : Longman.

Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., &Airasian, P. W. (2012).Educationalresearch:competencies foranalysisand applications (10thed).Boston:Pearson.

Harmer,Jeremy.2001.ThePracticeofEnglish LanguageTeaching.Cambridge:Longman

Huda Miftahul. 2011. Cooperative Learning. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Kusrini,Endang.2012.*Teaching Speaking for Senior High School Students Using Cooperative Learning "Think-Pair-Share".*Purwokerto: OnlineJournal. Ledlow.

Ledlow, Susan. 2012. Using TPS in College Classroom. Phoenix: Arizona State University.

Munir. (2000). The Interest of The Semester Students ofEnglish Department Faculty of Language and Arts MakassarState University In Learning Listening ComprehensionThrough Video Compact Disc. State University of Makassar, Makassar.

Nunan, R. (2003). *Teaching English as International Language*. London: Macmillan Publisher.

Susan.(2012).*UsingTPSinCollegeClassroom.*Phoenix:ArizonaStateUniversity.

Thornbury,Scott.2005.*HowToTeachSpeaking*.England: Longman

Wallace,Starihaand Walberg. 2004. *International Academi of International Bereau of Education Teaching Speaking, Listening and Writing.* Switzerland: The International Academy of Education (IAE) Palaisdes Academies, I, rue ducale, 1000 Brussels, Belgiumand the International Bereau of Education.