

# The Collaborative Think Pair Share Method

Henny Henny and Rosita Qurotul Uyun

Nurul Fikri Islamic Education and Empowering Foundation, Nurul Fikri Islamic Integrated Senior High School, Indonesia

**Keywords:** Think pair share, adjusting entries, student's achievement.

**Abstract:** When students are facing challenge especially difficult lesson and focus on teacher centre. The class condition become individualist and student's comprehension improve slowly. This phenomenon try to be take overed by using think pair share (TPS) method. TPS method consist of three steps, there are think independently (think step), pair discuss (pair step) and sharing the discussion result (share step). The aim of this action class research were knowing how to implement the TPS and was the effort of implementing TPS method could improve the student's achievement in adjusting entries lesson. This research used qualitative description by using the mastery learning as the indicator of achievement. The open quationare data processing result in cycle 1 and observer's note. The result showed that TPS could improve the student's achievement with pre-test 1 (pre cycle) score rate 72,74 (not mastering) increase to 80,14 (mastering) in pre-test 2 (cycle 1). In post-test 1 (pre cycle) reach score rate 48,10 (not mastering) then in post-test 2 (cycle 1) increase to 85,06 (mastering). In post-test 3 (cycle 2) student mastery reach 100% with score rate 94,53.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background

Accounting for trading company is a continuation of learning lessons at the level of the previous class, is accounting service company.

The uniqueness of adjusting entries lesson make this lesson has a high degree of difficulty compared to other accounting lesson. This is also evident from the initial condition of the class XII IPS students while review the adjusting entries lesson that has been taught during the class XI IPS.

Last year, a classroom action research with peer tutor method was used to improve learning achievement in the class XII IPS classroom adjustment lesson. The result of peer tutor methods proved to improve student achievement, although most of the tutorial activities more done outside of regular hours, so that the dynamics of peer tutors in the class is not very visible because student's sitting position in the class was permanent with the common model.

This year, researchers are interested in creating more dynamic and attractive classroom conditions, researchers are trying to implement the think pair share method.

This action research implement TPS which prove emotional intelligence can influence academic

achievement (Goleman, 2013). The emotional intelligent presented by conditioning the class basic rules, affective score board, etc.

Think pair share (Anita Lie, 2010) is one of cooperative learning learning model. Cooperative learning method is not only learning in groups. There are basic elements of cooperative learning learning that distinguishes it from the perfunctory group division.

Roger and David Johnson (1999) said that not all student's group can be implemented cooperative learning. To get maximum results, the five elements of the mutual learning model should be applied, ie positive interdependence, personal responsibility, face-to-face, peer-to-peer communication, and group process evaluation.

There have been three previous researches related to *Think-Pair-Share*, which were conducted by Hana Kurniawan (2012), Dino Sugiarto (2014) and Novi Marlana (2015). Hana Kurniawan's research indicates that TPS was successful to improve student's learning motivation in accounting lesson. Dino Sugiarto's research was successful to improve students' ability in reading narrative texts. Moreover, Novi Marlana showed that TPS implementation was effective to improve student learning's ability in self-concept lesson.

Teachers as facilitators role manage the steps by step, conditioned the classroom, conditioned the other

students by making the system or rules during the learning activities are done.

Based on the description above the researchers tried to conduct research with the title " The Implementation of Think Pair Share Method to Improve Student's Achievement in Adjusting Entries Lesson Class XII Social 2 ISLAMIC INTERGRATED SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL Nurul Fikri ".

## 1.2 Success Indicator

Indicators of Think Pair Share (TPS) success are assessed from five items:

- 1) Conformity of learning process with steps of Think Pair Share (TPS) learning method.
- 2) Students master learning if they get a minimum score of  $\geq 80$  and a maximum score of 100 or gain learning achievement of at least 80% on the assessment of the results of the average answers to questions on post-test 2 during cycle 1, post-test 3 during cycle 2 and there is an increase in the average value between Pre-test 1 and pre-test 2, post-test 1 and post-test 2.
- 3) The success of the class is assessed from at least 85% of the students in the class are completely studied during quiz 1 and post-test 3.
- 4) Activity participation and student's culture talk succeeded when achieved 80% success with the value of mastery 80.

Researchers can identify constraints during learning and find solutions to solve it.

## 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1 One other development economist who pays attention Think Pair Share

The strategy of think pair share (TPS) is a type of cooperative learning designed to influence the pattern of student interaction. The strategy of think pair share (tps) is developed from cooperative learning research. The strategy of think pair share (tps) was first developed by Frank Lyman and Colleagues at the Maryland University in 1981.

In Kagan (1989) think pair share is divided into three steps, the first step, the students think to themselves about the topic or problems conveyed by the teacher, then the students discuss in pairs on the topic that has been thought by each student, then they share the ideas or the result of their discussion in front of the class.

Think pair share is one form of cooperative learning method or cooperative learning. According to Slavin (1997), cooperative learning is a method of learning with students working in groups that have heterogeneous capabilities. All the methods of cooperative learning contribute to the idea that students who work together in learning and responsible for their teammates are able to make themselves learn as well.

### 2.2 Student's Achievement

Achievement of learning according to experts (Habsari, 2005) argue are:

- a. Ngalim Purwanto (1978) states: "Learning achievement is the learning outcomes that have been given by teachers to students or by lecturers to students within a certain period."
- b. Abu Ahmadi (1978) states: "Achievement learning is the result achieved in an effort learning to make changes or achieve goals."

From the descriptions above, learning achievement is always associated with the results achieved because of an effort, science and skills. There are internal and external factors that affect achievement. Internal factors are Intelligence Quotient, Emotional Quotient, Spiritual Quotient, Creativity Quotient, and Adversity Quotient.

Even according to research conducted Goleman in America there is a relationship between emotional intelligence with learning achievement while research in Indonesia by Sri Lanawati (1999) in Setiabudhi (2002) there is no relationship between emotional intelligence and learning achievement, but there is a significant relationship IQ with learning achievement. This happens because the education system in Indonesia is more oriented to the development of rational intelligence, less oriented to the developer of emotional intelligence in the learning process.

### 2.3 Adjusting Entries

According to Weygandt (2007) in order for revenues to be recorded in the period in which they are earned, and for expenses to be recognized in the period in which they are incurred, companies make adjusting entries. Adjusting entries ensure that the revenue recognition and expense recognition principles are followed.

Adjusting entries are necessary because the trial balance the first pulling together of the transaction data may not contain up-to-date and complete data.

Adjusting entries are required every time a company prepares financial statements. The company analyzes each account in the trial balance to determine whether it is complete and up to date for financial statement purposes. Every adjusting entry will include one income statement account and one balance sheet account.

### 3 METHODS

The design of this research is participatory classroom action research. The research procedure follows the basic principles proposed by Kemmis & McTaggart. According to Kemmis and McTaggart (1992) in Ary Gumanti, et al (2016), action research can be viewed as a spiral that begins with planning, action, observation, and reflection which may then be followed by the next spiral cycle.

The subject of the research is the twelfth grader of Nurul Fikri Islamic Integrated Senior High School Class XII social 2, which consist of 32 female students. The instrument used in this research are written test with minimum mastery criteria (MMC) 80, open questionnaire. The purpose of using questionnaire to get student’s perspective about their self-reflection (Xiaohong, 2003) and their feeling when implement TPS. The purpose of observation to look student’s performance and affective score through score board. Moreover, it will interpret the comprehension of the student’s assessment in team work. The questionnaire will be given at the end of every cycle, and it will measure the student’s comprehension in adjusting entries lesson and improvement teaching method.

#### 3.1 Pre Cycle

Pre cycle was done to get authentic data about student’s academic achievement and their basic

modality to learn adjusting entries. In the first phase of the study, which was also the beginning of the pre planning for change cycle, we started formal pre-test and post-test 1. After that, students wrote their general views on learning adjusting entries as subject in open questionnaire. The common problem raised was that adjusting entries involves teaching about very abstract concepts which learners find difficult to comprehend. The problem seemed to be compounded by lack of active learner involvement in class, because the subject was mostly taught from a teacher-centred approach.

Table 1: Recapitulation Result of *Pre Test* dan *Post Test 1*

No.	Score result	<i>Pre-test 1</i>		<i>Post Test 1</i>	
		N	%	N	%
1	Above MMC	12	38.71	1	3.45
2	MMC	2	6.45	0	0.00
3	Under MMC	17	54.84	28	96.55
Sum		31	100.00	29	100.00
Average		72.74		48.10	

Based on table 1 it showed that many students didn’t master the lesson, 54,84% under MMC for pre Test 1 and 96,66% under MMC for post-test 1. In accordance with the open questionnaires result, students stated that they need review lesson for adjusting entries.

#### 3.2 Cycle 1

The first step before implemented TPS method, we make a lesson plan completely, including the Alfa zone and warmer activities. We also prepared the scoreboard and emoticon stamps.

Students enjoyed the TPS method. They were quick to understand the TPS steps and get a good cooperation to each other. Although they still need to do the exercise to improve their learning ability.

Table 2: Recapitulation Result of *Pre Test*, *Post Test* and *Quiz* (Cycle 1)

No	Score Result	<i>Pre-test 1</i>		<i>Pre-test 2</i>		<i>Post Test 1</i>		<i>Post Test 2</i>		Quiz	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1	Above MMC	12	38.71	12	40.00	1	3.45	24	77.42	31	96.88
2	MMC	2	6.45	8	26.67	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
3	Under MMC	17	54.84	10	33.33	28	96.55	7	22.58	1	3.13
Sum		31	100.00	30	100.00	29	100.00	31	100.00	32	100.00
Average		72,74		80,17		48,1		85,06		96,28	

The data above illustrates that mastery learning target (80%) isn't fulfilled in pre-test 1, pre-test 2, post-test 1 and only reach 77,42%. Meanwhile the

average rate has increased especially from post-test 1 to post-test 2, and in the quiz result has fulfilled mastery learning target with 96,88%.

Table 3: Question Analysis Quiz (Cycle 1)

Question No.	Question Items	Correct Answer		Information
		n	%	
1	Defferal Transaction (recorded as assets)	29	90.63	9,37% wrong in nominal counting
2	COGS & Income Summary Approach	31	96.88	wrong in record name of account
3	Supplies using	30	93.75	wrong in nominal counting
4	Vehicle Depreciation	32	100.00	
5	Defferal Transaction (recorded as lialibities)	32	100.00	
6	Defferal Transaction (recorded as expenses)	16	50.00	43,75% wrong in nominal counting
				3,125% wrong in account position
				3,125% wrong in nominal counting and account name
7	Accrual transaction (Accrued revenues)	31	96.88	wrong in nominal counting and account name
8	Accrual Transaction (Accrued expenses)	31	96.88	wrong in nominal counting and account name
Average			90.63	

Based on table 3 illustrates that generally students have mastered adjusting entries lesson with average mastery score 90,63. But, students who haven't mastered mostly in deferral transaction (recorded as expenses) only 50% with the biggest mistake on nominal counting.

Table 4: Recapitulation Emoticon Sum in Scoreboard

No.	Emoticon Sum	Criteria	N=32	
			n	%
1	> 12	Very good	4	12.50
2	9-12	Good	21	65.63
3	5-8	Quite Good	6	18.75
4	1-4	Poor	1	3.13
Sum			32	100.00
Average			9,84	

Most of the students had a good criteria. Its mean they have good presence, quite active and had a good score (MMC or above MMC).

Table 5: Criteria Interpretation

Criteria	Interpretation
Very good	Full present, all test $\geq$ MMC, full participant
Good	Full present, 3-4 test $\geq$ MMC, 3-4 participant
Quite good	Half present, 1-2 test $\geq$ MMC, 1-2 participant
Poor	Poor present, 1 test $\geq$ MMC or 1 participant

### 3.3 Cycle 2

Based on reflection step in cycle 1, we made several changes in lesson plan specially assessment rubric to make easier assessments and more communicative score. Furthermore, there was no more scoreboard in cycle 2 because we had limited time in this research. Students had a very busy schedule to face their school exam.

Table 6: Recapitulation Score in Quiz and Post-test 3

No.	Score	Quiz (Cycle 1)		Post-test 3 (Cycle 2)	
		n	%	n	%
1	Above MMC	31	96.88	31	96.88
2	MMC	0	0.00	1	3.13
3	Under MMC	1	3.13	0	0.00
Total		32	100.00	32	100.00
Average		96,28		94,53	

The score that shows on table 6 it's a normal situation because in cycle 2 the closing journal and worksheet lesson are easier than adjusting entries. It's reasonable if students could have a very good score, quiz has a very good average cause it helped by drill method along the TPS implementation in cycle 1.

Table 7: Observation Result

No	Score	Participation		Talking Manner	
		n	%	n	%
1	above 80	31	96.88	32	100.00
2	80	0	0.00	0	0.00
3	under 80	1	3.13	0	0.00
Sum		32	100.00	32	100.00
Average		89,53		97,81	

Based on table 7 student's participation and talking manner had implemented very well. Student's enjoyed the class and they had the same frequency to build their nearest dream, the dream to face the college world. According to student's says about the implementation of think pair share method, they felt more responsible to each other, more focus, and some of their bad habit change, like sleeping in the classroom, forget to bring their learning tools, etc.

## 4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 4.1 Pre Cycle

The students didn't mastered the adjusting entries lesson yet. The average score only 48,10 and they thought adjusting entries is a difficult lesson.

The students needed to review the adjusting entries for Service Company first before entering adjusting entries for trading company and students still enjoyed the teacher centre model.

### 4.2 Cycle 1

The students had understood TPS method from the first time teacher gave explanation and did simulation. Although there were three student who still needed adaption for the pair step. They believed more to ask their teacher directly than ask their friend.

The student had a great cooperative involvement so they could get a progressive improvement and get ready to drill the exercise. Moreover the average score improve from 48,10 to 85,06.

The students felt the different method, felt the benefit of TPS and they could understand teacher's aim when implement TPS.

### 4.3 Cycle 2

The implementation of TPS was done easier because the closing journal lesson is also easier than adjusting entries. It's no wonder if they could reach 100% for the minimum mastery criteria (MMC).

The students felt more fun and attractive class. They just needed to follow the TPS steps timing.

## 4.4 Discussion

Data were analyzed based on indicators of Think Pair Share (TPS) success of five items: (1) Conformity of learning process with steps of Think Pair Share (TPS) learning method. (a) Cycle 1 is already running according to the steps of the think pair share method with the addition of peer tutor and drill method because of the difficulty level of the lesson. In the share step is also modified with presentation of the representation group. (b)The cycle 2 also runs quite in accordance with the steps of the think pair share method with modifications to the step of sharing that the presentation is done in the internal group because of limited facilities in the class that have not been prepared before. (2) Students are said to be master learning if they get a minimum score of  $\geq 80$  and the highest score of 100 or gain learning achievement of at least 80% on the assessment of the average results of answers to questions on post-test 2 during cycle 1. (3) The success of the class is assessed from at least 85% of the students in the class are completely studied when the quiz is in cycle 1 and post-test 3 at cycle 2.(4) Participation and student talk culture is said to succeed when achieved 80% success with the value of 80. (5) Researchers can identify constraints during learning and find solutions to their solutions. Based on self-reflection in cycle 1 and cycle 2 researchers can identify problems and attempt to make improvements in subsequent learning.

This in line with Ledlow (2001) Think-Pair-Share is a low-risk strategy to get many students actively involved in classes of any size. The procedure is simple: after asking a question, tell students to think silently about their answers. As a variation, you might have them write their individual answers. (Depending on the complexity of the question and the amount of time I think is appropriate for the activity, I give them anywhere from 10 seconds to five minutes to work individually.) Then ask them to pair up with a partner to compare or discuss their responses.

Moreover, Anita Lie (2010) stated that the implementation of cooperative learning model procedures correctly will possibly make the teachers to manage the class more effectively.

## 5 CONCLUSIONS

Based on the results of the research can be concluded that the implementation of Think Pair Share (TPS) can implement in a big class (over than 30-40 students). TPS method can be combined with discussion methods, drill and peer teaching method. TPS method can be adjusted duration of time depending on the lesson's difficulty.

Student learning outcomes increased and the student's positive character also improved very well specially in team building and their concern to each other.

## REFERENCES

- Goleman, Daniel, Richard E. Boyatzis and ,Annie McKee. 2013. *Primal Leadership: Unleashing the Power of Emotional Intelligence*. Harvard Business Press.
- Gumanti, Tatang Ary, Yunidar dan Syahrudin. 2016. *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Mitra Wacana Media.
- Hana Kurniawan & Andian Ari Istiningrum. 2012. Penerapan Metode Pembelajaran Kooperatif Teknik Think Pair Share Untuk Meningkatkan Motivasi Belajar Akuntansi Kompetensi Dasar Menghitung Mutasi Dana Kas Kecil Siswa Kelas X Akuntansi 2 SMK Negeri 7 Yogyakarta Tahun Ajaran 2011/2012. *Jurnal Pendidikan Akuntansi Indonesia* Vol. X. Hal. 114 – 134
- Henny dan Hendrastuti Retno Harsari. 2016. Action Class Research, "Penerapan Metode Pembelajaran Tutor Teman Sebaya Terhadap Peningkatan Prestasi & Motivasi Belajar dalam Remedial Materi Jurnal Penyesuaian, Harga Pokok Penjualan, dan Laba (Rugi) Perusahaan Dagang Perusahaan Dagang Kelas XII IPS".
- Johnson, David W. and Roger T. Johnson. 1999. *Making Cooperative Learning Work. Theory in to Praticce*. Spring 99, Vol 38 Issue 2. The Ohio University.
- Kagan, Spencer. 1989. *The Structural Approach to Cooperative Learning*.
- Ledlow, Susan. 2001. *Using Think-Pair-Share in the College Classroom* Arizona State University
- Lie, Anita. 2010. *Cooperative Learning. Mempraktikkan Cooperative Learning di Ruang-Ruang Kelas*. Jakarta: PT. Grasindo Widia Sarana Indonesia.
- Madjid, Abdul, M. Pd. 2016. *Strategi Pembelajaran*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Marlena, Novi, Renny Dwijayanti dan Retno Mustika Dewi. Penerapan Pembelajaran Think Pair Share (TPS) untuk Meningkatkan Hasil Belajar Dan Respon Mahasiswa pada Materi Konsep Diri Mata Kuliah Pengembangan Kepribadian. Universitas Negeri Surabaya: Prosiding Seminar Nasional 9 Mei 2015
- Mudlofir, Ali dan Evi Fatimatur Rusydiyah. 2016. *Desain Pembelajaran Inovatif dari Teori ke Praktik*. Jakarta: PT Rajagrafindo Persada.
- Mulyatiningsih, Dr. Endang. 2012. *Metode Penelitian Terapan Bidang Pendidikan*. Bandung: CV Alfabeta, Bandung.
- Slavin, Robert E. 2005. *Cooperative Learning Teori, Riset dan Praktik*. Bandung: Penerbit Nusa Media
- Sugiarto, Dino and Puji Sumarsono. 2014. The Implementation of Think-Pair-Share Model to Improve Students' Ability in Reading Narrative Texts. *International Journal of English and Education* Volume 3.
- Weygandt, Kimmel & Kieso. *Accounting Principles 10th Edition*. 2007. Amerika: John Wiley & Sons.
- Xiaohong, Zhao. 2003. *An Action Research Inquiry into Integrated Skills of English*. China: Guyuan Teachers' Collage.