

FROM PAIR TALK TO CLASSROOM VOICE: STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THINK-PAIR-SHARE IN ENGLISH SPEAKING ACTIVITIES

SUPARMI

Suparmi@upiypk.ac.id

English Language Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education,
Universitas Putra Indonesia YPTK Padang, Indonesia

Corresponding author: Suparmi@upiypk.ac.id

Abstract: Think-Pair-Share (TPS) provides a structured progression from individual preparation to peer rehearsal and whole-class speaking, making it relevant to English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms where students often need cognitive and social support before speaking publicly. This descriptive quantitative study examined English Education students' perceptions of TPS in English speaking activities across four functional dimensions: idea preparation, peer support, speaking confidence, and classroom participation. Data from 40 students were collected using a 20-item five-point Likert questionnaire. Negatively worded items were reverse-scored before descriptive analysis. The overall perception was positive ($M = 3.79$, $SD = 0.19$), with 66.75% of all scored responses falling in the agree or strongly agree categories. Peer support received the highest mean ($M = 3.97$, $SD = 0.36$), followed by classroom participation ($M = 3.86$, $SD = 0.43$), idea preparation ($M = 3.71$, $SD = 0.32$), and speaking confidence ($M = 3.63$, $SD = 0.44$). Item-level results showed strong appreciation for partner discussion and post-pair participation, but also revealed continuing fear and reluctance during public sharing. Internal consistency was low (Cronbach's $\alpha = .206$), so the findings are interpreted descriptively and with caution. The results suggest that TPS may be perceived as more supportive for collaborative preparation than for eliminating affective barriers to public speaking.

Keywords: Think-Pair-Share; speaking activities; students' perceptions; EFL; cooperative learning

A.Introduction

Speaking is a central component of communicative competence because it enables learners to negotiate meaning, express ideas, respond to others, and participate in academic and social interaction. In English as a Foreign Language (EFL) settings, however, speaking often remains one of the most demanding skills. Students may possess adequate receptive knowledge but still hesitate to communicate orally because they have limited preparation time, insufficient vocabulary, fear of making mistakes, concern about peer evaluation, or limited opportunities to practice. These challenges are especially visible in university speaking classes, where students are expected not only to produce grammatically acceptable language but also to organize ideas, respond spontaneously, and communicate with confidence in front of peers.

The need for supportive speaking pedagogy has encouraged the use of cooperative learning strategies that increase student-to-student interaction and reduce dependence on teacher-fronted instruction. Cooperative learning can provide more opportunities for oral rehearsal, peer feedback, shared responsibility, and lower-risk interaction. Namaziandost, Homayouni, and Rahmani (2020) reported that cooperative learning approaches, including Think-Pair-Share, supported EFL learners' speaking fluency by increasing interaction and active participation. Similarly, Raba (2017) found that Think-Pair-Share (TPS) contributed positively to oral communication, cooperative classroom interaction, and learner motivation. These findings suggest that structured peer interaction can create conditions in which students have more time and more social support to formulate and communicate ideas.

TPS is commonly described through three sequential stages: Think, Pair, and Share. In the Think stage, learners are given individual time to interpret a prompt, activate prior knowledge, generate ideas, and plan what they want to say. In the Pair stage, learners discuss their ideas with a partner, compare viewpoints, rehearse language, and receive immediate peer support. In the Share stage, learners communicate the result of their thinking and pair discussion to a larger audience. The pedagogical value of TPS therefore lies not only in the final public-speaking moment but also in the gradual movement from private cognitive preparation to low-risk peer interaction and, finally, public participation. This sequence is potentially useful in speaking classes because it can distribute the cognitive and affective demands of speaking across several manageable steps.

The sequence also provides a useful way to understand why students may perceive different parts of the technique differently. The Think stage primarily addresses cognitive readiness: learners decide on content, retrieve vocabulary, and organize a response. The Pair stage adds interpersonal scaffolding because a partner can confirm meaning, supply language, challenge an idea, or simply provide a safer rehearsal audience. The Share stage then introduces public accountability and visibility. These stages therefore involve different demands, and an overall attitude score may conceal important variation. A learner can value pair discussion but dislike public sharing, or appreciate thinking time while finding pair work unhelpful. Measuring these functions separately can produce a more diagnostically useful picture of the classroom experience.

Students' perceptions matter because instructional effectiveness is partly mediated by how learners interpret the learning environment. A technique that is theoretically interactive may not generate engagement if students feel rushed, mismatched with partners, or exposed during public sharing. Conversely, a relatively simple routine can become powerful when students perceive that it gives them preparation time, social support, and a legitimate opportunity to contribute. For speaking instruction, these perceptions are especially relevant because willingness to speak is not determined solely by linguistic knowledge; it is also influenced by confidence, perceived risk, audience, task structure, and opportunities for rehearsal.

For this reason, the present study treats perception as a multidimensional classroom construct rather than a single like-or-dislike judgment. Idea preparation represents the cognitive support students associate with the Think stage. Peer support represents the collaborative value of the Pair stage. Speaking confidence reflects the affective support students perceive across the transition from preparation to public speaking. Classroom participation represents the extent to which the Share stage creates a meaningful route into whole-class interaction. Together, these dimensions provide a practical model for interpreting how students experience TPS as a speaking-learning process.

Empirical work has generally supported the potential of TPS for speaking development. Darmawan and Lestariningsih (2023) reported that English Education students viewed TPS as helpful for self-confidence, oral communication, teamwork, and critical thinking. Sriyanda and Priyana (2024a) similarly found that students perceived TPS as beneficial for communication, participation, collaboration, practice, feedback, and confidence. In an experimental study, Yokomine and Purnamasari (2024) found a significant effect of TPS on students' English-speaking performance. More recent classroom studies also indicate that TPS may increase speaking participation (Ghifari et al., 2026), support public-speaking practice (Lestari & Yuliati, 2026), and contribute to speaking achievement and self-efficacy when combined with other cooperative structures (Fadillah, Sukirlan, & Kadaryanto, 2025).

Recent research has also begun to examine more specific aspects of TPS. Sonya and Seinsiani (2026), for example, focused on the Share phase and highlighted its role in speaking confidence and deeper learning. Wu, Hapsari, and Huang (2026) extended TPS into

technology-enhanced learning by incorporating AI chatbots and found benefits for speaking anxiety, language enjoyment, and speaking performance. These studies show that the effectiveness of TPS may be shaped by what happens within particular stages and by the support available to learners as they move from preparation to interaction and public performance.

Despite the growing body of TPS research, several gaps remain relevant to EFL higher education. First, many studies investigate the overall effect of TPS on speaking scores, fluency, or participation, which can obscure how students perceive the distinct functions of the three-stage sequence. Second, perception studies have often relied on very small qualitative samples. Darmawan and Lestariningsih (2023), for instance, used four interview participants, while Sriyanda and Priyana (2024a) selected five participants. Such studies provide rich descriptions, but a descriptive quantitative survey can complement them by showing the distribution and relative strength of perceptions across a larger group. Third, recent research has examined a single TPS stage, particularly the Share phase, yet fewer studies have mapped how the full sequence is perceived as supporting idea preparation, peer support, confidence, and participation within the same speaking context.

The Indonesian higher-education context also makes students' perceptions pedagogically important. Language use, classroom norms, and confidence influence how learners respond to speaking tasks. Within AMRJ, Poyungi (2025) showed that students' comfort, confidence, and comprehension can shape their perceptions of English-medium classroom practices, while Indriyani and Uspayanti (2023) emphasized the importance of contextual speaking materials that create meaningful opportunities to perform language. These findings reinforce the need to understand not only whether a teaching technique is theoretically effective but also how learners experience the support it provides during actual classroom communication.

Accordingly, this study examines students' perceptions of TPS in English speaking activities using a descriptive quantitative design. The novelty is modest but specific: instead of treating TPS as a single instructional package, the study maps student perceptions across four functional dimensions that correspond to the learning process embedded in TPS—idea preparation, peer support, speaking confidence, and classroom participation. This stage-informed perception mapping is intended to reveal which functions students value most and which require further instructional support. The study addresses two research questions: (1) What are English Education students' overall perceptions of Think-Pair-Share in English speaking activities? and (2) Which perceived dimensions of TPS—idea preparation, peer support, speaking confidence, and classroom participation—receive the strongest and weakest evaluations? The findings are expected to provide practical guidance for lecturers who wish to structure speaking activities more gradually and inclusively.

B.Method

This study employs a descriptive quantitative survey design. The design is appropriate because the purpose is to describe the pattern and intensity of students' perceptions rather than to test a causal effect or compare experimental groups. The unit of analysis is the individual student's perception after experiencing TPS-based speaking activities. Quantitative responses are summarized using descriptive statistics so that the overall tendency and the relative strength of each perception dimension can be identified.

The study was conducted in the English Education Study Program at Universitas Putra Indonesia YPTK Padang, Indonesia. A total of 40 undergraduate students who had experience participating in Think-Pair-Share-based English speaking activities provided complete questionnaire responses and were included in the analysis. The study focused on students'

perceptions of the instructional experience rather than on measured gains in speaking proficiency.

The questionnaire was administered after students had experienced TPS-based speaking activities. In the classroom sequence, students first considered a speaking prompt individually, then discussed and rehearsed ideas with a partner, and finally shared responses with a wider audience. The survey asked students to evaluate the perceived support provided by these recurring stages for preparation, peer interaction, confidence, and participation.

The primary instrument was a 20-item closed-ended questionnaire organized around four dimensions: idea preparation, peer support, speaking confidence, and classroom participation. Each dimension contained five items. Responses were recorded on a five-point Likert scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree. Items 5, 10, 15, and 20 were negatively worded and were reverse-scored before composite means were calculated. The questionnaire blueprint and complete item list are provided in Appendix A.

The questionnaire was conceptually structured to represent the functional sequence of TPS rather than to treat the technique as a single undifferentiated construct. Idea preparation represented the Think stage, peer support represented the Pair stage, classroom participation represented the Share stage, and speaking confidence captured affective support across the sequence. Internal consistency was examined using Cronbach's alpha. Because the obtained reliability coefficients were low, the analysis emphasizes descriptive patterns and item-level interpretation rather than strong psychometric claims about the scale (Taber, 2018).

Data were collected through the completed questionnaire responses. All 40 questionnaires contained complete responses for the 20 perception items, so no case deletion or missing-value imputation was required. Responses were tabulated anonymously using respondent codes before analysis.

Data analysis used descriptive statistics. Frequencies and percentages were calculated for the response categories, while means and sample standard deviations summarized item-level, dimension-level, and overall perceptions. Mean scores were interpreted using the following descriptive ranges: 1.00–1.80 = very negative, 1.81–2.60 = negative, 2.61–3.40 = neutral/moderate, 3.41–4.20 = positive, and 4.21–5.00 = very positive. The four dimension means were ranked to identify the strongest and weakest perceived functions of TPS. Cronbach's alpha was also computed for the overall instrument and each dimension. Because the study was descriptive, the results are interpreted as students' perceptions rather than causal evidence of speaking improvement.

Table 1. Questionnaire Blueprint

Dimension	TPS Link	Indicators	Item Numbers	No. of Items
Idea Preparation	Think	Generating ideas; organizing content; planning language; readiness to speak	1–5	5
Peer Support	Pair	Rehearsal; clarification; feedback; vocabulary support; reduced uncertainty	6–10	5
Speaking Confidence	Think–Pair–Share	Reduced nervousness; willingness to speak; confidence before sharing; perceived control	11–15	5

Dimension	TPS Link	Indicators	Item Numbers	No. of Items
Classroom Participation	Share	Active contribution; equal opportunity; engagement; willingness to respond; classroom voice	16–20	5

C.Results and Discussion

A total of 40 valid questionnaires were analyzed. All response cells were complete. Negatively worded Items 5, 10, 15, and 20 were reverse-scored before the calculation of item, dimension, and overall means.

The overall Cronbach's alpha after the planned reverse scoring was $\alpha = .206$, indicating low internal consistency. Dimension-level coefficients were also limited: idea preparation $\alpha = -.213$, peer support $\alpha = .339$, speaking confidence $\alpha = .311$, and classroom participation $\alpha = .569$. The four reverse-worded items produced notably low reverse-scored means, suggesting response-direction or wording effects. For this reason, the composite results below are reported transparently but interpreted cautiously, with particular attention to item-level patterns.

Table 2. Reliability of the Perception Questionnaire

Scale/Dimension	No. of Items	Cronbach's Alpha	Interpretation
Overall TPS Perception	20	.206	Low
Idea Preparation	5	-.213	Problematic
Peer Support	5	.339	Low
Speaking Confidence	5	.311	Low
Classroom Participation	5	.569	Limited

Table 3. Students' Perceptions by Dimension

Dimension	Mean	SD	Rank	Category
Idea Preparation	3.71	0.32	3	Positive
Peer Support	3.97	0.36	1	Positive
Speaking Confidence	3.63	0.44	4	Positive
Classroom Participation	3.86	0.43	2	Positive
Overall Perception	3.79	0.19	—	Positive

Overall Perceptions Of Think-Pair-Share

The overall mean score was $M = 3.79$ ($SD = 0.19$), indicating a positive perception of TPS in English speaking activities. Across all 800 scored item responses, 66.75% were in the agree or strongly agree categories, 16.50% were neutral, and 16.75% were in the disagree or strongly disagree categories. Thus, the response pattern was generally favorable, although the low internal consistency and the contradictory response pattern on reverse-worded items require a cautious reading of the composite score.

The generally positive pattern is consistent with earlier studies reporting favorable student responses to TPS. Darmawan and Lestariningsih (2023) found that students associated TPS with confidence, teamwork, and oral communication support, while Sriyanda and Priyana (2024a) identified perceived benefits for participation, collaboration, practice, feedback, and confidence. In the present data, however, positive responses were not uniform across all items, which adds a useful caution: students may value particular stages of TPS while still experiencing difficulties in other parts of the speaking process.

These findings represent perceptions rather than proof of improved speaking proficiency. A positive questionnaire score indicates that students believed TPS supported parts of their speaking process; it does not demonstrate measurable gains in fluency, accuracy, pronunciation, or speaking-test performance. Studies using performance measures have reported beneficial effects of TPS (Namaziandost et al., 2020; Yokomine & Purnamasari, 2024), but the present design addresses how learners evaluate the instructional experience.

Idea Preparation: The Think Stage

The idea-preparation dimension obtained $M = 3.71$ ($SD = 0.32$), ranking third among the four dimensions and falling in the positive category. The highest-rated item was Item 1, "The thinking time helps me generate ideas before I speak" ($M = 4.60$, $SD = 0.55$). The lowest was reverse-scored Item 5, concerning whether the individual thinking stage did not help speaking preparation ($M = 2.20$, $SD = 0.94$). This contrast suggests that students strongly valued idea generation during the Think stage, but responses to the negatively worded statement were inconsistent with the surrounding positive items.

The Think stage may be particularly important in speaking classes because oral performance requires both content generation and linguistic formulation under time pressure. Individual thinking time allows learners to decide what they want to say before they are required to say it. If this dimension receives a high score, the finding would suggest that students value preparation as a form of cognitive scaffolding. This interpretation is consistent with the broader cooperative-learning literature, which emphasizes structured opportunities for learners to process information before interaction, and with TPS studies that link the technique to clearer idea organization and communication (Raba, 2017; Sriyanda & Priyana, 2024b).

Because idea preparation ranked below peer support and classroom participation, the Think stage appears useful but not sufficient on its own. Lecturers can strengthen this stage through concise guiding questions, vocabulary cues, key-word notes, or a short planning frame that helps students organize content without encouraging full script dependence. The item-level inconsistency also suggests that future versions of the questionnaire should avoid reverse wording or test it more carefully before administration.

Peer Support: The Pair Stage

The peer-support dimension produced the highest mean, $M = 3.97$ ($SD = 0.36$), indicating a positive perception of the Pair stage. Item 6, "Discussing with a partner helps me clarify my ideas," was the highest-rated item in the entire questionnaire ($M = 4.70$, $SD = 0.52$). In contrast, reverse-scored Item 10, which stated that partner work made speaking preparation more confusing, obtained $M = 2.28$ ($SD = 0.88$). The strong rating of Item 6

indicates that students particularly valued the clarification function of pair interaction, although the reverse item again revealed response inconsistency.

Pair work can reduce the immediate social risk of speaking because students first test ideas with one peer rather than in front of the whole class. The high peer-support mean aligns with Darmawan and Lestariningsih (2023), who reported that students valued teamwork in TPS. In the present study, the Pair stage appears to function as the most clearly appreciated bridge between private preparation and public performance, especially for clarifying ideas and rehearsing a response.

However, pair work is not automatically productive. A lower peer-support score may reflect unequal participation, overreliance on a more proficient partner, off-task discussion, or the use of Indonesian when English practice is intended. Lecturers can respond by rotating partners, assigning clear speaking roles, providing language frames, and requiring both students to contribute before the Share stage. Such implementation details are important because previous TPS studies have repeatedly noted that the quality of classroom implementation shapes the benefits students experience.

Speaking Confidence Across The Tps Sequence

The speaking-confidence dimension recorded $M = 3.63$ ($SD = 0.44$), the lowest of the four dimensions, although it remained within the positive category. Item 14, indicating that the TPS process helped students feel more in control of what they wanted to say, received the highest confidence-related mean ($M = 4.40$, $SD = 0.55$). Reverse-scored Item 15, which stated that students remained just as afraid to speak even after the Think and Pair stages, had the lowest mean in the entire instrument ($M = 1.33$, $SD = 0.57$). This pattern suggests that perceived control over content did not necessarily remove fear of public speaking for all students.

Confidence is an important affective component of classroom speaking because students may know what they want to say but still avoid participation when they fear errors or negative evaluation. TPS can potentially reduce this barrier by allowing a response to be cognitively prepared and socially rehearsed before public sharing. Previous studies have linked TPS with speaking confidence (Darmawan & Lestariningsih, 2023; Sriyanda & Priyana, 2024a), and Sonya and Seinsiani (2026) specifically highlighted the role of the Share phase in confidence development. Wu et al. (2026) further showed that TPS can interact with additional support, such as AI chatbots, to influence speaking anxiety and enjoyment.

The comparatively lower confidence score is pedagogically important. Pair rehearsal may help students prepare what to say without fully eliminating anxiety about saying it publicly. Lecturers may therefore combine TPS with smaller sharing groups, repeated low-stakes speaking opportunities, supportive feedback, and gradual movement from pair talk to whole-class performance. This distinction between preparation and affective readiness is one of the most informative patterns in the data.

Classroom Participation: The Share Stage

The classroom-participation dimension obtained $M = 3.86$ ($SD = 0.43$), ranking second. Item 18, "I am more willing to respond to classroom questions after discussing them with a partner," was rated very highly ($M = 4.68$, $SD = 0.53$). Reverse-scored Item 20, which stated a preference to remain silent during the Share stage even after pair discussion, received $M = 1.68$ ($SD = 0.66$). The result indicates that many students perceived pair discussion as supporting subsequent participation, but the reverse-item pattern also points to continued reluctance to speak publicly among some respondents.

Participation is the most visible outcome of TPS because the Share stage moves learners from pair-level talk to a broader audience. Ghifari et al. (2026) reported increased speaking

participation after TPS implementation, while Lestari and Yuliati (2026) described TPS as a structured support for EFL public speaking. A positive participation score in the present study would be consistent with these findings and would suggest that students perceive the sequence as giving them a clearer pathway into classroom talk.

At the same time, the Share stage can remain demanding. Not every student may receive equal airtime, and some students may prefer pair interaction to whole-class speaking. Sonya and Seinsiani (2026) emphasized that the Share phase deserves specific attention because its value depends on how the public contribution is organized. Lecturers can therefore vary the Share format: selected pairs can report, both partners can speak, students can share in small groups before plenary reporting, or brief rotating responses can be used to broaden participation.

Stage-Informed Perception Pattern And Practical Novelty

The central contribution of the present study lies in comparing four perceived functions within one TPS sequence. Peer support was rated highest ($M = 3.97$), followed by classroom participation ($M = 3.86$), idea preparation ($M = 3.71$), and speaking confidence ($M = 3.63$). This ranking suggests that students most clearly appreciated the collaborative value of pair interaction, while affective readiness for public speaking remained comparatively weaker. In other words, feeling supported by a partner does not automatically mean feeling fully confident before a wider audience.

This stage-informed approach provides a small but meaningful novelty relative to earlier studies that have assessed TPS as a whole or focused on a single phase. Sriyanda and Priyana (2024a) and Darmawan and Lestariningsih (2023) described overall student perspectives using small qualitative samples, while Sonya and Seinsiani (2026) concentrated specifically on the Share phase. The present survey complements those approaches by quantifying how students evaluate multiple functional dimensions across the entire sequence. The contribution is therefore not the claim that TPS is new, but the more precise mapping of how students experience its internal learning process in a university speaking context.

This distinction is also practically useful for lecturers. A technique can receive an overall positive evaluation while still containing a weak stage. Dimension-level results can guide instructional adjustment: low idea-preparation scores may call for stronger prompts; low peer-support scores may require partner-structure changes; low confidence scores may require gradual exposure and supportive feedback; and low participation scores may require more equitable Share formats. In this way, descriptive perception data can inform targeted pedagogical decisions rather than simply confirming that students like or dislike a method.

Pedagogical Implications

The positive but third-ranked idea-preparation score suggests that the Think stage should be maintained while being made more concrete. Brief planning prompts, key-word notes, vocabulary cues, and sentence starters can help students transform thinking time into speakable content without encouraging memorized scripts.

Because Peer Support was the highest-rated dimension, lecturers can use pair work more deliberately as a rehearsal and clarification space. Students can be asked to paraphrase a partner's idea, provide one suggestion, identify one useful expression, or rehearse a short response before moving to the Share stage. Such structure may preserve the collaborative benefit that students valued most strongly.

Speaking Confidence was the weakest dimension, so the transition from pair talk to public performance deserves special attention. Students may benefit from an intermediate stage in which two pairs combine, from brief low-stakes sharing, from explicit normalization

of minor language errors, and from supportive feedback that emphasizes meaning before accuracy during fluency-oriented tasks.

Classroom Participation was the second-highest dimension, indicating that the Share stage was generally perceived positively. To broaden participation beyond already-confident students, lecturers can rotate pair reporters, use random selection only after adequate rehearsal, conduct mini-presentations, or use short response rounds. These formats can preserve the movement from pair talk to classroom voice while reducing the pressure of a single high-stakes performance.

Limitations And Directions For Further Research

The study has several limitations. First, the overall internal consistency was low ($\alpha = .206$), and the reverse-worded items produced response patterns that were inconsistent with neighboring positive items. The composite means should therefore be interpreted descriptively rather than as evidence of a highly reliable latent scale. Future studies should revise or positively rephrase the reverse-worded items and re-evaluate reliability in a larger pilot sample.

Second, the data were based on self-reported perceptions from a single institution. Students may perceive TPS positively even when their speaking performance does not improve, and students in other universities, proficiency levels, course types, or cultural settings may experience pair work and public sharing differently. Replication across settings would strengthen the generalizability of the stage-informed pattern.

Third, the descriptive quantitative design identifies response patterns but cannot fully explain why some students remain anxious or silent after pair discussion. Follow-up interviews or open-ended responses could clarify partner dynamics, preparation habits, anxiety, language choice, and classroom climate, particularly around the transition to public sharing.

Finally, the study does not test causal effects. Future research can combine a refined stage-informed perception instrument with speaking assessments, participation counts, or classroom observation to examine whether perceived preparation, peer support, confidence, and participation correspond to measurable differences in speaking performance.

Table 4. Highest- and Lowest-Rated Questionnaire Items (reverse-scored where applicable)

Rank Type	Item No.	Short Statement	Mean	SD
Highest 1	6	Partner discussion helps clarify ideas	4.70	0.52
Highest 2	18	More willing to respond after pair discussion	4.68	0.53
Highest 3	1	Thinking time helps generate ideas	4.60	0.55
Lowest 1	15R	Still afraid after Think and Pair	1.33	0.57
Lowest 2	20R	Prefer to stay silent during Share	1.68	0.66
Lowest 3	5R	Think stage does not help preparation	2.20	0.94

D.Conclusion

This study described English Education students' perceptions of Think-Pair-Share in English speaking activities through four functional dimensions. The overall perception was positive ($M = 3.79$, $SD = 0.19$). Peer support was the highest-rated dimension ($M = 3.97$), followed by classroom participation ($M = 3.86$), idea preparation ($M = 3.71$), and speaking confidence ($M = 3.63$). The pattern indicates that students most clearly valued the collaborative support of pair interaction, while confidence during public speaking remained comparatively weaker. Item-level results further showed that students appreciated partner-based clarification and were more willing to respond after pair discussion, yet some still reported fear or a preference for silence during sharing. Because the overall reliability was low ($\alpha = .206$), these findings should be read as descriptive evidence rather than as a strong psychometric profile. The study's practical contribution is the stage-informed mapping of TPS: lecturers can preserve the strong Pair function while strengthening the transition from preparation and peer support to confident whole-class speaking. Future research should refine the reverse-worded items and combine perception data with interviews, observations, or speaking-performance measures.

References

- Akbarjono, A., Putra, P. P., & Khasanah, U. N. (2022). The students' perception of cooperative learning with Think-Pair-Share strategy in teaching English speaking. *JPI: Jurnal Pustaka Indonesia*, 1(3). <https://doi.org/10.62159/jpi.v1i3.641>
- Baan, A. (2023). The Think-Pair-Share approach in learning Indonesian language for semester 1 students of English Education Program. *ELT Worldwide: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.26858/eltww.v10i1.45612>
- Darmawan, Y. R. R., & Lestariningsih, F. E. (2023). Students' views toward the use of Think-Pair-Share strategy on students' oral communication skill in an EFL context. *JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 11(4), 798–809. <https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v11i4.8694>
- Fadillah, A. N., Sukirlan, M., & Kadaryanto, B. (2025). Integrated Talking Chips and Think-Pair-Share strategies to promote speaking achievement and self-efficacy. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 9(2), 4198–4205. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.9020329>
- Ghifari, A., Syahriwan, M., Fahreza, N., & Syahid, A. (2026). Improving speaking participation through Think-Pair-Share in an EFL classroom. *Indonesian Journal of Classroom Action Research*, 4(1), 16–18. <https://doi.org/10.53866/ijcar.v4i1.1150>
- Indriyani, N., & Uspayanti, R. (2023). Adapting Google Maps as the source of speaking material for EOP students. *Acceleration: Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 1(4). <https://doi.org/10.70210/amrj.v1i04.43>
- Lestari, T. D., & Yuliati, Y. (2026). The implementation of Think-Pair-Share in EFL public speaking: A case study. *Esteem Journal of English Education Study Programme*. <https://doi.org/10.31851/bjz37d26>
- Namazandost, E., Homayouni, M., & Rahmani, P. (2020). The impact of cooperative learning approach on the development of EFL learners' speaking fluency. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 7(1), 1780811. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2020.1780811>
- Poyungi, Y. S. (2025). Non-English major students' perceptions: The use of English in English subject learning. *Acceleration: Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 3(2), 53–59. <https://doi.org/10.70210/amrj.v3i2.134>
- Pratiwi, A., Putra, E., Maulidza, M., Pratiwi, R., Putri, R. H., Salsabila, S., & Juliati, J. (2025). Application of Think-Pair-Share method to improve speaking skills of

- elementary school students. *TOFEDU: The Future of Education Journal*, 4(5), 1039–1045. <https://doi.org/10.61445/tofedu.v4i5.553>
- Raba, A. A. A. (2017). The influence of Think-Pair-Share (TPS) on improving students' oral communication skills in EFL classrooms. *Creative Education*, 8(1), 12–23. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2017.81002>
- Sonya, P., & Seinsiani, I. G. (2026). The role of sharing phase in Think-Pair-Share technique in promoting deep learning and student's speaking confidence: A qualitative study. *Journal of English Language and Education*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.31004/jele.v11i1.2061>
- Sriyanda, R., & Priyana, J. (2024a). Students' perceptions of Think-Pair-Share technique in promoting students' communication skills in an EFL context. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, 11(6), 583–591. <https://doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v11i6.6154>
- Sriyanda, R., & Priyana, J. (2024b). Promoting critical thinking in speaking classes using the Think-Pair-Share technique. *JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 12(4), 1913–1925. <https://doi.org/10.33394/jolllt.v12i4.12582>
- Syafii, M. L. (2018). Using the Think-Pair-Share strategy to increase students' active involvement and to improve their speaking ability. *Indonesian Journal of English Education*, 5(1), 61–80. <https://doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v5i1.7679>
- Taber, K. S. (2018). The use of Cronbach's alpha when developing and reporting research instruments in science education. *Research in Science Education*, 48, 1273–1296. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-016-9602-2>
- Wu, T.-T., Hapsari, I. P., & Huang, Y.-M. (2026). Effects of incorporating AI chatbots into Think-Pair-Share activities on EFL speaking anxiety, language enjoyment, and speaking performance. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 39(5–6), 1408–1446. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2025.2478271>
- Yokomine, M. A. A., & Purnamasari, A. (2024). The effectiveness of using Think Pair and Share technique on students' English-speaking performance. *Journal of English Teaching*, 10(3), 335–345. <https://doi.org/10.33541/jet.v10i3.5634>