



**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.52714/dthu.14.07S.2025.1699>

## **THE EFFECTIVENESS OF USING THE THINK-PAIR-SHARE COOPERATIVE LEARNING IN TEACHING ENGLISH SPEAKING SKILLS TO HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS**

**Ho Thi Hue Lam<sup>1\*</sup> and Le Thanh Nguyet Anh<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>*Postgraduate, Dong Thap University, Cao Lanh 870000, Vietnam*

<sup>2</sup>*Foreign Languages Faculty, Dong Thap University, Cao Lanh 870000, Vietnam*

*\*Corresponding author, Email: [huelamc3qt@gmail.com](mailto:huelamc3qt@gmail.com)*

### **Article history**

*Received: 07/11/2025; Received in revised form: 30/11/2025; Accepted: 05/12/2025*

### **Abstract**

*This quasi-experimental study investigates the effects of the Think–Pair–Share (TPS) cooperative learning strategy on the English-speaking skills of 46 10th-grade students at a rural high school in An Giang province, Vietnam. The 12-week intervention was integrated into the English 10 textbook with weekly speaking lessons structured around three phases such as individual thinking, paired discussion, and whole-class sharing. Quantitative data were collected from pre- and post-speaking tests assessed across five domains including content, organization, pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary. Complementary qualitative data were obtained through semi-structured interviews with ten students. The results indicated statistically significant improvements in all assessed areas. Moreover, interview data revealed enhanced learner confidence, reduced speaking anxiety, and improved idea organization through peer collaboration. While students valued the structured interaction and peer support offered by TPS, some reported challenges related to time pressure and uneven group participation. These findings suggest that TPS is an effective, low-cost instructional strategy for fostering communicative competence in English as a foreign language, particularly in under-resourced rural contexts. The study highlights the pedagogical potential of TPS for promoting interactive speaking practice in secondary EFL classrooms and calls for further research into its long-term effects and adaptability across different learner populations.*

**Keywords:** *Cooperative learning, English speaking proficiency, EFL learners, instructional implementation, learner affective factors, quasi-experimental design, rural secondary education, Think–Pair–Share strategy.*

Cite: Ho, T. H. L., & Le, T. N. A. (2025). The effectiveness of using the Think-Pair-Share cooperative learning in teaching English speaking skills to high school students. *Dong Thap University Journal of Science*, 14(07S), 33-46. <https://doi.org/10.52714/dthu.14.07S.2025.1699>

Copyright © 2025 The author(s). This work is licensed under a CC BY-NC 4.0 License.

## **HIỆU QUẢ CỦA VIỆC SỬ DỤNG HÌNH THỨC HỌC TẬP HỢP TÁC THINK–PAIR–SHARE TRONG DẠY KỸ NĂNG NÓI TIẾNG ANH CHO HỌC SINH TRUNG HỌC PHỔ THÔNG**

**Hồ Thị Huệ Lam<sup>1</sup> và Lê Thanh Nguyệt Anh<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>*Học viên cao học, Trường Đại học Đồng Tháp, Việt Nam*

<sup>2</sup>*Khoa Ngoại ngữ, Trường Đại học Đồng Tháp, Việt Nam*

*\*Tác giả liên hệ, Email: huelamc3qt@gmail.com*

### **Lịch sử bài báo**

*Ngày nhận: 07/11/2025; Ngày nhận chỉnh sửa: 30/11/2025; Ngày duyệt đăng: 05/12/2025*

### **Tóm tắt**

*Nghiên cứu bán thực nghiệm này nhằm khảo sát tác động của chiến lược học tập hợp tác Suy nghĩ – Làm việc cặp đôi – Chia sẻ (TPS) đối với kỹ năng nói tiếng Anh của 46 học sinh lớp 10 tại trường trung học phổ thông nông thôn An Giang, Việt Nam. Trong thời gian thực hiện kéo dài 12 tuần, TPS được tích hợp vào các tiết học nói theo sách giáo khoa Tiếng Anh 10, bao gồm ba giai đoạn: tư duy cá nhân, thảo luận cặp đôi và chia sẻ trước lớp. Dữ liệu định lượng được thu thập từ bài kiểm tra nói trước và sau can thiệp, được đánh giá dựa trên năm tiêu chí: nội dung, tổ chức, phát âm, ngữ pháp và từ vựng. Song song đó, dữ liệu định tính được thu thập thông qua phỏng vấn với 10 học sinh. Kết quả cho thấy sự cải thiện có ý nghĩa thống kê ở tất cả các tiêu chí được đánh giá. Bên cạnh đó, dữ liệu phỏng vấn phản ánh sự gia tăng mức độ tự tin, khả năng tổ chức ý tưởng và giảm lo âu khi nói thông qua quá trình hợp tác với bạn học. Mặc dù học sinh đánh giá cao tính tương tác có hướng dẫn và sự hỗ trợ từ bạn cùng nhóm trong quá trình thực hiện TPS, một số em vẫn gặp khó khăn như áp lực thời gian và mức độ tham gia chưa đồng đều giữa các thành viên. Những phát hiện này cho thấy TPS là một chiến lược giảng dạy hiệu quả, chi phí thấp trong việc phát triển năng lực giao tiếp tiếng Anh, đặc biệt phù hợp với bối cảnh giáo dục nông thôn còn thiếu nguồn lực. Nghiên cứu đồng thời đề xuất tiếp tục khảo sát hiệu quả lâu dài và khả năng điều chỉnh của TPS với các nhóm người học khác nhau.*

**Từ khóa:** *Chiến lược Suy nghĩ – Làm việc cặp đôi – Chia sẻ, giáo dục trung học vùng nông thôn, học tập hợp tác, năng lực nói tiếng Anh, người học tiếng Anh như ngoại ngữ, thiết kế bán thực nghiệm, triển khai giảng dạy, yếu tố cảm xúc của người học.*

## **1. Introduction**

The revised General Education English Language Curriculum (MOET, 2018) prioritizes communicative competence and real-world language use in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) instruction. Despite this progressive shift, speaking remains the most challenging skill for Vietnamese high school students, particularly in rural contexts such as An Giang province. Students at Nguyen Cong Tru High School, for instance, exhibit comparatively low oral proficiency and limited classroom interaction, largely due to teacher-centered practices and a fear of making mistakes. This calls for more innovative, student-centered strategies aligned with the government's recent educational reform efforts (MOET, 2024), which encourage learner autonomy, communication, and critical skills.

In response, the TPS strategy (Lyman, 1981) has gained attention for promoting collaborative speaking. International research (Al-Zahrani, 2022; Hajrayana, 2022; Latifah, 2022; Adellia, 2022) reports improvements in fluency, vocabulary, and learner confidence. Additionally, Vietnamese studies (Phan, 2021; Nguyen et al., 2021, 2023) also indicate that TPS supports student participation and speaking development. Nonetheless, most prior research has focused on urban schools. Therefore, this study aims to investigate the pedagogical impact of the TPS cooperative learning strategy on the development of English-speaking skills among Grade 10 students in a rural high school setting in Vietnam. In addition, it seeks to explore students' perceptions regarding the benefits and challenges associated with participating in TPS-based speaking activities.

To achieve these aims, the study was conducted with Grade 10 students at Nguyen Cong Tru High School. It was guided by the following research questions: (1) To what extent does the implementation of TPS influence students' English-speaking performance? and (2) What perceived benefits and challenges do students report after engaging in TPS-integrated speaking tasks?

## **2. Literature Review**

### **2.1. Theoretical Foundations of the Think–Pair–Share Strategy**

TPS is a cooperative learning strategy first conceptualized by Lyman (1981) to promote student engagement through structured phases of reflection and peer interaction. Instead of teacher-fronted delivery, TPS aligns with learner-centered pedagogy rooted in social constructivist theory (Vygotsky, 1978), where learners co-construct knowledge via dialogue and shared problem-solving.

The strategy has been widely acknowledged for fostering both cognitive and affective gains in EFL instruction. TPS encourages students to generate, refine, and express ideas collaboratively, supporting higher-order thinking and language use in meaningful contexts (Johnson & Johnson, 1999; Brown, 2004). Moreover, it offers incremental scaffolding through individual preparation and peer interaction, which helps reduce cognitive overload and build learner confidence in oral communication (Harmer, 2002; Raba, 2017).

Another central advantage of TPS is its flexibility across class sizes, age groups, and proficiency levels. Its structure can be adapted to different teaching conditions, making it particularly suitable for under-resourced or rural classrooms where communicative opportunities are often limited (Ismail & Al Allaq, 2019; Nguyen et al., 2023). These theoretical and pedagogical strengths form the foundation for its growing adoption in EFL contexts.

## **2.2. Empirical Studies on TPS in EFL Speaking Development**

Despite the increasing adoption of TPS in EFL instruction, its documented impacts tend to cluster around four major domains, which are reviewed below to identify both consistent findings and persisting research gaps.

### *Speaking Fluency and Idea Development*

One of the most widely reported outcomes of TPS is its positive influence on students' fluency and ability to organize ideas. Nasution and Surya (2017) found that Indonesian high school students who engaged in TPS-based speaking tasks demonstrated improved fluency and greater spontaneity compared to those in conventional classrooms. Cahyani (2018) similarly reported enhanced verbal expression and logical sequencing of ideas, though her study's short duration limited the evaluation of long-term retention. In Saudi Arabia, Al-Zahrani (2022) observed that structured peer discussion in TPS significantly contributed to fluent and cognitively rich speech among university students. In the Vietnamese context, Nguyen et al. (2023) confirmed that repeated collaborative interaction supported more coherent and extended speaking performance.

### *Vocabulary Use and Language Accuracy*

TPS has also been linked to improvements in learners' lexical range and grammatical control. Retnowati and Ngadiso (2018) demonstrated that when TPS was integrated with vocabulary-focused tasks, students showed increased lexical recall and more accurate word use in speaking. Kurjum et al. (2020) further found that the structured peer interaction in TPS helped learners apply syntactic structures more accurately. In Vietnam, Nguyen et al. (2023) noted more varied and precise vocabulary use among learners participating in TPS activities, suggesting that the strategy supports not only fluency but also linguistic competence.

### *Affective Factors: Confidence and Anxiety Reduction*

The affective dimension of speaking is another area where TPS has shown considerable promise. Harmer (2002) argued that reducing learners' psychological barriers is key to increasing oral participation, and the peer discussion phase of TPS provides a low-anxiety space for learners to rehearse ideas. Putri et al. (2020) and Phan (2021) both observed significant reductions in speaking anxiety among students after TPS implementation. Phan's quasi-experimental study in Vietnam specifically revealed that TPS enhanced student confidence and willingness to speak. Similar results were reported by Adellia (2022) and Latifah (2022), who found improvements in learner motivation and risk-taking, although these studies relied on self-report data without controlled comparisons.

### *Peer Collaboration and Learner Autonomy*

In addition to cognitive and affective gains, TPS has been shown to strengthen peer collaboration and foster learner autonomy. Raba (2017) and Kandasamy and Habil (2018) highlighted how TPS promoted active negotiation of meaning and increased learner responsibility during speaking tasks. Adellia (2022) observed enhanced classroom interaction and mutual support in lower-secondary learners, while Nguyen et al. (2021) reported that English teachers viewed TPS as effective in increasing student participation and ownership of learning. However, some of these studies did not directly measure changes in oral proficiency or classroom discourse, pointing to the need for more rigorous designs.

Despite growing evidence supporting the effectiveness of Think–Pair–Share (TPS) in enhancing EFL speaking skills, several limitations persist. Existing research predominantly focuses on urban or semi-urban contexts (Nasution & Surya, 2017; Al-Zahrani, 2022), leaving

rural areas particularly in southern Vietnam underexplored, where students often face reduced language exposure and confidence (Nguyen & Dao, 2020). Moreover, many studies adopt descriptive or perception-based approaches (Putri et al., 2020; Adellia, 2022), with limited use of quasi-experimental designs featuring control groups and pre-tests and post-tests (Phan, 2021). Additionally, few investigations integrate learners' perspectives to examine the cognitive and emotional effects of TPS-based instruction (Nguyen et al., 2023). Addressing these gaps, the present study explores the impact of TPS on Grade 10 students' speaking performance in a rural Vietnamese high school, drawing on both quantitative and qualitative data to provide a more comprehensive understanding of TPS in under-researched EFL contexts.

### **3. Methods**

#### **3.1. Research design**

Given the absence of random assignment, this study adopted a quasi-experimental mixed-methods design to investigate the effects of the TPS strategy on learners' speaking proficiency. Pre-/post-tests and semi-structured interviews were employed to integrate statistical outcomes with learner-reported experiences (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Forty-six Grade 10 students from Nguyen Cong Tru High School, An Giang, were selected via convenience sampling. For the qualitative phase, ten students were purposively chosen to ensure gender balance and variation in oral performance (Lazaraton, 2014; Kandasamy & Habil, 2018), enriching both depth and representativeness (Cahyani, 2018; Darmawan & Lestariningsih, 2023).

#### **3.2. Think-Pair-Share Intervention**

TPS intervention was implemented over 12 weeks during the second semester of the 2024–2025 academic year. Each 45-minute English lesson followed the *English 10* textbook in accordance with the MOET (2018) curriculum. Following the main instructional content, students participated in a 20-minute TPS activity designed to enhance their speaking performance through structured interaction and reflection. Each TPS sequence followed three consistent steps:

- *Think (5–7 minutes)*: Students individually reflected on two to three guiding questions related to the lesson theme. They took notes using target structures and vocabulary previously taught (e.g., modal verbs, relative clauses), allowing time for idea generation and language rehearsal.
- *Pair (7–8 minutes)*: Learners worked in pairs to exchange and elaborate on their responses. Peer interaction encouraged clarification, negotiation of meaning, and spontaneous language use. The teacher circulated to provide unobtrusive support as needed.
- *Share (7–8 minutes)*: Pairs formed small groups (4–6 students) to consolidate key points, followed by short presentations from selected individuals or groups. Feedback was provided by peers and the teacher, with attention to fluency, clarity, and accuracy.

This three-phase structure was integrated into Speaking lessons from Units 6 to 10. Although lesson topics varied (e.g., education, technology, environment), the TPS procedure remained consistent to support procedural fluency and scaffolded oral practice in a low-anxiety environment.

#### **3.3. Data Collection Instruments**

##### **3.3.1. English Speaking Pre-Test and Post-Test**

To evaluate students' oral proficiency, standardized pre- and post-tests were administered at the beginning and end of the 12-week TPS intervention. Each assessment consisted of three components: (1) a brief self-introduction, (2) an individual discussion of topic-based prompts, and (3) follow-up questions posed by the examiner to elicit extended and spontaneous responses. The pre-test and post-test were designed with age-appropriate and thematically relevant topics to reflect students' language development over time. To ensure reliable and consistent scoring, an analytic rubric adapted from Brown (2004) was employed, assessing five key dimensions of speaking performance: content, organization, pronunciation, grammatical accuracy, and lexical resource. The full rubric is presented in Appendix A, and representative task prompts for both assessments are provided in Appendix B.

### *3.3.2. Semi-Structured Interviews*

To complement the quantitative test data and deepen the understanding of students' responses to the TPS intervention, semi-structured interviews were conducted with ten students upon completion of the study. These interviews served to triangulate the pre- and post-test findings by capturing learners' subjective experiences, perceived benefits, and challenges encountered during TPS-based speaking activities. Guiding questions focused on three thematic areas: students' participation in TPS tasks, perceived impacts on their speaking development, and suggestions for improving future implementation. The complete set of interview questions is provided in Appendix C.

## **3.4. Data collection and analysis**

### *3.4.1. Speaking tests*

The speaking tests were conducted in a designated English classroom equipped for language assessment at Nguyen Cong Tru High School. This setting provided a quiet and distraction-free environment, enabling consistent evaluation of students' oral performance. Both pre-tests and post-tests were audio-recorded using high-quality digital devices to ensure objectivity and accuracy during the scoring process. The pre-test was administered in the week prior to the TPS intervention, while the post-test was carried out immediately after the 12-week program concluded.

Each student's performance was evaluated by two experienced English teachers using a standardized rubric adapted from Brown (2004), which covered five domains: Content, Organization, Vocabulary, Grammar, and Pronunciation. Each criterion was rated on a 0.4-point scale, with the overall speaking score calculated as the average of the two raters' total scores. In the event of a score discrepancy greater than 0.8 points, the raters reviewed the audio recordings and reached a consensus through discussion.

All test scores were input into IBM SPSS Version 26 for statistical analysis. Descriptive statistics and paired-sample t-tests were employed to compare pre-test and post-test results and determine the significance of changes in speaking proficiency (Field, 2018; Pallant, 2020; Stockemer, 2019). Results were visualized in tables to present trends and validate the intervention's effects.

### *3.4.2. Interviews*

Semi-structured interviews were conducted individually with selected participants in the same English classroom, which offered a comfortable and private setting to foster openness. Each session lasted approximately 10–12 minutes and aimed to explore students' perceptions of the TPS strategy, including its benefits, limitations, and overall impact on their speaking confidence and engagement.

All interviews were conducted in Vietnamese and recorded upon receiving the participants' consent. The recordings were then transcribed verbatim and translated into English to ensure accuracy and preserve the intended meanings. All personal identifiers were removed to maintain confidentiality and adhere to ethical research guidelines. Thematic analysis followed the six-phase approach proposed by Braun and Clarke (2006). The coding process began with initial open coding, identifying meaningful units in the text, followed by axial coding to group related concepts. Thematic categories were then refined and interpreted. And two external English instructors independently reviewed the coding results to enhance reliability (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Nowell et al., 2017). Themes such as collaborative learning, reduced speaking anxiety, and peer support were consistently reported, providing qualitative support to the quantitative findings and enriching the overall interpretation of the TPS intervention's impact.

**3.5. Ethical considerations**

Before data collection, participants received comprehensive information about the study's purpose, procedures, and potential benefits. Their voluntary participation was emphasized, and confidentiality was strictly maintained through data anonymization and secure storage, adhering to ethical research principles and national guidelines (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; MOET, 2024).

**4. Results and discussion**

**4.1. Pretest and posttest findings**

Speaking performance was evaluated across five core dimensions: content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation. Each category was rated using a standardized 0.4-point rubric, allowing for consistent scoring across participants. Descriptive and inferential statistics for pre-test and post-test scores are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1. Descriptive and Inferential Statistics of Pre-Test and Post-Test Speaking Scores (N = 46)**

Statistic	Minimum Score	Maximum Score	Mean	SD	Mean Difference	t (df = 45)	Significance (2-tailed)
Pre-Test	0.40	2.00	1.40	0.376	—	—	—
Post-Test	0.60	2.00	1.67	0.327	—	—	—
Difference	↑ 0.20	—	↑ 0.27	↓ 0.049	-0.265	-4.924	.000 ***

Table 1 presents both descriptive and inferential statistics comparing students' speaking performance before and after the implementation of the TPS strategy. The minimum score increased from 0.40 in the pre-test to 0.60 in the post-test, suggesting a baseline improvement among lower-performing students. The maximum score remained constant at 2.00, indicating that the highest level of achievement was maintained across both test phases. The mean score rose from 1.40 to 1.67, reflecting a mean difference of 0.27, which indicates an overall enhancement in speaking proficiency. Furthermore, the standard deviation decreased slightly from 0.376 to 0.327, implying a more consistent distribution of scores among participants after the intervention. Inferentially, a paired-samples t-test revealed a statistically significant improvement ( $t(45) = -4.924, p < .001$ ), with a 95% confidence interval ranging from -0.374 to -0.157. These results confirm that the TPS strategy had a meaningful and reliable impact

on learners' speaking outcomes.

The pre- and post-test results showed a clear improvement in students' English-speaking skills after using the TPS strategy. The average score increased from 1.40 to 1.67 ( $t = -4.924, p < .001$ ), showing that students became more fluent and used better vocabulary after the lessons. This result is similar to Raba (2017), who found that TPS helped students speak more in class and become more confident. Putri et al. (2020) also reported that TPS helped students improve speaking because they had more time to think and work with a partner. However, their study focused on smaller, urban classrooms, while this study was done in a rural high school with fewer resources. Namaziandost et al. (2019) also showed that TPS helped students speak more accurately and confidently. In this study, students with lower starting scores also improved, which supports Nguyen et al. (2023), who said that repeating TPS activities helps students at all levels. These results prove that TPS can work well in different types of classrooms, including large and rural ones.

## **4.2. Interview findings**

Although the quantitative results confirmed significant gains in speaking proficiency, they offered limited insight into the mechanisms underlying these improvements. To complement the statistical findings and explore learner engagement with the TPS strategy, semi-structured interviews were conducted with ten participants. Thematic analysis revealed three key areas: students' engagement with TPS procedures, perceived impacts on speaking development, and challenges encountered during the intervention. These themes are discussed below with reference to relevant literature.

### *4.2.1. Students' Practice with the TPS Strategy*

Most students confirmed that their teachers regularly applied all three stages of TPS with clear instructions. During the Think phase, students reported silently preparing ideas and recalling vocabulary. For example, S2 said, *"I try to think about the topic and what words I will use in English,"* while S5 noted, *"I always prepare my ideas first, so I don't get confused when talking to my partner."* This kind of pre-task planning supports earlier findings by Cahyani (2018), who found that students in Indonesia benefited from the Think phase through reduced anxiety and clearer output.

Moving into the Pair phase, all 10 participants described meaningful peer interaction. They exchanged ideas, corrected errors, and often helped each other rephrase or clarify. S1 explained, *"We help each other improve the answer."* This aligns with Retnowati and Ngadiso's (2018) study, which showed that peer work within TPS fosters lexical development and fluency, especially when visuals or scaffolds are present.

However, participation in the Share phase varied. While most students presented regularly, others admitted to avoiding it due to nervousness. S6 reflected, *"Sometimes I feel shy to speak in front of everyone, even when I prepare."* Similar reactions were found by Kandasamy and Habil (2018), who reported that some Malaysian learners still feared public speaking despite preparation time. Overall, these patterns confirm Al-Zahrani's (2022) conclusion that TPS encourages both cognitive processing and verbal participation, provided that classroom support is consistent.

### *4.2.2. Students' Perceptions of TPS and Speaking Development*

Almost all students said TPS made them feel more confident speaking English. The structure of the activity, especially the chance to talk in pairs before sharing with the class, helped ease anxiety. Inter6 shared, *"I don't speak alone suddenly,"* and Inter10 added, *"When I talk with my classmate first, I'm not scared to talk later."* These experiences echo Al-Zahrani



(2022) and Hajrayana (2022), who both observed that TPS reduced affective barriers and built students' willingness to speak.

In terms of skill development, most students believed their vocabulary, pronunciation, and fluency improved. Inter8 explained, *"My partner helps me find words when I forget,"* while Inter9 said, *"I practice speaking many times, and it helps my pronunciation."* These comments support findings by Latifah (2022), who reported significant vocabulary gains and sentence complexity improvements among students engaged in TPS activities.

Moreover, several students noted that TPS made lessons more enjoyable and less stressful. They felt that the structured steps made it easier to organize ideas before speaking. This reflects Nguyen et al. (2023), who found that TPS promoted deeper thinking and more fluent output, even in under-resourced schools. Similarly, Adellia (2022) highlighted increased student engagement and reduced speaking hesitation when TPS was used in lower-secondary classrooms.

#### *4.2.3. Students' Challenges with TPS Implementation*

Despite the benefits, students also faced several challenges. First, in the Think phase, six students admitted they struggled to generate ideas or recall vocabulary. Inter4 said, *"Sometimes I don't have any idea, so I just wait for my friend,"* and Inter5 noted, *"I want to speak but I forget the words or grammar."* These difficulties highlight the need for more language input and support—particularly in rural contexts—echoing findings by Nguyen et al. (2021), who reported limited speaking readiness among students in remote areas.

Second, in the Pair phase, some students expressed discomfort when paired with unfamiliar or less motivated peers. Inter6 remarked, *"When I pair with someone I don't know well, it's hard to talk."* This is consistent with Kandasamy and Habil (2018), who emphasized the importance of pair dynamics in cooperative learning outcomes.

Third, the Share phase remained a source of anxiety for some students. Inter7 shared, *"I feel shy to speak in front of everyone, even when I prepare."* This confirms what Phan and Do (2021) found regarding persistent speaking anxiety in Vietnamese high schools. Unlike students in Wuryandani's (2021) study—who gained independence after regular TPS practice—rural students in this study still relied heavily on teacher support.

Other issues included time pressure, unequal participation (with stronger students dominating), and occasional copying of ideas. These findings mirror concerns raised by Hajrayana (2022), who noted that short lesson times and limited follow-up often reduced the effectiveness of TPS activities.

### **5. Conclusion, Implications, and Limitations**

The study's findings indicate that the TPS strategy had a positive impact on the English-speaking competence of Grade 10 students at a rural high school in An Giang, Vietnam. Both quantitative and qualitative data revealed improvements in students' fluency, pronunciation, vocabulary, and interaction, alongside increased participation and reduced anxiety during speaking tasks. The results align with previous studies suggesting that TPS promotes structured peer collaboration and supports learners' oral performance (Cahyani, 2018; Al-Zahrani, 2022; Retnowati & Ngadiso, 2018). Furthermore, the study contributes to existing literature by documenting the effectiveness of TPS in an under-resourced, exam-oriented educational context, where traditional instruction remains dominant (Phan & Do, 2021; Nguyen et al., 2023). Nonetheless, certain challenges such as unequal participation, limited vocabulary, and public speaking anxiety were also observed through interview data.

Based on these findings, several implications for integrating TPS into rural English-speaking instruction are identified. First, teachers should receive adequate training to implement all TPS stages effectively, including strategies for scaffolding weaker learners and managing pair dynamics. As the results suggest, students benefit most when they are clearly guided and supported during the Think and Share phases, particularly in large or mixed-ability classes (Kandasamy & Habil, 2018). Second, TPS can be adopted as a low-cost, scalable solution in schools with limited access to technology, supporting communicative learning goals without the need for digital infrastructure (Latifah, 2022). Lastly, professional development programs should emphasize teacher facilitation skills, including how to select appropriate speaking topics, provide feedback, and sustain student engagement during peer interaction (Nguyen et al., 2023). Together, these implications offer a practical framework for improving oral English instruction in similar rural and resource-constrained environments.

Despite these contributions, several limitations must be acknowledged. First, the study did not employ a control group, which limits the ability to attribute learning gains solely to the TPS intervention. Second, the sample size was relatively small ( $N = 46$ ), and participants were drawn from a single rural high school, restricting the generalizability of the results. Third, the qualitative data relied on interviews with ten students, which may not fully represent the broader population. Future research should incorporate larger and more diverse samples, include control or comparison groups, and examine long-term effects of TPS on speaking development across different educational contexts.

## References

- Adellia, A. R. (2022). *The implementation of teaching speaking skills through Think- Pair-Share strategy at eighth grade students of Junior High School Queen Ibnu Sina, 2022–2023 academic year*. [Undergraduate thesis, UIN Kiai Haji Achmad Siddiq Jember. <https://digilib.uinkhas.ac.id/16555/>]
- Al-Zahrani, A. S. (2022). The impact of the Think-Pair-Share strategy on the critical thinking skills of intermediate school students in English language learning. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 13(1), 257–271. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1301.30>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practice*. Pearson Education.
- Cahyani, F. (2018). The use of the Think-Pair-Share technique to improve students' speaking performance. *Research in English and Education (READ)*, 3(1), 76–90.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (5th ed.)*. SAGE Publications.
- Darmawan, Y. R. R., & Lestariningsih, F. E. (2023). Students' views toward the use of the Think-Pair-Share teaching strategy on students' oral communication skills in an EFL context. *JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 11(4), 798–809. <https://doi.org/10.33394/joltt.v11i4.8694>
- Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics (5th ed.)*. SAGE Publications.
- Harmer, J. (2002). *The practice of English language teaching (3rd ed.)*. Longman.

- Hajrayana, H. (2022). *The effectiveness of Think-Pair-Share strategy to improve the student speaking skill at the eleventh grade of SMAN 2 Luwu* [Doctoral dissertation, Institut Agama Islam Negeri (IAIN) Palopo].
- Ismail, S., & Al Allaq, A. (2019). Cooperative learning to enhance English speaking skills. *Borneo Management Review*, 1(1), 19-44.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1999). *Learning together and alone: Cooperative, competitive, and individualistic learning (5th ed.)*. Allyn & Bacon.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2018). *Cooperative learning in the classroom*. Routledge.
- Kandasamy, C., & Habil, H. (2018). Exploring cooperative learning method to enhance speaking skills among school students. *LSP International Journal*, 5(2), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.11113/lspi.v5n2.59>
- Kurjum, M., Muhid, A., & Thohir, M. (2020). Think-Pair-Share model as a solution to develop students' critical thinking in Islamic studies: Is it effective? *Cakrawala Pendidikan*, 39(1), 144-155. <https://doi.org/10.21831/cp.v39i1.28762>
- Latifah, I. K. A. (2022). *Effectiveness of Think-Pair-Share strategy to improve students' speaking skill at SMAN 2 Palopo*. [Doctoral dissertation, Institut Agama Islam Negeri (IAIN) Palopo].
- Lazaraton, A. (2014). Second language speaking. *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*, 4, 106-120. Lyman, F. (1981). *The Think-Pair-Share technique*. University of Maryland.
- Namaziandost, E., Shatalebi, V., & Nasri, M. (2019). The impact of cooperative learning on developing speaking ability and motivation toward learning English. *Journal of Language and Education*, 5(3), 83–101. <https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2019.9809>
- Nasution, A. K., & Surya, E. (2017). The effectiveness of using Think-Pair-Share (TPS) technique on students' achievement in speaking. *International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research (IJSBAR)*, 34(2), 35–45.
- Nguyen, C., Trinh, T., Le, D., & Nguyen, K. (2021). Cooperative learning in English language classrooms: Teachers' perceptions and actions. *Anatolian Journal of Education*, 6(2), 89–108. <https://doi.org/10.29333/aje.2021.628a>.
- Nguyen, T. T., Do, T. M. A., & Tran, T. T. (2023). Unlocking the power of psycholinguistic theory: How the Think-Pair-Share technique enhances speaking skills. *Journal for Reattach Therapy and Developmental Diversities*, 6(10s2), 1044–1054. [https://doi.org/10.53555/jrtdd.v6i10s\(2\).1507](https://doi.org/10.53555/jrtdd.v6i10s(2).1507).
- Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 16(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917733847>.
- Pallant, J. (2020). *SPSS survival manual: A step-by-step guide to data analysis using IBM SPSS (7th ed.)*. McGraw-Hill Education.
- Phan, H. (2021). Using Think-Pair-Share strategy to support students in speaking lessons. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 3(4), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.32996/jeltal.2021.3.4.1>.
- Phan, M. H., & Do, T. M. L. (2021). Using the Think-Pair-Share strategy to support students in speaking lessons. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 3(4), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.32996/jeltal.2021.3.4.1>

- Putri, H., Fahriany, F., & Jalil, N. (2020). The influence of Think-Pair-Share in enhancing students' speaking ability. *Journal of Education, Teaching and Learning*, 5(1), 67–72.
- Raba, A. A. A. (2017). The influence of Think-Pair-Share (TPS) on improving students' oral communication skills in EFL classrooms. *Creative Education*, 12(2), 23–32. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2017.81002>.
- Retnowati, A. E., & Ngadiso. (2018). Improving students' speaking skills using Think- Pair-Share method with flashcard media. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 9(7), 164–169.
- Slavin, R. E. (1995). *Cooperative learning: Theory, research, and practice (2nd ed.)*. Allyn & Bacon.
- Vietnamese Ministry of Education and Training. (2018). *English language education curriculum*. Vietnamese Ministry of Education and Training.
- Vietnamese Ministry of Education and Training. (2024). *Conclusion 91-KL/TW on continuing the implementation of Resolution 29-NQ/TW on fundamental and comprehensive innovation in education*. <https://thuvienphapluat.vn/van-ban/Giao-duc/Ket-luan-91-KL-TW-2024-tiep-tuc-thuc-hien-Nghi-quyet-29-N>
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

## Appendix A: English Speaking Assessment Rubric

Criteria	0.4 Points	0.3 Points	0.2 Points	0.1 Point
<b>Content</b>	Fully addresses topic, clear and well- developed ideas with strong support	Mostly relevant to main ideas and some supporting details	Partially relevant, ideas underdeveloped or unsupported	Off-topic, lacks main ideas, disconnected thoughts
<b>Organization</b>	Clear introduction, body, conclusion; logical flow and transitions	Well-structured with minor issues	Some structure present, weak flow	No clear structure, difficult to follow
<b>Pronunciation</b>	Clear, natural, correct stress and intonation	Mostly clear, minor issues	Errors affecting some understanding	Frequent errors, hard to understand
<b>Grammar</b>	Variety of correct structures, minimal errors	Mostly correct with minor errors	Frequent errors in longer sentences	Errors impede understanding
<b>Vocabulary</b>	Wide range, appropriate and accurate use	Good use with some repetition	Basic, some errors in choice	Very limited, inaccurate words

## Appendix B: Pre- and Post-Test Speaking

### Pre-Test Prompts:

1. Talk about how household chores are shared in your family.
2. Talk about the advantages of using smartphones.
3. Talk about how people can live a greener lifestyle.
4. Talk about your personal experience with voluntary work.

### Post-Test Prompts:

1. Should girls get married before 18? Say why or why not.
2. Talk about the benefits of online learning.
3. Talk about how people can help protect the environment.
4. Talk about a place in Vietnam you want to visit or have visited.

## **Appendix C: Semi-Structured Interview Questions**

### **(a) Student Participation in TPS Activities**

- How often did your teacher use the TPS strategy in speaking lessons?
- What activities did you usually engage in during the Think, Pair, and Share phases?
- Did you clearly understand what to do at each stage? How helpful were the teacher's instructions?

### **(b) Perceived Impacts on Speaking Performance**

- In your opinion, did TPS help improve your English-speaking skills? In what specific ways?
- Did working with a partner enhance your confidence or fluency when speaking English? Why or why not?
- Compared to regular speaking lessons, did TPS make you feel more motivated or engaged?

### **(c) Challenges and Suggestions**

- What difficulties or obstacles did you experience during any TPS phase?
- Have you ever felt hesitant or uncomfortable sharing your ideas? Please explain.
- Do you think TPS should be used more often in English speaking classes? Why or why not?