Loquen: English Studies Journal
DOI: http://doi.org/10.32678/loquen.v12i01
Available online
http://jurnal.uinbanten.ac.id/index.php/loquen/index

Applying Think-Pair-Share Model in Vocabulary Learning

Muhammad Ihsan
IAIN Palu

Keywords:
Applying, Think-Pair-Share, vocabulary learning

***Correspondence Address:**
tbig.iainpalu@gmail.com

Abstract: This research aims at finding out whether think-pair-share model of learning can be applied to improve the vocabulary mastery of the second semester of PAI 1 FTIK IAIN Palu. The researcher focused the vocabulary learning with the objectives: 1) to know the meaning of the words; 2) to know the pronunciation of the words; 3) to know the category of the words; and 4) to know how to use the words in sentences or contexts. The subject of this research was 20 students of the second semester of PAI 1 FTIK IAIN Palu. This was a classroom action research which was done in two months. The researcher applied two cycles during the research. The result of the research shows that the application of think-pair-share model can improve the vocabulary learning of the the second semester of PAI 1 FTIK IAIN Palu. This can be proven by the increase from 8 students (40%) in cycle 1 to 15 students (75%) who got score greater than 75 of 20 students in cycle 2. The treatment was stopped after 75% of the classical achievement has met the criteria of success. Therefore, the application of think-pair-share technique was effective to improve the vocabulary mastery.

INTRODUCTION

In learning a foreign language, in this case English, vocabulary plays an important role. It is one element that links the four skills of speaking, listening, reading and writing all together (Cahyono & Widiati, 2015; Marzuki, 2017a; Marzuki, 2018). In order to communicate well in a foreign language, students should acquire an adequate number of words and should know how to use them accurately.

However, even though students realize the importance of vocabulary when learning language, most Indonesian students learn vocabulary passively due to several factors. From the observation and based on the researcher's own knowledge, there are some reasons underlying this condition. First, the students consider the lecturer's explanation for meaning or definition, pronunciation, spelling and grammatical functions boring. In this case scenario, language learners have nothing to do in a vocabulary learning section but to listen to their lecturer. Second, students only think of vocabulary learning as knowing the primary meaning of new words. Therefore, they ignore all other functions of the words. Third, students usually only acquire new vocabulary through new words in their textbooks or when given by lecturers during classroom lessons. For example, learners find many new words in a text and then ask the lecturer to explain the meanings and uses. Forth, many Indonesian students do not want to take risks (in other words, lazy) in applying what they have learnt. Students may recognize a word in a written or spoken form and think that they already "know the word", but they may not be able to use that word properly in different contexts or pronounce it correctly. Without vocabulary, it would be impossible to learn a language.

Traditionally, vocabulary has not been a particular subject for students to learn, but has been taught within lessons of speaking, listening, reading and writing (Harmer, 2007; Marzuki, 2017b). During the lesson, students use their own vocabulary and are introduced to new words provided by the lecturer and classmates which they apply to classroom activities. For many learners of English, whenever they think of vocabulary, they think of learning a list of new words with meanings in their native language without any real context practice (Schmitt, 2014; Marzuki, 2016b). A number of learners may share the same experience of looking up words in a bilingual dictionary to find their meanings or definitions when they encounter new words. They may even write down lines of new words without any idea of the real use of them in context.

Some students may require lecturers to give meaning and grammatical function for words that they are not familiar (Munir, 2016; Marzuki, 2016a). Learners just wait for lecturers who control the lesson to provide new forms of words then they write those words in their notebooks or complete their exercises. They may use words they learn in the exact formats as the original patterns in which those words appeared (Furqon, 2013; Nikbakht & Boshrabadi, 2015). This kind of habitual verbal memorization is good to a certain extent since it helps learners learn and use the correct form of words. In other words, learners just know how to use the vocabulary in an exact form, but they do not know how to use it with different shades of meanings in real life communication.

Moreover, for a relatively long period of time vocabulary is viewed as a language sub skill that develops in parallel with a major language skill, such as reading and writing (Schmitt,

2010; Spencer et al., 2012; Zarei & Sahami Gilani, 2013). Vocabulary is something learners pick up while improving their reading skills. This also becomes the reason for the researcher to apply think-pair-share when the students are reading a text to learn the content of the vocabularies in the passages.

Cooperative learning has many strategies that can be applied by the lecturers. One of the strategies is think-pair-share. Many researchers have been done about think-pair-share and its relation to foreign language learning, however, the focus is mostly on language skills. The researcher is interested with think-pair-share because there has been no research done in Palu in relation to English language learning previously. Moreover, students tend to study and work together to solve their problems in learning. Think-pair-share lets encourages the students to work together in learning (Kaddoura, 2013; Marzuki, 2016b). So, based on this learning situation, the researcher is interested in analyzing the impact of think-pair-share on vocabulary development of the students.

In relation to the above situation, then think-pair-share model of learning must be applied correctly to the teaching of vocabulary to the students so that they can achieve the sufficient vocabulary that they should possess. The development of vocabulary is expected to be achieved through the application of the correct model of learning. The problem at the moment is that the vocabulary mastery of the students at Islamic Education Department IAIN Palu has not yet developed. The fact was found in the result of the vocabulary test given to the students from the last two years. This means that: 1) The students do not have enough knowledge to use vocabulary in the language skills; 2) Their vocabulary is limited; and 3) They do not know how to use the vocabulary to support the language skills. In other words, the vocabulary teaching and learning has been done in the traditional way, through memorization, and make the words learnt by the students become meaningless. In relation to this, the problem statement in this research is can the use of think-pair-share model of learning improve the vocabulary mastery of the students of PAI 1 at FTIK IAIN Palu?

THEORETICAL SUPPORT

1. Vocabulary Learning Strategies

Psychologists, linguists, and language lecturers have been interested in vocabulary learning strategies for a long time. There have been numerous studies have been conducted comparing the retention effects of different vocabulary presentation strategies. In fact, the vocabulary field has been especially productive in the last two decades as the emergence of theories, research, and practical tips on vocabulary learning. Vocabulary acquisition research in the linguistics tradition has largely concentrated on vocabulary (target: what is to be learned; or product: what is learned), and not on acquisition (how is vocabulary learned, the learning/acquisition process (Gunning, 2013).

There are three important processes that may lead to a word being remembered. These processes can be viewed as three steps with the later steps including the earlier steps. The first process encouraging learning is attention. This means that learners need to *notice* the word to be aware of it as a useful language item. This noticing may be affected by several factors, including: 1) the salience of the word in the textual input or in the discussion of the text; 2) previous contact that the learners have had with the word; and 3) the learners' realization that the word fills a gap in

their knowledge of the language (Alexander-Shea, 2011).

The second process that may lead to a word being remembered is retrieval. A word may be noticed and its meaning comprehended in the textual input to the task, and if that word is subsequently retrieved either receptively or productively during a task, then the memory of that word will be strengthened. Receptive retrieval involves perceiving the form and having to retrieve its meaning when the word is met in listening or reading. Productive retrieval involves wishing to communicate the meaning of the word and having to retrieve its spoken or written form as in speaking or writing. Retrieval does not occur if the form and its meaning are presented simultaneously to the learner.

The third process that may lead to a word being remembered is generation. Generation, or generative processing, can also be receptive or productive. In its productive form, it involves producing new ways of using the wanted vocabulary in new contexts. This means that a word is used generatively if it is used in speaking in a way which is different from its use in the textual input. Receptive generative use involves meeting the word in new contexts.

By far the most important vocabulary strategy to teach is to guess unknown words from context. When learning first language, most of the words are not taught, we pick them up from books, the TV and from conversations. There is not enough time to teach thousands of words one by one in class, so language learners must also know how to guess unknown words successfully. Sadly, many lecturers just expect learners to know how to guess well, but there are thousands of learners who could be helped to be more successful at guessing. So, it is best for the lecturer to teach this strategy to the students.

The first thing to do when a learner meets a new word is to ignore it. If it is important it will come again. If they meet the word a second time and communication breaks down, then they should try to guess its meaning. Initially, it is important to make them notice its part of speech, and then they should look for clues around the word to help with the meaning. If they have an idea, they should try to substitute their guess into the sentence to see if the meaning of the sentence is clear. They will soon realize if they have the wrong part of speech, or wrong meaning. Finally, they can use word affix knowledge to confirm the guess.

However, it is vital to understand when teaching learners to guess words from context that they will not be able to guess successfully until they know many of the other words in the text (Jitendra et al., 2011). If the text is too difficult, then the large number of unknown words will make successful guessing much less likely. Therefore, it is wide to not start teaching this strategy too early in the learning process, because the learners will not know enough other words to guess successfully. Starting too early leads to too much failure and can reinforce the idea that word learning is difficult.

It should always be remembered that teaching does not cause learning, so lecturers should expect learners to not understand sometimes and they should not expect learners to remember every word they teach. The aims of vocabulary instruction then should be to create the conditions where the learner can learn independently of the lecturer. The ultimate aim of any teaching is to enable the learner to get to a position in which she does not need us anymore. Thus, lecturers should teach vocabulary learning strategies, such as how to use a

dictionary well; how to learn words systematically; how to keep vocabulary notebooks and so on. If lecturers can do some of these things, learners will benefit more from their classes and will not only remember more words, but will be on the road to becoming independent vocabulary learners.

2. Think-Pair-Share

Think-pair-share is a class discussion activity that was developed by Frank Lyman (1981) at the University of Maryland and adopted by many educators as a cooperative learning tool. Brady (2006) states:

Think-pair-share group involves a posed problem that students consider along for a specified period. They then form pairs to discuss the problem, listening carefully to each other, as they might be required to explain their partner's response later. The usual conclusion involves the pairs reporting to the whole class. The group is engaging as it involves a 'conversation': a one-to-one sharing of ideas and information.

Think-pair-share is a cooperative learning strategy that deepens the level of thinking for all students and promotes participation in a low affective filter environment (Kaddoura, 2013). The strategy also gives the students an opportunity to speak English to another student because they have to response to the question addresed by the lecturer. The students think of a response. Then with a partner, each student shares his/her ideas. The students may also share the idea with another pair or the whole class.

In THINK, the lecturer challenges the students with an open-ended question or observation to incite critical thinking. The students are given a short period of silent reflection to think about the question.

With PAIR, students pair up with a friend, neighbor, or desk cohort to talk about the answer that each came up with during silent reflection. They compare notes and come up with the most substantial answer. In SHARE, after there is a short discussion period, each pair is called upon to share their thinking with the rest of the class.

This strategy can be used before introducing new concepts. It gives everyone in the class time to access prior knowledge and provides a chance for them to share their ideas with someone. Think-pair-share helps students organize their knowledge, and motivates learning of new topics. It is a relatively low-risk and short collaborative learning structure, and is ideally suited for instructors and learners who are new to collaborative learning.

The think-pair-share structure gives all learners the opportunity to discuss their ideas. This is important because learners start to construct their knowledge in these discussions and also to find out what they do and do not know. This active process is not normally available to them during traditional lectures.

After several minutes the instructor solicits comments to be shared with the whole group. The responses received are often more intellectually concise since learners have had a chance to reflect on their ideas. The think-pair-share structure also enhances the student's oral communication skills as they discuss their ideas with the one another and with the whole group.

One variation of this structure is to skip the whole-group discussion. Another variation is to have learners write down their thoughts on note cards and collect them. This gives the instructor an opportunity to see whether there are problems in comprehension (Kaddoura, 2013).

METHOD

The research was designed as a classroom action research which was carried out at PAI 1 FTIK IAIN Palu. The subject of the research was the second semester students of PAI 1 FTIK IAIN Palu consisting of 20 students. The researcher and the collaborator would collaboratively design lesson plan, prepared instructional material and media, and implemented the action plan. The research was conducted in two cycles through stages of planning, acting, observing and reflecting (Fraenkel et al., 2011; Kemmis, McTaggart & Nixon, 2013; McNiff, 2013; McKernan, 2013).

The cycle consists of three meetings. The researcher with his collaborator collected the data by using questionnaire, survey and test. The criteria of success in this research focused on the area of concerned. Since the researcher conducted the research in the area of vocabulary learning, the criteria of success covered the classical achievement on vocabulary test. In other words, this research was successful if 75% of the students get scores equal or greater than 75. It is based on the Minimum Criteria of Success used in this classroom.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

1. Cycle 1

1.1 Planning

At this phase the researcher with the collaborator discussed and selected the lesson plan by presenting the basic competence to be achieved. The researcher made the preparation by explaining the objectives of the lesson, preparing the lesson, selecting the method, which was think-pair-share. The use of the think-pair-share method was to show another way of learning English by collaborative teaching and learning. In other words, the students were given a way to work on their tasks by working on with other students.

1.2 Implementing

The researcher applied three-phase technique in each meeting. They were pre-activities, whilst activities and post activities. In pre-activities, the researcher greeted the students and checked their attendance list. Then, whilst activity, the researcher asked the students to sit in pairs. There were twelve pairs in this first meeting. He then distributed the text to each pair and asked them to scan the text to look for the difficult words first before they started reading. The researcher asked the pairs to identify first the words they think difficult. Identify in this case meant that the students have to know the parts of speech for the words (noun, adjective, verb or adverb). The researcher helped the students by giving some ways to identify the parts of speech for a word. For instance, one way to identify verb in past tense was the ending *–ed* in the base word. The suffix *–ed* can also be understood as the past form of a verb. To help the students to differentiate verb and adjective with –uffix *-ed*, the researcher taught them about the position of the words in a sentence. For example, a noun comes after a verb. A noun can be a subject or an object in a sentence. The researcher also encouraged the students to look up the words in the dictionary. After the students had found the parts of speech of the words, he pronounced the words in front of the class. He also asked the students to repeat those words. Those tasks were aimed to develop students' vocabulary mastery and practice their pronunciation.

Then, the researcher continued by asking the students to find out the other parts of speech for the words to be developed. For instance, the word *desperate* was an adjective. So, the researcher asked the students to find out some other parts of that word. For

example, the noun of the word *desperate* was *desperation*, the adverb of manner was *desperately*, and so on.

The researcher then selected some words that had been developed to be made into sentences. The researcher asked each pair to give one word they could make into a sentence. None of the words could be repeated. He gave fifteen minutes for the pair to build up a sentence.

During the time, the researcher controlled and guided the students to develop the sentences. He walked around and checked the students; answers. But, the researcher did not correct the mistakes. After the students finished their sentences, the researcher asked them to swap or share the answers with other pair. For example, pair A gave their sentence to pair B, and pair B gave their sentence to pair C.

In post activity, the researcher asked the pair to present the sentence in front of the class. But, they presented the sentence of the other group that their answer was in their hand. For example, pair B presented the answer of pair A by writing the sentence on the board. If Pair B thought that the sentence was correct, the members just had to inform that they think the sentence was correct. On the other hand, if the pair thought the sentence was incorrect, they needed to write the correct one. After they wrote the sentence on the board, they also had to read aloud the sentence. This time, the researcher corrected any mispronounced words.

At the end of this meeting the researcher concluded the lesson and reminded the students on the objectives of the lesson.

1.3 Observation

In this phase the writer observed the implementation of learning process, students' seriousness to follow the class; students were active in responding to questions and answering questions based on the material. In this observation time the observer used an observation sheet.

1.4 Learning Achievement

The learning achievement referred in this chapter was students' knowledge on the vocabulary they have learnt in the meetings. The researcher allowed the students to work in pairs and to get them to know the meaning of the words better, the researcher asked them to build up sentences. However, the main instrument was test containing the vocabulary. The result after the implementation of think-pair-share method can be seen in the following table 1.

Table 1. Students' Score of the Test in Cycle 1

No	Student	Total Correct Answer	Score	Category
1	A	39	78	successful
2	B	32	64	failed
3	C	36	72	failed
4	D	24	48	failed
5	E	29	58	failed
6	F	39	78	successful
7	G	31	62	failed
8	H	38	76	successful
9	I	36	72	failed
10	J	32	64	failed
11	K	37	74	failed
12	L	27	54	failed
13	M	29	58	failed
14	N	38	76	successful
15	O	38	76	successful
16	P	39	78	successful
17	Q	36	72	failed
18	R	42	84	successful
19	S	39	78	successful
20	T	34	68	failed

The researcher has to explain firstly how to compute the individual score of each student before he computed the classical achievement. He used the formula, as follows:

$$\text{Students' score} = \frac{\text{Achievement score}}{\text{Maximum score}} \times$$

After noting the individual score of the students, then, the researcher computed the students' success in vocabulary test classically by using the formula is as follows:

$$\text{Classical Achievement} = \frac{\text{The total of students who reach the scores}}{\text{The total of students who join the test}} \text{ X } 100\%$$

It can be seen on the table 1 that there were twelve students who got score less than 75 and eight students who got score equals or greater than 75. It means that the twelve students did not pass the lesson because their scores could not achieve the minimum criteria of success. So, the computation of the classical achievement is in the following:

$$\text{Classical Achievement} = \frac{8}{20} \text{ X } 100\% = 40\%$$

The result above shows that the classical achievement 40% was less than 75 %. It indicated that the result have not met the criteria of success. As stated previously in criteria of success that if individual achievement score was equal or more than 75 and the total classical percentage was at least 75%, it means that this study was not successful.

1.5 Reflection

After doing observation, the collaborator and researcher discussed the implementation of action and the result of observation during the teaching and learning process based on the result. The implementation of learning by using think-pair-share method in cycle 1 did not yet show expected result, so researcher and the collaborator make another plan for the next cycle.

Table 2. The Result of Reflection in Cycle I

No	Researcher's Activities	Students' Activities
1.	Researcher did not give students a reward and reinforcement about the model on how to work in pair and what they have to do as a pair.	Most of the students found it difficult to construct the sentences by using the words they have learnt.
2.	The researcher gave instructions in English only, forgetting to explain it in bahasa Indonesia.	According to the observation, most students did not understand the instructions given by the researcher.
3.	The researcher did not read or pronounce the words clearly and made sure that the students knew how to pronounce the words correctly.	Most students could not read the sentences well because they did not know how to pronounce some of the words.
4.	The researcher did not monitor the class evenly. The researcher only focused the attention on some pairs.	Most students were hesitated because they were unsure with the sentences and performance in front of the class. They felt that not enough support given to them by the researcher.
5.	The researcher did not teach a trick for the whole students to learn the words faster and easier, like –ness to identify noun, etc.	The students spend quite a lot of time to work on the words, they did not do enough sharing.

2. Cycle 2

1.1 Planning

Based on the reflection above, the researcher revised the teaching plan as following. The researcher kept assigning students to work in pairs. To get the students well prepared and well informed, the researcher let the students know the narrative they were going to discuss before the coming meeting. The researcher trained the students to construct the words into sentences. Moreover, words have to be built with other parts of speech for the word. For example, a noun was the main word in the reading

passage, so the students had to know other forms of speech for the word as well. An example was the word *description*. The students should know *describe* (verb), *descriptive* (adjective), and *descriptive* (adj).

1.2 Implementation

The researcher opened the class by greeting the students and checking the attendance list. The researcher asked the students if they were ready to continue the learning. He also gave the chance to the students to say any problems related to teaching and learning process they are having. Because none of the students mentioned anything, they then were divided into pairs by the researcher as their permanent pair for the model.

In the whilst-activity the researcher asked the students to mention some words from the previous lessons. The students mentioned some words. The researcher listed them on the board. When there were more than twenty words were listed, the researcher asked the students to select twenty words as the pair work words.

The researcher asked the students to find the synonyms and antonyms of the words. Then, the researcher reduced the words selection of five synonyms and five antonyms to be developed into a sentence. The researcher gave half an hour for the students to produce their sentences. Each pair was required to present two sentences they have built in front of the classroom. Before the class ended, the students were administered a questionnaire to be done before going home.

1.3 Observation

According to the data of observation on the students, they were more familiar with the model now than the previous meetings. They were also more familiar with the tenses used in narrative text, that was the simple past tense. The students were prepared themselves, too by bringing their dictionaries to the classroom. They were also prepared in pronouncing the words. This could be seen that more students offered to read or correct any mispronunciation.

Based on the data obtained from the field, there were twelve students who were willing to read the sentences they have produced aloud in front of the other students.

1.4 Learning Achievement

The researcher assessed the students' improvement in vocabulary after they have worked in pairs. The researcher presented the result of the test in the following table.

Table 3. Students' Scores of the Post Test

No	Student	Total Correct Answer	Score	Category
1	A	43	86	successful
2	B	36	72	failed
3	C	44	88	successful
4	D	44	88	successful
5	E	39	78	successful
6	F	43	86	successful
7	G	46	92	successful
8	H	38	76	successful
9	I	36	72	failed
10	J	37	74	failed
11	K	44	88	successful
12	L	34	68	failed
13	M	39	78	successful
14	N	38	76	successful
15	O	44	88	successful
16	P	39	78	successful
17	Q	36	72	failed
18	R	42	84	successful
19	S	39	78	successful
20	T	43	86	successful

The researcher has to explain firstly how to compute the individual score of each student before he computed the classical achievement. He used the formula (Marzuki, 2018), as follows:

$$\text{Students' score} = \frac{\text{Achievement score}}{\text{Maximum score}} \times 100\%$$

After noting the individual score of the students, then, the researcher computed the students' success in vocabulary test classically by using the formula (Marzuki, 2018) is as follows:
Classical Achievement=

$$\frac{\text{The total of students who reach the scores}}{\text{The total of students who join the test}} \text{X100\%}$$

It can be seen on the table 4.3 that there were five students who got score less than 75 and fifteen students who got score equals or greater than 75. It means that the five students did not pass the lesson because their scores could not achieve the minimum criteria of success. So, the computation of the classical achievement is in the following:
Classical Achievement =

$$\frac{15}{20} \text{ X } 100\% = 75\%$$

The result above shows that the classical achievement 75% was similar to 75 %. It indicated that the result have met the criteria of success. As stated previously in criteria of success that if individual achievement score was equal or more than 75 and the total classical percentage was at least 75%, it means that this study was successful.

Table 4. The Result of Reflection in Cycle 2

No	Researcher's Activities	Students' Activities
1.	Researcher gave students enough reward and reinforcement whenever they can answer or reply to the instruction correctly.	The students can construct the sentences by using the words they have learnt.
2.	The researcher combined the use of English and bahasa Indonesia when giving important instructions to the students.	The students could comprehend the instruction as the researcher also explained in bahasa Indonesia.
3.	The researcher pronounced and spelled the words and asked the students to repeat after her.	The students could read the sentences well because they knew how to pronounce of the words.
4.	The researcher walked around the classroom to give same opportunity to the students to speak.	The students were at ease to give their opinion as the researcher invited everyone to pronounce or read sentences.
5.	The researcher did not teach a trick for the whole students to learn the words faster and easier, like –ness to identify noun, etc.	The students helped each other by reminding the identification of words, like –ness for nound and –al for adjective.

1.5 The Result of the Questionnaire

The researcher presented the questionnaire containing 7 items related to the teaching and learning with the application of think-pair-share. The items in the questionnaire could be used as a cross reference with the students' answers. The detail distribution of each item in the questionnaire could be seen below.

Table 5. Result of the Questionnaire

No	Statement	Agree Very Much	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Disagree Very Much
1	Technique used by the researcher in teaching vocabulary mastery encourage my enthusiasm and joyful to learn	12 = 60%	6 = 30%	2 = 10%		
2	This technique can help me to make the homework easier	15 = 75	5 = 25%			
3	In understanding a reading text, I can do it faster with this technique	10 = 50%	10 = 50%			
4	My speed in reading and speaking had improved	8 = 40%	12 = 60%			

5	My vocabulary mastery increased significantly	13 = 65%	7 = 35%
6	This technique can be used in improving the vocabulary mastery	12 = 60%	8 = 40%
7	This technique can be used in improving reading and speaking skill	8 = 40%	12 = 60%

Most of the students either agree or agree very much that the technique has helped them. The complete result of the questionnaire was presented in relation to the cross check the result in test.

DISCUSSION

During cycle 1, first meeting, the result was not satisfying yet, below the minimum standard. The teaching and learning process was centered on the lecturer and therefore the students became passive. Because the teaching and learning process in the first meeting in cycle 1 has not been successful, the second meeting must be done. The implementation of teaching and learning process was done by using the think-pair-share technique.

The researcher exposed the use of think-pair-share technique in the learning can create an effective learning situation for the students so that the students can make progress, reply to questions, answer to questions from the fellow students and researcher. Because the result was not satisfactory, there was still another action in cycle II. The treatment in cycle II was done only once after the group achievement had been met. The result of observation went in accordance with the result of the test. The students were given the questionnaire in the end after they have been given the test two times. The questions given were to see whether the students agreed with the application of think-pair-share technique to improve their vocabulary mastery.

Most of the students agreed that the technique could make them joyful to learn (Question 1). They also could do their homework easier because they work with other friends (Question 2). In addition, the students mostly agreed that they can comprehend or understand the passage better by the application of the strategy (Question 3). The speed in reading and speaking had improved as well (Question 4). Because the main aim presenting this technique to the students was to improve their vocabulary mastery, the students learned a great number of vocabularies which they needed in their daily life. Again, this question was related to the next one (Question 5). It stated that the vocabulary for each student had improved significantly. So, most of the students draw their conclusion that this model was effective to be used in learning vocabulary (Question 6) which later will led to the improvement in mastering the reading skill (Question 7).

CONCLUSION

This research found out that think-pair-share technique could be used to improve the vocabulary mastery of the second semester students of PAI-1 FTIK IAIN Palu. The use of this technique could be done by applying the variation of sentence making and words development. Students could improve their vocabulary after they had been given the tricks to identify certain types of words, like *–ness*, and *-tion* for noun. Informing the suffixes to the students helped them to identify the word class faster. The result of the research shows that the application of think-pair-share model can improve the vocabulary learning of the the second semester of PAI 1 FTIK IAIN Palu. This can be proven by the increase from 8 students (40%) in cycle 1 to 15 students

(75%) who got score greater than 75 of 20 students in cycle 2.

REFERENCES

Alexander-Shea, A. (2011). Redefining vocabulary: The new learning strategy for social studies. The Social Studies, 102(3), 95-103.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2010). Foundations of qualitative research in education. Qualitative educational research: Readings in reflexive methodology and transformative practice, 21-44.

Brady, Laurie. (2006). *Collaborative Learning in Action*. Frenchs Forest: Pearson Education.

Cahyono, B. Y., & Widiati, U. (2015). The teaching of EFL vocabulary in the Indonesian context: the state of the art. TEFLIN journal, 19(1), 1-17.

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. (2011). How to design and evaluate research in education. New York: McGraw-Hill Humanities/Social Sciences/Languages.

Furqon, F. (2013). Correlation between students'vocabulary mastery and their reading comprehension. Journal of English and Education, 1(1), 68-80.

Gunning, T. G. (2013). Creating literacy instruction for all students. Boston, MA: Pearson.

Harmer, J. (2007). *How to Teach English.* New Edition. Edinburgh Gate, England: Pearson Education Limited, Longman.

Jitendra, A. K., Burgess, C., & Gajria, M. (2011). Cognitive strategy instruction for improving expository text comprehension of students with learning disabilities: The quality of evidence. Exceptional children, 77(2), 135-159.

Kaddoura, M. (2013). Think pair share: a teaching learning strategy to enhance students' critical thinking. Educational Research Quarterly, 36(4), 3-24.

Kemmis, S., McTaggart, R., & Nixon, R. (2013). The action research planner: Doing critical participatory action research. Springer Science & Business Media.

Marzuki, A. G. (2016a). Developing reading skill of islamic education department students through guided reading. Paedagogia: Jurnal Pendidikan, 5(2), 235-257.

Marzuki, A. G. (2017a). Applying mind mapping technique in improving english vocabulary mastery in an efl classroom. Paedagogia: Jurnal Pendidikan, 6(2), 276-293.

Marzuki, A. G., Alim, N., & Wekke, I. S. (2018, May). Improving the reading comprehension through cognitive reading strategies in language class of coastal area in indonesia. In IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science (Vol. 156, No. 1, p. 012050). IOP Publishing.

Marzuki, A.G., Developing speaking skill through oral report in an efl class in indonesia, *Al-Ta'lim Journal*, Vo. 24 No. 3 (2017b), p. 243-254.

Marzuki, A.G., Utilizing cooperative learning in islamic college students' classroom, *IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education)*, Vo. 3 No. 2 (2016b), p. 123-139.

McKernan, J. (2013). Curriculum action research: A handbook of methods and resources for the reflective practitioner. Routledge.

McNiff, J. (2013). Action research: Principles and practice. Routledge. Chapman and Hall, Inc., London.

Munir, F. (2016). The effectiveness of teaching vocabulary by using cartoon film toward vocabulary mastery of EFL students. Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics, 1(1), 13-37.

Nikbakht, E., & Boshrabadi, A. M. (2015). Analysing the potential of social networking sites on EFL learners' vocabulary mastery: A situated-learning approach. Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 5(8), 1635-1641.

Schmitt, N. (2010). Researching vocabulary: A vocabulary research manual. Springer.

Schmitt, N. (2014). Size and depth of vocabulary knowledge: What the research shows. Language Learning, 64(4), 913-951.

Spencer, E. J., Goldstein, H., Sherman, A., Noe, S., Tabbah, R., Ziolkowski, R., & Schneider, N. (2012). Effects of an automated vocabulary and comprehension intervention: An early efficacy study. Journal of Early Intervention, 34(4), 195-221.

Zarei, A. A., & Sahami Gilani, M. (2013). L2 vocabulary learning through collaborative techniques. International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World, 4(1), 71-84.