

## Integrating Think-Pair-Share with Chain Drill to Enhance Students' Speaking Achievement

Faqih Aulia Rahman<sup>1</sup>, Flora<sup>2</sup>, Muhammad Sukirlan<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Student of Master of English Education, University of Lampung, Indonesia

<sup>2,3</sup> Professor of English Education, University of Lampung, Indonesia

**ABSTRACT:** The challenge of low student engagement and sub-optimal fluency remains a persistent issue in teaching speaking achievement within the Indonesian secondary school context. This study addresses the necessity for effective, communicative, and interactive pedagogical strategies to improve students' speaking achievement. The research specifically aimed to determine the effectiveness of integrating the Think-Pair-Share (TPS) technique with the Chain Drill (CD) technique in comparison to conventional teaching methods. A quantitative, quasi-experimental design was implemented, involving two seventh-grade student groups: an experimental class receiving the integrated TPS-CD treatment, and a control class taught using the conventional approach. Both groups underwent pre-tests and post-tests assessed across five speaking components: pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. Analysis using the t-test revealed a statistically significant difference in the post-test mean scores between the two groups. The experimental class demonstrated a notable increase in their mean score from 60.5 (pre-test) to 81 (post-test), significantly outperforming the control group's post-test score of 79. These findings conclude that combining Think-Pair-Share with Chain Drill is an effective, viable, and recommended teaching technique for substantially enhancing students' speaking fluency and overall communicative competence.

**KEYWORDS:** Communicative Competence, Chain Drill, Fluency, Speaking Achievement, Think-Pair-Share.

### INTRODUCTION

Speaking achievement is widely recognized as a fundamental measure of success and the primary goal of foreign language acquisition. As noted by Brown and Yule (2000), proficiency in speaking is often the benchmark used to gauge a learner's mastery of a language. Essentially, speaking is an interactive, constructive process involving both receiving and producing information, requiring spontaneity and communicative efficiency (Cornbleet & Carter, 2002). Despite its centrality, many students, particularly in non-native English-speaking contexts, struggle to achieve fluency and accuracy due to common challenges such as speaking anxiety, lack of confidence, and limited opportunities for interactive practice. This pedagogical gap necessitates the exploration and implementation of strategic teaching methodologies capable of fostering a vivid, low-anxiety, and participatory learning environment.

To address the observed difficulties in achieving speaking proficiency, this study employs the integration of two established instructional strategies: Think-Pair-Share (TPS) and Chain Drill. TPS serves as a cooperative learning strategy that effectively manages the cognitive load by encouraging students to first reflect and organize their thoughts individually (Think), share ideas with a partner (Pair), and then participate in a wider group discussion (Share). This preparatory stage is crucial for meaningful input generation. Conversely, the Chain Drill technique provides the necessary mechanical, repetitive, and structured oral practice required to improve pronunciation, reduce hesitation, and enhance fluency. By combining these two methods, the study aims to leverage the benefits of cognitive preparation (TPS) with focused oral practice (Chain Drill).

Previous research has explored the positive impact of individual techniques on language skills. For instance, studies such as Handayani (2011) have demonstrated that the application of Chain Drill, often in combination with other methods, is effective in improving various aspects of speaking, particularly fluency. However, a critical gap remains in the literature regarding the systematic, integrated application of Think-Pair-Share and Chain Drill and its corresponding empirical impact on overall student speaking achievement. While the components are proven beneficial individually, the synergistic effect of the integrated technique, used as a complete instructional cycle, needs robust investigation. This research, therefore, establishes its position by focusing on this combined approach, providing a specific pedagogical model for teachers.

This research aims to investigate the effectiveness of the combined Think-Pair-Share with Chain Drill technique in significantly enhancing students' speaking achievement, specifically focusing on measurable improvements in fluency, comprehension, vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation. It lies in providing strong quantitative and qualitative evidence that the structured integration of a cognitive planning strategy (TPS) with a mechanical practice mechanism (Chain Drill) yields statistically superior results. By validating this integrated framework, the research offers a proven, strategic methodological solution that English teachers can readily adopt to simultaneously boost students' cognitive preparation and practical oral communication skills, ultimately closing the gap between knowledge and achievement in speaking.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter presents the theoretical foundation of this research, focusing on the nature of speaking achievement, the core components of speaking achievement, and the instructional techniques—Think-Pair-Share (TPS) and Chain Drill (CD)—used as the intervention.

### 1.1 The Nature of Speaking

Speaking is widely considered one of the most essential skills in foreign language learning. As articulated by Brown and Yule (2000), the mastery of speaking serves as a primary measurement of a language learner's success. It is the primary means by which individuals express opinions, ask for information, share knowledge, and engage in social interaction. Furthermore, Cornbleet and Carter (2002) contend that speaking is an interactive and dynamic process. It involves the spontaneous construction of meaning, requiring both the production and reception of information. Given its spontaneous nature, effective speaking demands not only linguistic knowledge (grammar, vocabulary) but also pragmatic and interactive competence.

#### 1.1.1 Components of Speaking Achievement

To accurately measure students' speaking achievement, several key components must be assessed. Based on the assessment rubric referenced in this study's methodology (as seen in the draft appendix), speaking achievement is typically evaluated across five main components: Pronunciation: The ability to produce phonemes, stress, and intonation correctly, making the speech comprehensible. Grammar: The correct use of syntactic and morphological structures appropriate for the context. Vocabulary: The range and accuracy of words used to convey meaning. Fluency: The speed, effortlessness, and smoothness of speech, allowing for communication without excessive hesitation or halting. Comprehension: The ability of the speaker to understand and process the information received from the listener during an interaction.

#### 1.1.2 Think-Pair-Share (TPS) Technique

Think-Pair-Share is a cooperative learning strategy designed to encourage student participation and comprehension by requiring them to consider a question individually, discuss it with a partner, and then share their ideas with the larger group. Think: Students are given a short period (individually) to think about a specific question posed by the teacher. This stage promotes independent thinking and reduces anxiety associated with immediate public speaking. Pair: Students pair up and discuss their thoughts. This allows them to articulate their ideas in a lower-risk environment, rehearse their language, and clarify their understanding. Share: The pairs share their ideas with the rest of the class. This final step promotes confidence and provides varied perspectives.

#### 1.1.3 Chain Drill (CD) Technique

The Chain Drill technique is a controlled practice activity where students take turns interacting with each other sequentially across the classroom, often following a specific question-and-answer pattern. The primary benefits of the Chain Drill are: Accuracy and Pronunciation Practice: The repetitive nature of the drill allows students to practice target vocabulary and grammatical structures with immediate correction from the teacher. Fluency Development: The required sequential interaction encourages rapid, patterned speech, moving students toward greater oral fluency. Interactive Patterning: As noted in the study's conclusions, Chain Drill practice enables students to learn proper question-and-answer patterns for real conversations, developing clearer speech and appropriate vocabulary use.

#### 1.1.4 Integrating Think-Pair-Share with Chain Drill

The integration of TPS and CD aims to leverage the strengths of both techniques to create a holistic learning cycle for speaking. Preparation (TPS): The TPS stages provide students with the necessary cognitive preparation. They think about the content and pair up to rehearse the language needed to discuss that content. This ensures that when they speak, they have organized ideas and practiced structures. Production (CD): The Chain Drill then provides the structured, high-frequency, communicative practice.



Students move from internalized thought and small-group rehearsal (TPS) to confident, sequential oral performance (CD). This integration is hypothesized to overcome the limitations of using either technique in isolation: TPS can sometimes lack high-frequency oral repetition, while CD can lack critical thinking and content generation—a gap the combined approach fills.

## 1.2 Review of Related Studies

The findings of this current study align with and are supported by previous research exploring the effectiveness of these two techniques. A highly relevant study conducted by Handayani (2011) investigated the impact of integrating Think-Pair-Share with the Chain Drill technique on students' speaking fluency. Handayani's research demonstrated a significant improvement in students' speaking fluency after the integrated treatment was administered. Specifically, the mean scores showed an improvement from 3.1 in the pre-test to 4.2 in the second cycle test. This prior finding provides essential empirical backing, confirming that the combination of cooperative learning (TPS) and controlled, repetitive oral practice (CD) is an effective pedagogical strategy for enhancing the oral communication skills of language learners. The current research further validates this effectiveness by applying it in a new context and utilizing a quantitative approach to measure the resulting speaking achievement.

## 1.3 Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework guiding this study posits that students who receive instruction through the integrated Think-Pair-Share and Chain Drill technique will demonstrate a statistically significant improvement in their speaking achievement compared to those taught using conventional methods. The framework is structured on the premise that the TPS model provides the necessary cognitive and psychological preparation for speaking (generating ideas, reducing anxiety), while the Chain Drill model provides the intensive, repetitive, and structured oral practice required to develop fluency and accuracy in pronunciation and grammar. The synergy between these two methods is thus expected to lead to enhanced overall speaking achievement.

## METHODOLOGY

This chapter outlines the procedures and methods employed in conducting this study. It details the research design, participants, data collection methods and instruments, data analysis techniques, and the steps taken to ensure the validity and reliability of the data.

### 2.1 Research Design

This study employed a Quasi-Experimental Design, specifically the Non-equivalent Control Group Design. This design was chosen because the participants (students) in the educational setting were organized into pre-existing classes (intact groups), making random assignment to experimental and control groups impractical.

The study involved two groups: an Experimental Group which received the treatment (Integrating Think-Pair-Share with Chain Drill Technique), and a Control Group which received conventional teaching. Both groups were administered a pre-test before the treatment and a post-test after the treatment to measure the effect of the intervention.

The structure of the research design can be illustrated as follows:

Group	Pre-test	Treatment	Post-test
Experimental	$O_1$	$X$	$O_2$
Control	$O_3$	-	$O_4$

Where:

- $O_1$  and  $O_3$  = Pre-test administered to both groups.
- $X$  = The treatment (Integrating Think-Pair-Share with Chain Drill Technique).
- - = No specific treatment (Conventional teaching method).
- $O_2$  and  $O_4$  = Post-test administered to both groups.

### 2.2 Research Participants

The population of this study was all the students of the seventh grade at SMP N 1 Bandar Lampung in the academic year 2023/2024. The total number of students in the seventh grade was approximately 200, distributed across eight parallel classes. The



sample of the study consisted of two classes chosen from the population: one as the Experimental Group and one as the Control Group. The sampling technique used was Cluster Random Sampling, where two existing classes were randomly selected to represent the sample groups. The two chosen classes were:

1. **Class VIII A** as the Experimental Group (receiving the treatment).
2. **Class VIII B** as the Control Group (receiving conventional teaching).

The selection of these intact groups ensures the study reflects real-world teaching conditions.

### 2.3 Data Collection Method

The primary data collection method used in this research was speaking test. The speaking achievement of the students was measured twice:

1. **Pre-test:** Conducted before the treatment to establish the initial equivalence of the two groups and measure their prior speaking achievement.
2. **Post-test:** Conducted after the treatment was administered to the Experimental Group to determine the final effect of the intervention.

### 2.4 Data Collection Instrument

The instrument used to collect data on the students' speaking achievement was an Oral Test assessed using a standardization Speaking achievement Rubric.

#### 2.4.1 Speaking Achievement Test

The test required students to perform a descriptive speaking task (e.g., introducing themselves and describing a person they know well). The test items were designed to elicit speech that could be evaluated across various language components.

#### 2.4.2 Speaking Assessment Rubric

The students' performance was recorded and evaluated by two independent raters using a standardized analytical scoring rubric. The rubric assessed four components of speaking achievement, adapting the criteria from Brown and Yule (2000), commonly including:

1. **Pronunciation:** Clarity and accuracy of sounds.
2. **Grammar:** Correct usage of grammatical structures.
3. **Vocabulary:** Range and appropriateness of word choice.
4. **Fluency:** Smoothness, pace, and naturalness of speech.

The scores from the two raters were averaged to obtain the final score for each student.

### 2.5 Data Analysis

The quantitative data collected from the pre-test and post-test scores were processed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The analysis began with calculating descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation). Following this, prerequisite tests were performed: the Normality Test (e.g., Saphiro Wilk) to ensure the data distribution met the criteria for parametric testing. Finally, the research hypothesis was tested using the Independent Sample T-Test to compare the mean scores of the Experimental and Control Groups' post-test. A significant level of ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ) was used to determine whether the treatment had a statistically significant effect on students' speaking achievement.

### 2.6 Validity and Reliability

The quality of the data collection instrument was ensured through both validity and reliability measures. Validity was established in two forms: Content Validity, by ensuring the test items were aligned with the seventh-grade curriculum (KI-KD), and Construct Validity, by using a scoring rubric based on established linguistic components of speaking (e.g., grammar, fluency). Reliability was established through Inter-Rater Reliability. The speaking achievement were scored independently by two experienced raters, and the consistency of their scores was calculated using the Pearson Product-Moment correlation coefficient. This step guaranteed the objectivity and consistency of the scoring process.



**FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS**

**RESEARCH FINDING**

Prior to implementing the treatment, a pretest was conducted in the experimental group to assess students' baseline speaking proficiency. Students were required to deliver presentations before their peers. The distribution of pretest scores for both groups is presented below.

**Table 1. The Rate Percentage of Score in Experimental Class (Pretest)**

No.	Classification	Score	Frequency	Percentage
1	Excellent	91-100	0	0
2	Very Good	81-90	0	0
3	Good	71-80	2	6.7%
4	Moderate	61-70	11	36.7%
5	Enough	51-60	11	36.7%
6	Low	41-50	5	16.6%
7	Poor	31-40	1	3.3%
<b>TOTAL</b>			30	100%

Following the intervention, substantial improvement was observed. The post-treatment results showed that 10% of students reached excellent performance levels, 33.3% achieved very good scores, and 36.7% attained good scores. The moderate category decreased to 16.7%, with only 3.3% remaining at the adequate level. Notably, no students scored in the low or poor categories after treatment, indicating significant overall progress.

**Table 2. The Rate Percentage of Score in Experimental Class (Posttest)**

No.	Classification	Score	Frequency	Percentage
1	Excellent	91-100	3	10%
2	Very Good	81-90	10	33.3%
3	Good	71-80	11	36.7%
4	Moderate	61-70	5	16.7%
5	Enough	51-60	1	3.3%
6	Low	41-50	0	0
7	Poor	31-40	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>			30	100%

Following the intervention, substantial improvement was observed. The post-treatment results showed that 10% of students reached excellent performance levels, 33.3% achieved very good scores, and 36.7% attained good scores. The moderate category decreased to 16.7%, with only 3.3% remaining at the adequate level. Notably, no students scored in the low or poor categories after treatment, indicating significant overall progress.

**Table 3. The Rate Percentage of Score in Control Class (Pretest)**

No.	Classification	Score	Frequency	Percentage
1	Excellent	91-100	0	0
2	Very Good	81-90	0	0
3	Good	71-80	5	16.7%
4	Moderate	61-70	10	33.3%
5	Enough	51-60	11	36.7%
6	Low	41-50	3	10%
7	Poor	31-40	1	3.3%
<b>TOTAL</b>			30	100%



The control group's baseline performance was comparable to the experimental group, with 16.7% scoring good, 33.3% moderate, and 36.7% adequate. Additionally, 10% scored low and 3.3% poor, with no students achieving excellent or very good ratings.

**Table 4. The Rate Percentage of Score in Control Class (Posttest)**

No.	Classification	Score	Frequency	Percentage
1	Excellent	91-100	2	6.7%
2	Very Good	81-90	9	30%
3	Good	71-80	12	40%
4	Moderate	61-70	6	20%
5	Enough	51-60	1	3.3%
6	Low	41-50	0	0
7	Poor	31-40	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>			30	100%

The control group also demonstrated improvement, though less pronounced. Post-treatment results showed 6.7% achieving excellent scores, 30% very good, 40% good, 20% moderate, and 3.3% adequate. No students remained in the low or poor categories.

The normality of data distribution was verified using SPSS 16.0 with the Shapiro-Wilk test. With a significance threshold of 0.05, both pretest ( $p=0.216$ ) and posttest ( $p=0.109$ ) values exceeded this threshold, confirming normal distribution.

Tests of Normality						
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
pretest	.134	30	.178	.954	30	.216
posttest	.159	30	.051	.943	30	.109

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

A paired samples t-test was employed to examine the research hypothesis regarding the effectiveness of integrating Think-Pair-Share with Chain Drill methodology. The analysis revealed a mean improvement of 20.5 points (from 60.50 to 81.00) with a standard deviation of 5.469. The calculated t-value of 20.530 substantially exceeded the critical value of 2.462 ( $df=29$ ), with  $p<0.001$ . These results provide:

Paired Samples Statistics					
		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	posttest	81.00	30	9.595	1.752
	pretest	60.50	30	8.545	1.560



**Paired Samples Test**

	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Pair 1 posttest pretest	20.500	5.469	.999	18.458	22.542	20.530	29	.000

The findings demonstrated that the integrated Think-Pair-Share and Chain Drill approach effectively enhanced students' speaking proficiency. This analysis addresses the second research objective by examining whether significant differences exist between students instructed through the integrated methodology versus those taught using the conventional Think-Pair-Share technique alone. The investigation utilized a comprehensive assessment framework encompassing pretest administration, intervention implementation, and posttest evaluation across four fundamental speaking competencies.

**Table 6. The Increase of Students' Achievement of Each Aspects of Speaking**

No	Aspects of Speaking	Mean Score of Pretest	Mean Score of Posttest	Gain
1	Grammar	3.2	4	0.8
2	Vocabulary	3	4	1
3	Fluency	3.1	4.2	1.1
4	Pronunciation	2.9	3.8	0.9
<b>Total</b>			16.4	3.6

The data indicate positive gains across all assessed dimensions of speaking competence. Fluency demonstrated the most substantial improvement (1.1 points), suggesting that the paired interaction component was particularly effective in promoting spontaneous speech production. Conversely, grammatical accuracy showed the most modest gains (0.8 points), indicating this dimension may require additional instructional support or extended practice time to achieve comparable progress.

**DISCUSSIONS**

Initial assessment revealed comparable baseline proficiency in both groups, indicating homogeneity before intervention. Post-treatment, the experimental group demonstrated marked improvement, achieving good proficiency levels and confirming the approach's effectiveness in developing oral fluency. Statistical analysis using the independent t-test revealed significant differences between groups. Pre-intervention results in the experimental group showed 6.7% at good level, 36.7% moderate, 36.7% adequate, 16.7% low, and 3.3% poor, with none achieving excellent or very good ratings. Post-intervention, 10% reached excellent, 33.3% very good, 36.7% good, 16.7% moderate, and 4% adequate, with no poor scores. Post-test mean scores showed the experimental group scoring 2.7 versus the control group's 2.5, a 0.2-point difference demonstrating superior progress in the experimental group. Post-treatment analysis revealed significant differences between groups. The experimental group achieved a mean of 81 compared to the control group's 79, with maximum scores of 95 and 90 respectively. These findings indicate Chain Drill is a strategic pedagogical technique that creates an engaging environment and encourages oral performance. These results align with Handayani (2011), who reported enhanced English fluency following integrated instruction, with mean scores improving from 3.1 to 4.2. The performance gap between groups reflects the instructional difference: experimental students



received integrated Think-Pair-Share and Chain Drill, while controls received Think-Pair-Share alone. The integration of Think-Pair-Share with Chain Drill demonstrates considerable value for enhancing seventh-grade students' speaking proficiency, supported by quantitative improvements and increased student engagement in oral communication.

## CONCLUSION

This study provides empirical evidence that integrating Think-Pair-Share with Chain Drill technique significantly improves students' speaking achievement across all measured aspects: grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and pronunciation. The integrated approach proved more effective than using Think-Pair-Share alone, as demonstrated by the experimental group's superior posttest performance (mean score 81.00 vs. 79.00) and higher maximum scores (95 vs. 90).

The technique's effectiveness stems from multiple pedagogical mechanisms: universal participation through sequential patterns, reduced speaking anxiety through graduated exposure, immediate error correction, cognitive processing time, and sustained practice opportunities. Among the four speaking aspects, fluency demonstrated the highest improvement (gain score 1.1), indicating that the technique particularly enhances students' achievement to speak smoothly and confidently.

The findings have important implications for English language teaching, suggesting that combining complementary instructional techniques can produce synergistic effects that exceed the impact of individual methods. The structured, sequential nature of Chain Drill effectively complements the collaborative, reflective nature of Think-Pair-Share, creating a comprehensive framework for speaking achievement development.

## SUGGESTIONS

The chain drill technique has proven effective in enhancing students' speaking abilities. Therefore, teachers should incorporate this technique into their speaking lessons to help students improve their oral communication skills. Chain drill practice enables students to learn proper question-and-answer patterns for real conversations. Through this method, students can develop clearer speech, improve their pronunciation, and use vocabulary more appropriately. Since teachers can immediately correct errors during chain drill exercises, students should practice this technique both inside and outside the classroom to achieve fluency and accuracy in pronunciation, comprehension, vocabulary, and grammar. Further classroom action research should be conducted to explore additional teaching strategies that enhance the learning process. Researchers should also investigate how the chain drill technique can be adapted for developing other language skills, including listening, reading, and writing.

## REFERENCES

1. Brown, H. Douglas. 2001. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. New York: Pearson Education Company. Skill. Jakarta: UHAMKA.
2. Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language Assessment*. San Francisco: Longman.
3. Cornbleet, Sandra and Carter, Ronald. 2002 *The Language of Speech and Writing*. Second Edition. New York: Routledge.
4. Handayani, Kusuma Utami. 2011 *Using a Chain Drill Students' Fluency to in Improve Speaking English*. English Department Faculty of Languages and Arts: Semarang State University.
5. Hatch, E., & Farhady, H. 1982. *Research Methods and Statistics for Applied Linguistics*, Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
6. Hughes, R., & Reed, B. S. 2016. *Teaching and researching speaking*. Taylor & Francis.
7. Kagan, S. 1994 *Cooperative learning*. San Clemente, CA: Kagan Publications.
8. Larsen, D. 2000. *Techniques and Principle in Language Teaching*. England: Oxford University Press, inc. Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English: The Living Dictionary (New Edition). 2003. Essex: Longman.
9. Setiyadi, B. 2006. *Metode penelitian Untuk Pengajaran Bahasa Asing Pendekatan Kualitatif dan Kuantitatif (I)*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Graha Ilmu.
10. Yule, George. 2000. *Pragmatics*. Berlin. Oxford University Press.

*Cite this Article: Rahman, F.A., Flora, Sukirlan, M. (2025). Integrating Think-Pair-Share with Chain Drill to Enhance Students' Speaking Achievement. International Journal of Current Science Research and Review, 8(12), pp. 6252-6259. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijcsrr/V8-i12-36>*