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| **INTRODUCTION**In line with the development of society today, education faces many challenges and obstacles. One of the interesting challenges is related to the improvement of the quality of education which is still caused by the low quality of education in Indonesia. Understanding of the teacher's understanding and view of  |

teaching methods will influence the role and activities of students in learning. In contrast, teacher activity in teaching as well as student activity in learning is also dependent on teacher's understanding of teaching method. According to the Law on National Education System (Sisdiknas RI) no. 20 Year 2003, Chapter II, article 2 and 3 states that: National education function to develop ability and forming character and dignity of nation dignity in the intellectual life of nation, aiming for the development of potential learners in order to become human believer and cautious to God Almighty, be noble, capable, creative, independent, and become a democratic and responsible citizen.

The government is working hard to improve the quality of education in Indonesia. One of the efforts made by the government is to renew and improve the existing curriculum. Currently the government has issued a new curriculum, the curriculum 2013. Curriculum 2013 is a curriculum designed to prepare the next generation of the nation in the face of challenges in the future. The curriculum emphasizes understanding, skills, and character education. Students are required to understand the material, active in discussions and presentations and have a high level of manners and discipline. Permendikbud No. 81a Year 2013 attachment IV, states that the learning process consists of five main learning experiences of observing, asking, gathering information, associate, and communicate.

**Table-1: List of Student Exam Values XI SMKN 1 Gunungsitoli**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Class | Number of Students | Minimum Grade | Passing Grade (%) | Not Passing Grade (%)  |
| XI-1  | 33 | 70 | 11 | 33% | 22 | 67 % |
| XI-2  | 35 | 70 | 14 | 40% | 21 | 60 % |
| XI-3  | 32 | 70 | 16 | 50% | 16 | 50 % |
| Total | 100 |  | 41 | 41 % | 59 | 59 % |

In the existing teaching and learning activities, the ability to understand and express the meaning of what is contained in the learning is needed because students are required to be active in learning, critical and can interact with the environment. And hope will achieve satisfactory learning outcomes. However, in fact many students who have low learning outcomes or did not pass the KKM (minimal completeness criteria), it is seen from the results of student learning that is in table 1. Low learning results caused by many students who do not understand the lessons described teacher’s class, because students tend to be silent and passive. At the time of questioning given to the students, many students did not use the opportunity given, because of shame about their friends in the class, and also embarrassment to the teacher. A passive attitude in learning can make the student fail in his studies.

Ability to communicate also not fully owned by students SMKN 1 Gunungsitoli because students feel reluctant and afraid of the teacher. This results in boredom in students to learn better. Students are accustomed to being guided to follow existing steps and procedures and work on and accomplish something so that they are accustomed to following the instructions and do not need the thinking process. Improving communication skills can minimize these problems. One can communicate easily with others if it has good communication skills, and also with one's communication can express themselves and feelings, ask each other, answer and share with others.

In teaching, teachers need to communicate with each individual student because through the communication will create a good relationship with students. Teacher communication to the students by using the existing learning model, aimed so that teachers can get and monitor the growth and development of each learner directly or indirectly, so as to create a better understanding of learning and learning outcomes. In other words, the better the students communication skills in that component the better the students' learning outcomes as well.

The low ability of students to communicate may also be caused by conventional learning that tends to self-study. Conventional learning model that is generally applied in business communication learning causes only one-way communication and ignore the social nature of learning business communication itself, so that students tend to work individually in learning activities. Because the conventional learning that became the center of learning is not the students but the teacher as the center of learning. This is a big task for a business communications teacher to continue to make improvements in order to improve communication skills in students. One of the improvements that must be done by teachers is in the selection of learning models. Teachers should design learning strategies in groups, so that students are able to communicate with fellow friends to build knowledge.

In the process of learning business communication required a condition that can enable students more active, more freely express opinions, help each other and share opinions with friends, and together solve problems to acquire new knowledge. Conditions that allow the emergence of these things is learning in small groups collaboratively contained in cooperative learning.

There are several models of cooperative learning, one of the cooperative learning models that meet the indicator of students' communication ability is the Think Pair Share (TPS) learning model first developed by Frank Lyman and colleagues at the University of Maryland. Think Pair Share is a learning structure designed to influence the interaction patterns of students, in order to create a cooperative learning that can increase academic mastery and student skills. In addition, TPS is also one of the learning models developed from constructivism theory, which is a combination of learning independently and learning in groups. The constructivism approach is a learning process that explains how knowledge is structured in the thinking of the learner. Think pair share is an effective way to create variations in the atmosphere of class discussion. Assuming that all discussions require settings to control the class as a whole, and the procedures used in think pair share can give students more time thinking, to respond and to help each other.

So it can be said that think pair share is the pattern of class discussion requires students to be more active in thinking and responding and helping each other. Think pair share learning model is an effective cooperative learning structure to improve students' partisifasi and student's thinking power. This is possible because the procedure has been arranged in such a way that it can give students more time to think, and respond as one way that can arouse the form of student participation.

Knowledge is actively developed by the students themselves and is not passively accepted from those around them. This means that learning is the result of the student's own efforts and not just transferred from the teacher to the student. This means that students no longer stick to old teaching and learning concepts, where teachers only pour or transfer knowledge to students without any prior effort from the students themselves. The TPS type cooperative learning model helps students interpret their ideas together and improve students' understanding of a concept. Thus, the TPS learning model can assist students in improving their communication skills. Communication is important because the subject of business communication is not only a tool of thought that helps students to develop science, solve problems and draw conclusions but also as a tool to communicate thoughts, ideas and ideas clearly, precisely and briefly.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

The problems of education in the 21st century are increasingly complex, among which teachers must be able to teach in multicultural societies, teaching for meaning constructions, teaching for active learning, teaching with technology, and teacher accountability in teaching [1] . Learning outcomes are expected to include the competence and intelligence patterns needed to take action in the 21st century. Education is not just preparing for the future, but how to create the future. Education should help the creation of critical individuals with higher levels of creativity and thinking skills as well as life long education.

Heinich *et al.* [2], defines learning as the arrangement of information and the environment in order to facilitate learning. The environment in question is not only the place where learning takes place, but also the models, media, and tools necessary to convey information and direct learners' learning. Teachers have multi role in learning process among others; teachers can act as teachers, class leaders, mentors, learning environment regulators, advocates, supervisors, motivators, and evaluators. Teachers are a dominant determinant factor in education in general, because teachers play a role in advocacy which is at the core of the overall educational process.

How to apply a lesson will greatly affect the ability of students in educating themselves. Successful teachers are not just renderers who are charismatic and persuasive. Furthermore, successful teachers are able to engage students in tasks that are full of cognitive and social content, and teach students how to do the tasks productively. Successful teachers always teach students how to absorb and master information derived from the explanation. While effective students are able to describe the information, ideas, and wisdom of their teachers and use the resources of learning effectively. Thus, the main role in teaching is to print a reliable learner [3].

Social Sciences (IPS), included in the subject group of science and technology taught in a unified way. National Council for Social Studies (NCSS) [4], defines IPS as follows: Social studies is the integrated study of social sciences and humanities to promote civic competence. Within the school program, social studies, coordination, history, law, philosophy, political science, psychology, humanities, mathematics, and natural sciences. One alternative model of IPS learning that enables the development of student thinking skills is a cooperative advocacy model. Cooperative learning is an activity that takes place in small group learning environments, so students can share ideas and work collaboratively to complete academic tasks [5].

Cooperative learning is in accordance with the paradigm that besides individual beings, human beings are social beings who can not stand on their own, but always need cooperation with others. Cooperative learning is not only aimed at understanding students about the material to be studied but more emphasis on training students to have social skills. The social skills in question are the ability to work together, understand each other, share information, help each other among group friends, and take responsibility for fellow group friends to achieve the group's general goals. In cooperative learning not only required individual success but also group success. From that thought in cooperative learning, students learn in small groups that are heterogeneous in terms of academic ability, mutually helping each other in achieving common goals [6].

One of the efforts to overcome these problems is through the implementation of Think-Pair-Share (TPS) cooperative learning model which means thinking-pair-sharing. Think Pair Share (TPS) is a type of cooperative learning that is designed to influence the interaction patterns of students. Think Pair Share (TPS) is one of the learning models developed from constructivism theory which is a combination of learning independently and learning in groups. Think Pair Share has explicitly defined procedures to give students more time to be active in learning through thinking, pairing and sharing [7].

According to Richard and Rodgers [8], there are several forms of techniques, which are derived from cooperative learning method such as Jigsaw, Student Teams Achievement Divisions (STAD), Think-Pair-Share (TPS), Numbered Heads Together (NHT), Three- Step Interview, Co-op, Round Robin, Inside-Outside Circle, Roundtable, and etc. According to Kagan [9] as cited in Khan [10], those techniques are similar in principles in which they help students to fully engage in the learning activities and do the activities cooperatively with other students. However, he states that those cooperative learning techniques are different in terms of its implementation structures. Some of those techniques such as STAD, Jigsaw, and Co-op, have higher degree of complexity in their implementation structures than the others. However, Numbered Heads Together (NHT) and Think Pair Share (TPS) have lower degree of complexity. Besides, there is a very unique finding in relation to these two techniques. According to Kagan [9] as cited in Khan [10], NHT can be used in conjunction or can be combined with TPS. Further, he states that although NHT and TPS have distinct academic and social functions, however, they have been proved empirically in improving students reading comprehension.

**RESEARCH METHODS**

This study included quasi experiments aimed at seeing or knowing whether or not there was a result of something imposed on the subject of the student. By giving treatment to group of research sample through think pair share study model using Kemmis & Taggart design which consist of: planning, implementation and observation, reflection[9].

The design of this study used a two-group pretest-posttest design model. In this design, before treatment begins, both groups are given a preliminary or pre-test test to measure the initial conditions. Further treatment is given. After completion of treatment, both groups were given a test as a post-test. This design can be described as follows:

**Table-2: Pretest – posttest Control Group Desain**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Class | Pre – test | Treatment | Post – test |
| Experiment (XI-2) | T1 | X1 | T2 |
| Control (XI-1 ) | Q1 | X2 | Q2 |

**Keterangan**

T1: Initial test and questionnaire distribution in the experimental class

Q2: Initial test and questionnaire distribution in the control class

X1: Treatment using think pair share learning model

X2: Treatment using conventional learning model

T2 : Test and dispute of questionnaire after giving teaching treatment to experiment class

Q2: Test and dispute of questionnaire after giving teaching treatment to control class



**Fig-1:Research Design Scheme**

To obtain the data needed as the analyzing material in a research needs to set data collection tool. In this case used two methods of data collection that is with tests for learning outcomes and questionnaires for interpersonal communication. Hypothesis test is done by unpaired t test by comparing thitung with ttable both for hypothesis I and II with the following formula:

Where:

 Average of experiment class grade

 Average of control class grade

 The number of students in the experimental class

 The number of students in the control class

 Variant in the experimental class

 Variant in the control class

**FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

The research conducted at SMKN 1 Gunungsitoli involves two classes by providing different learning treatments in both classes. Class XI-1 as experimental class is treated in the form of learning by using Think Pair Share model and class XI-2 as control class is treated in the form of learning by using conventional model.

After all have been agreed then designed teaching materials and questions for research instrument. Before the question of research instrument is given to the sample to be used, the researcher first tests the validity, reliability, difficulty level problem and different problem power. Trial of this instrument is done on SMKN 1 Gunungsitoli also in class XI-3. The tested instrument is a question of multiple choices of 25 questions.

From the result of validity test, it was found that 4 invalid questions and questionnaire 8 invalid statements, thus 21 valid questions and 22 statements in valid questionnaire were used as instruments in this research. Meanwhile, from the calculation of the reliability of the test, obtained r-value = 0.742 by consulting the price r-table = 0.367 with n-2 = 29-2 = 27 at the level ɑ = 0.05 so that r-value > r-table. So it can be concluded that the problem as a whole is a reabel with high reliability. Similarly, the questionnaire reliability r-value = 0.946 and to test the level of difficulty questions from the test results about the known result of the calculation of all the test items concluded that 1 problem is categorized difficult, 17 medium categorized and 3 easily categorized matter. Then to test the differentiating power problem, obtained data from 21 problem can be concluded that there are 3 problem categorized very good, 16 matter categorized good, 1 matter categorized enough, and 1 problem categorized less.

After the research instrument has been tested the validity, reliability, difficulty and distinguishing power. So researchers continue the process of research, the research process is done in the classroom. Before the learning begins, first pre-tested to the two classes aimed to see the students' early skills in Presentation Techniques. From the results of the pre test conducted, the normality and homogeneity tests were tested. It can be concluded that the experimental class and control class data are normal and there is no significant difference between the students' initial ability of the experimental class and the Control class. This means that the sample meets the criteria for treatment, in other words the research can be continued with the sample.

The learning process with presentation technique materials where the experimental class happened 2 meetings and control class 2 times meeting which the researcher himself brought to the control class and experimental class. At the end of the meeting the researcher gave posttest and communication communication questionnaire to see the learning result obtained from the learning process that has been going on. From the pre test and posttest data obtained letah results, and this is what researchers use for the process of data management for the purposes of researchers, and re-test.

**Table-3: Normality Test**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Groups | Mean | SD | L-value | L-table | Sig | Result |
| Test Normality for Pre-Test Results Learning |
| Experiment | 51.212 | 12.8789 | 0.078 | 0.154 | 0,05 | Normal |
| Control | 47.891 | 11.1412 | 0.017 | 0.149 | 0,05 | Normal |
| Test Normality for Post-Test Results Learning |
| Experiment | 72.270 | 12.1173 | 0.151 | 0.154 | 0,05 | Normal |
| Control | 65.829 | 13.5274 | 0.113 | 0.149 | 0,05 | Normal |
| Test Normality for Pre-Test Communication Capabilities |
| Experiment | 60.03 | 3.592 | 0.147 | 0.154 | 0,05 | Normal |
| Control | 60.89 | 7.095 | 0.100 | 0.149 | 0,05 | Normal |
| Test Normality for Post-Test Communication Capabilities |
| Experiment | 66.34 | 7.223 | 0.107 | 0.154 | 0,05 | Normal |
| Control | 63.17 | 4.508 | 0.125 | 0.140 | 0,05 | Normal |

Based on the normality test using the liliefors technique, the pre test test for the experimental class obtained L-value = 0.078. From the list of liliefors test with a real level of ɑ = 0.05 with n = 33 then obtained L-table = 0.154 this means L-value < L-table. While the pretest normality test of Control class obtained Lhitung = 0.017 from the list of liliefors test with the real level ɑ = 0,05 with n = 35 then obtained L-table = 0.149 this means L-value < L-table.

Furthermore, the normality test results by using the liliefors technique then the test of post test mormality for the experimental class obtained L-value = 0.151. From the list of liliefors test with a real level of ɑ = 0.05 with n = 33 then obtained L-table = 0.154 this means L-value < L-table. While the post control test normality test obtained L-value = 0.113 from the list of liliefors test with a real level of ɑ = 0.05 with n = 35 then obtained L-table = 0.149 this means L-value < L-table.

Based on the normality test by using the liliefors technique then the test of pre test communication mormality for the experimental class obtained L-value = 0.147. From the list of liliefors test with a real level of ɑ = 0.05 with n = 33 then obtained L-table = 0.154 this means L-value < L-table. While the test of normality of pre test of communication class ability of Control obtained L-value = 0,100 from list of test of liliefors with real level ɑ = 0,05 with n = 35 then obtained L-table = 0.149 this mean L-value < L-table.

Furthermore, the results of normality test using the liliefors technique then test postoperative mormalitas communication ability for the experimental class obtained L-value = 0.107. From the list of liliefors test with a real level of ɑ = 0.05 with n = 33 then obtained L-table = 0.154 this means L-value < L-table. While the post normality test test of control class communication ability obtained L-value = 0.125 from liliefors test list with the real level of ɑ = 0,05 with n = 35 then obtained L-table = 0.149 this means L-value < L-table.

**Table-4: Homogeneity Test of Pre Test Value and Post Test Result Learning Outcome**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Class | F-Value | F-table | Result |
| Pretest Score | Experiment | 0.196 | 3.99 | Homogen |
| Control |
| Posttest Score | Experiment | 0.231 | 3.99 | Homogen |
| Control |

From the calculation of homogeneity test by using interpolation calculation obtained F-table = 3.99 while F-value for pretest data is 0.196 and F-value for post test data is 0.231. By comparing the price is obtained F-value <F-table is 0.196 < 3.99 for pre test data and F-value < F-table is 0.231 < 3.339 for posttest data. It can be concluded that the variance of both sample groups for pre test and post test has the same or homogeneous variance.

**Table-5: Homogeneity Test of Pretest Value and Post Test of Communication**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Class | F-Value | F-table | Result |
| Pretest Score | Experiment | 0.010 | 3.99 | Homogen |
| Control |
| Posttest Score | Experiment | 0.018 | 3.99 | Homogen |
| Control |

From the calculation of homogeneity test by using interpolation calculation is obtained F-table = 3.99 while F-value for pre test data of communication trait is 0.010 and F-value for posttest data of communication ability is 0.018. By comparing the price obtained F-value < F-table is 0.010 < 3.99 for pre test data communication ability and F-value < F-table is 0.018 < 3.339 for post test data communication ability. It can be concluded that the variance of both groups of samples for pre test and posttest of communication ability has the same or homogeneous variance.

Having known that the two samples are normally distributed and have the same variance (homogeneous), then further testing the research hepotesis to see whether there is a significant difference at a certain level of the variables studied. Hypothesis testing using unpaired t-test formula. For hypothesis test calculation using t test at 95% confidence level at ɑ = 0,05. This test is used to determine whether the hypothesis in this study accepted or rejected. Criteria testing if t-value > t-table then alternative hypothesis (Ha) accepted and if otherwise the hypothesis zero (Ho) rejected.

**Table-6: Results of hypothesis testing Using**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Class | T-Value | T-Table | Result |
| Learning Outcome | Experiment | 2.067 | 1.671 | Hypothesis Accepted |
| Control |
| Communication | Experiment | 3.180 | Hypothesis Accepted |
| Control |

Based on the results of the calculation for hypothesis testing of the post test results obtained obtained t-value = 2.064 and t-table = 1.671 and the communication ability obtained t-value = 3.180 and t-table = 1.671 at 95% confidence level and the real level ɑ = 0.05 with dk = n1 + n2 - 2 = 33 + 35 - 2 = 66 obtained t (0.95) (66) of 1,671 by means of linear interpolation. By comparing the two values, it can be concluded t-value > t-table is 2.064 > 1.671 for business communication learning results and price t-value > t-table, 3.180> 1.671 for communication skills. This means the null hypothesis (Ho) rejected and alternative research hypothesis (Ha) accepted states that the learning outcomes of business communication taught and the communication skills of students with the model of learning Think Pair Share is applied higher than the results of business communication taught and communication skills using conventional methods.

Students in experiment class with thinking pair share learning model is more enthusiastic / active and focused in learning activities compared with students in control class. This affects the students' understanding of the experimental class in the material that is taught better and optimally sprinkled by the students in the control class. Thus, the hypothesis that states the results of business communication learning and communication skills of students who are taught with the model of thinking pair share is applied significantly higher than the results of business communication learning and communication skills of students taught by conventional methods students SMKN 1 Gunungsitoli acceptable. This research has been done as carefully as possible, although this research is not perfect and there are still some shortcomings. The shortcomings include the time allocation used is still not enough and the learning materials are still not varied.

**CONCLUSSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the result of the research and discussion, it can be concluded that the result of learning of business communication and student communication ability on the presentation material that is taught using the think pair share learning model is significantly higher than the result of business communication learning and communication ability of students taught by conventional method of XII class student SMKN 1 Gunungsitoli. To the teacher, especially for the teacher of the field of business communication studies should be able to improve teaching skills by continuing to innovate in the learning process in the classroom by using various learning models, one of them is the learning model of think pair share for maximum learning result. To the school, is expected to pay more attention and encourage teachers to always use a variety of learning models and appropriate to improve student-learning outcomes. to further researchers who are interested to conduct research with the same title, is expected to pay more attention to students who are passive and less participate in learning and time allocation used in teaching and learning activities. In order to obtain better results can try to develop research with other basic material so that can enrich the repertoire of science in the field of education.
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