

# **The Effects of Students Team Achievement Division (STAD) to Improve Students' Achievement in Writing Skill**

<sup>1)</sup> Charlie Ba'ka', S.Pd, M.Pd

[charliezendyryant@yahoo.co.id](mailto:charliezendyryant@yahoo.co.id)

Correspondence: <sup>1</sup> English Education Department, Teacher Training and Education Faculty, Christian University of Indonesia Toraja

## **Abstract**

Charlie Baka. The Effects of Students Team Achievement Division (STAD) to Improve Students' Achievement in Writing Skill (Supervised by Kisman Salija and Murni Mahmud)

The objectives of this research are (1) to find out whether the use of Students Team Achievement Division (STAD) improve students' achievement in writing skill (2) to find out whether the use of STAD motivate the students in learning writing skill at fourth semester of English department of UKI Toraja. This research employed quasi-experimental design. It used two groups, one received treatment STAD and the other group received GI. The subjects of this research were class F and G were taken randomly. Class F as the experimental group and class G as control group consisted of 30 students. The data of this research was collected through writing test and questionnaire. The results of this research were (1) The use of STAD has effects to improve the writing achievement of the fourth semester students of UKI Toraja in experimental class. (2) The motivations of the fourth semester students of UKI Toraja as experimental class showed a great positive in learning writing by using STAD. So, it can be concluded that the use of STAD motivated the students in writing and agreed to use of STAD because it could built students' confidence and finding ideas. Many students also agreed that the use of STAD was interested in work group session.

**Keywords:** Effects, Students Team Achievement Division (Stad), Improve, Writing Skill

## A. INTRODUCTION

Many students during the writing task are sometimes confuse and could not continue to complete their writing task with simple reason such as lack of vocabulary, not having enough ideas, cannot make up longer sentences. These may occur since they have not enough writing experience and focus their attention mainly on grammar and vocabulary. Lecturers also face problem of writing class is how to motivate the students to write interesting and effective materials and also find good techniques.

In the case of UKI Toraja, the researcher found that the ability of the students to write were low. Students could not develop the ideas as the result they can only write very short paragraph. They were difficult to develop paragraph and the structure of the sentences that made were still not correct. It indicated unsuccessful in teaching learning process. This phenomenon could be caused by many factors such as the students do not have enough experience to write or the material and the strategy which provided in the class by the teachers is not suitable for the students.

Based on the problem above, the English teachers have to be more creative in choosing the materials and teaching strategy which can make the writing class more interesting, motivating, exiting and more effective. Various techniques or strategies of teaching writing in English have been applied by teacher such as mind mapping, brain-storming, songs, etc. Some of them are considered effective in teaching writing. One of the possible ways for assisting is cooperative learning.

Cooperative learning is an instructional program in which students work in small groups to help one another understand the academic content of materials. Harmer (2004:117) states that groups work has some advantages, one of them is it promotes learner autonomy by allowing learners to make their own decision in group without being told what to do by the teacher. They work together in group work or pairs work for doing something to achieve the goals of language learning. There are some techniques that can be used in cooperative learning such as Cooperative Integrated Reading Composition (CIRC), Jigsaw, Teams game Tournament (TGT), Students Team Achievement Division (STAD) and Group Investigation (GI), and etc. In this research STAD will be used.

Slavin (1990) stated that STAD is the simplest groups of Cooperative Learning methods method emphasizing student team learning methods. In the STAD technique, students are assigned to four to six members reflecting a heterogeneous grouping.

## **B. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND HYPOTESIS**

### **1. Writing**

#### **a. The essence of writing**

Many definitions about writing are given by linguistics. Lindblom (1983) defines that writing as a way of learning to focus our mind on important matters and learning about them. By writing activity, a person can find the solution of difficult problem, master the fact and even by writing a person can also communicate through the way that is impossible.

Harmer (2011:10) defines writing is a productive skill which involves thought and emotion. It is a medium of communication. Writing cannot be mastered at one but it needs practice. The practice may include imitating or copying words and sentences from the giving ideas or expressing free ideas based on the writers' knowledge, experience and point of view.

Nunan (1995:91) states that writing is clearly a complex process, and competent writing is frequently accepted as being the last language skill to be acquired. Few people write spontaneously, and few feel comfortable with a formal writing task intended for the eyes of someone else. Writing is not a natural activity.

Based on the explanation, the researcher concludes that writing is one of the production skills in language. In its process needs attention for the rules such as structure or content. The aim of writing is to tell about ideas, concept, or message from the writer to the reader.

#### **b. The components of writing**

Jacobs in Fatmasari (2011:16) states that there are five components in writing. Those are content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanics. It will be presented in the following:

1) Content

The content of writing should be clear to readers. So, that the readers can understand the message conveyed and gain information from it. In order to have good content in writing, its content should be well unified and completed.

2) Organization

The process of organization in writing involves coherence, order of importance, general to specific, specific to general, chronological order and spatial pattern.

3) Vocabulary

One of requirements of a good writing always depends on the effective use of the words. In personal description, word plays a dual role: to communicate and to evoke, to the readers to perceive and feel. These two purposes are evident even if such as a practical and common form of writing as an advertisement.

4) Language use

Writing involves correct usage endpoint of grammar, such as verb, nouns, and agreement.

5) Mechanism

The use of mechanics is due to capitalization, and spelling appropriately. This aspect is very important since it leads readers to understand or recognize immediately what the researcher means to express definitely.

## **2. Cooperative Learning**

Cooperative learning is the activities in teaching learning process where the students are divided into some groups. The students learn and work in small group interaction until they get experience. Hill and Hill (1990) state that cooperative learning has significant advantages for both intellectual and social development, over individualized and competition learning individual environment.

Cooperative learning is an instructional program in which students work in small group to help one another understand the academic content of materials. Harmer (2004:117) states that groups work has some advantages; one of them is to promote learners to make their own decision in group without being told what to do by the teacher.

According to Slavin (in Slage, 2009:17), cooperative learning strategies made it possible for students to see one another in a positive light and to establish friendships based on human qualities rather than on skin colors or by the way a student may speak. Furthermore, Slavin stated that students' proved to be more successful when working within groups than when they worked independently. Moreover, it was believed that students who participated in cooperative groups were more likely to increase friendships across ethnic and racial lines.

## **3. Students Team Achievement Deviation (STAD)**

### **a) Definition of STAD**

An effective cooperative learning method is called Students Teams Achievement Division or STAD (Slavin, 1994:288). STAD consist of a regular cycle of teaching, cooperative study in mixed-ability teams, and quizzes, with recognition or other rewards provided to teams whose members most exceed their own past records. STAD consist of a regular cycle of instructional activities, as follows: (1) teach: present the lesson, (2) team study: students work on worksheet in their team to master the material, (3) test: students take individual quizzes, (4) team recognition: team scores are computed on the basis of team members' improvement scores, and certificates, a class newsletter, or a bulletin board recognizes high-scoring teams.

### **b) Using STAD in Teaching English**

STAD is made up of five major components namely: class presentation, teams, quizzes, individual improvement, score and team recognition. (Slavin, 1994)

#### **1) Class presentation**

Material in STAD technique is initially introduced in a class presentation. Class presentation in STAD technique differ from usual teaching only in that they must be careful attention during the class presentation because doing so will help them to do well on the quizzes. The quizzes determine their team score.

2) Teams

Teams are composed of four to six students who present a cross section of the class in academic performance, sex, and race or ethnicity. The major function of the team is to prepare its members to do well on the quiz after the teacher present the material; the team meets to study worksheet or other material. Most often, the study takes the form of students discussing problem together, comparing answer and correcting any misconceptions if teammates makes mistake.

3) Quizzes

Students are not permitted to help one another during the quizzes. This makes sure that every student is individually responsible for knowing the material.

4) Individual improvement score

The idea behind individual improvement score is to give each students performance goal that the students can reach but only they work harder and perform better that in the past.

5) Team recognition

Teams may earn certificates or other rewards if their average scores exceed a certain criterion. Students' team score may also be used to determine up to five bonus points toward their grades.

#### **4. Motivation**

##### **a. Definition of motivation**

Brown (2007:168) states that motivation is yet another affective variable to consider, but one that so central and with research foundations that are so pervasive that it deserves a separate category here. Undoubtedly the most frequently used catch-all term for explaining the success or failure of virtually any complex task, motivation is a star player in the cast of characters assigned to second language learning scenarios around the world. Such assumptions are of course not erroneous, for countless studies and experiments in human learning have shown that motivation is a key to learning general.

Donough (1993) states that motivation is the factors that support the students to learn English language, most language teacher agree that motivation is one of the most important factors influencing the students successful or failure in learning language. In oxford dictionary (1992:100) of current English, motivation is an energy within the person created by affective an arousal and anticipatory goal reaction.

##### **b. Types of motivation**

Harmer (1993:3) distinguishes motivation into two kinds as extrinsic and intrinsic motivation.

###### **1) Extrinsic motivation**

Extrinsic motivation is concerned with factor outside the classroom; Penny Ur (1996) states that extrinsic motivation is that drives from the influence of some kinds of external incentive, as distinct from the wish to learn for its own sake or interest in task.

###### **2) Intrinsic motivation**

In educational psychology, intrinsic motivation is something to relate to long success and usually defined as motivation, which is guided by an interest in the task, itself in which one is engaged. In Harmer (1993:4) point out that intrinsic motivation is concerned with what take place inside the classroom.

## HYPOTHESIS

1. Null hypothesis (H0)
  - a. Students Team Achievement Division (STAD) cannot improve students' achievement in writing skill at fourth semester students of English department of UKI Toraja.
  - b. Students Team Achievement Division (STAD) cannot motivate the fourth semester students of English department of UKI Toraja.
2. Alternative hypothesis (H1)
  - a. Students Team Achievement Division (STAD) can improve students' achievement in writing skill at fourth semester students of English department of UKI Toraja.
  - b. Students Team Achievement Division (STAD) can motivate the fourth semester students of English department of UKI Toraja.

## C. RESEARCH METHOD

### 1. Research Design

In this research, the researcher uses the quasi-experimental design. It involves two groups, one receives treatment through Students Team Achievement Division (STAD) as experiment group and the other group receives treatment through Group Investigation (GI) as control group. Both of groups are given pretest and posttest. The pretest is administered to find out the prior knowledge of students while posttest is administered to find out the influence of using STAD in Learning English writing. The design is formulated as follows:

EG	O1	X	O2
<hr/>			
CG	O1	Y	O2

*Figure 3.1 Research design (adapted from Gay, 2006:258)*

Where:

EG = experimental group

CG = control group

O1 = pre test

O2 = post test



X = treatment with STAD technique

Y = treatment with GI technique

## **2. Research Variable**

This research consists of two variables, namely dependent variable and independent variable. The research has two independent variables and one dependent variable. The three variables are defined as follows:

- a. The independent variables are STAD and GI techniques. Both of them are used to facilitate students to improve their English writing.
- b. The dependent variables of this research are the students' writing achievement.

## **3. Operational definition of Variables**

- a. STAD (Students Team Achievement Division) is group activity where the lecturer present lesson and students study worksheet in four to six members' team. STAD is made up of five major components namely; class presentation, teams, quizzes, individual improvement, score and team recognition.
- b. GI (Group Investigation) is cooperative learning which students form interest groups within which to plan and implement an investigation and synthesize the findings into a group presentation for the class. GI has four important components; investigation, interaction, interpretation, and intrinsic motivation.
- c. Students' writing skill is the ability of the students after application of STAD and GI in writing English in terms of accuracy content, organization, language use or structure, vocabulary, and mechanics.
- d. Students' motivation is students' desire and effort to achieve the goal of writing which is measured by using the Likert scale which is classified as strongly motivated, motivated, fairly motivated, unmotivated, and strongly unmotivated. The level of the students' motivation in writing class by STAD is high when their motivation is in the level of strongly motivated or motivated.

#### **4. Population and Sample**

##### **a. Population**

The population of this research is the fourth semester students of English Department of UKI Toraja, South Sulawesi Province. The total number of the classes is nine namely; class A, class B, class C, class D, class E, class F, class G, class H, and class I. Each class consists of different number of students. The population is 255 students.

##### **b. Sample**

The sample is selected by using cluster random sampling technique. The researcher takes two classes which are homogeneous. They are class F and class G. These two classes are then taken randomly. Class F is given treatment by using STAD which consists of 30 students, while Class G is given treatment by using GI which consists of 30 students.

#### **5. Research Instrument**

The instruments used to collect data consists of two kinds of instruments, they are as follows:

##### **a. Writing test**

The test consists of pretest and posttest. This instrument is intended to measure the students' writing achievement. The test is made by researcher. The tests which given are some topics where the students should write paragraph about the topic which given.

##### **b. Questionnaire**

The other kind of research instrument is questionnaire. In this research the instrument is given to find out the students' motivation toward the use of STAD in writing. The questionnaire uses Likert Scale, strongly motivated, motivated, fairly motivated, unmotivated, and strongly unmotivated

## **6. Procedure of Collecting Data**

To collect the research data, the researcher conducts research by employing the setting below:

1. Pretest : the researcher gives writing test to the students. The pretest is run 30 minutes.
2. Treatment for experimental class (STAD); the researcher gives the treatment in six times. The researcher uses some topics. The procedure of giving treatment as follows:
  - 1) Presenting theme of problem by using slide.
  - 2) Dividing the students into some teams and each team consists of four to six students.
  - 3) Students begin to discuss the theme of problem which given in team, after that the teams start writing.
  - 4) One of the members of teams is pointed to write.
  - 5) After that, the students are given quizzes. During the quizzes, students are not permitted to help each others. So, they will do the quizzes individually.
  - 6) Calculating the score which got by all the teams.
3. Treatment for control class (GI):
  - 1) The students are introduced using group investigation method in writing skill.
  - 2) The lecturer introduces new theme on the slide.
  - 3) Then, students are divided into some groups. Each group consists of five to six students.
  - 4) Each group getting the task then investigating, interacting, and interpreting the theme.
  - 5) Each group finds out data about the theme and prepares a report in writing form of paragraph.
  - 6) After finishing, the students each group presents their report in the class.
  - 7) During presentation, the researcher observes the students cooperative in group, the students' activeness in present the material, students concern toward other group presentation, the students' activeness in asking question, and the students' activeness in answering questions in group.
4. Posttest: after doing the treatment the researcher gives a posttest. The researcher applies posttest to point out the students' achievement in writing skill by applying STAD and GI. The posttest is run 30 minutes.

## 7. Technique of Data Analysis

In analyzing the data collects through writing test and questionnaire, the researcher uses the analysis below.

### a. Writing test

In this research, the data is collected after giving test to the students. The data is analyzed through quantitative analysis. To get the score the researcher uses scoring scale which includes the content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanics.

The gain score is analyzed as follows:

The gain score is converted to a set of score of maximum of 100, using the following the following simple formula:

$$\text{A student's score} = \frac{\text{The gain score}}{\text{The maximum score}} \times 100\%$$

Calculating the mean score, standard deviation, and t-test between the pre-test and post-test of both of experiment group and control group by using statistic package for social science (SPSS) program version 20.0

### b. Questionnaire

Data on students' motivation is analyzed by using Likert scale as follows:

Table 3.3 Likert scale

Positive statement score		Negative statement score
5	Strongly agree	1
4	Agree	2
3	Undecided	3
2	Disagree	4
1	Strongly disagree	5

(Sugiyono, 2008:181)

This research employs 10 positive statement and 10 negative ones. Hence, if a respondent answers all the positive statements with strongly agree along with ten negative ones with strongly disagree, he or she gets 100 scores, and the one who answers all positive statement with strongly disagree along with ten negative ones with strongly agree gets 20 score.

## D. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The research used pre-test and post-test in which these test aimed at collecting data of students' writing achievement of both classes, experimental and control class. The questionnaire was intended to get information of the students' motivation toward the use of STAD.

### 1. The achievement of the students in writing

This segment deals with the presentation of the result of the students' achievement to write paragraphs in pre-test and pos-test of experimental group and control class.

#### a. The Rate Percentage and Frequency of Students' Score Pretest and Posttest in Experimental and Control

Students' score of pre-test and posttest were classified into seven classifications namely excellent, very good, good, fairly good, fair, poor, and very poor. The frequency and the rate percentage of the students' score of pre-test and posttest in experimental and control classes are presented in the following:

Table 4.1 The Rate Percentage and Frequency of Students' Score of Pre-Test in Experimental and Control Class

Classificati on	Score	Experimental class		Control class	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Excellent	96-100	0	0	0	0
Very good	86-95	0	0	0	0
Good	76-85	1	3.3	1	3.3
Fairly	66-75	8	26.7	7	23.4
Good	56-65	18	60	18	60
Fair	36-55	3	10	4	13.3
Poor	0-35	0	0	0	0
Very poor					
Total		30	100	30	100

Based on the data shown in table 4.1 the result of the pre-test both of group was that none (0%) of students got excellent and very good. The result of the students' score in experimental class was one (3.3%) of students got good, eight (26.7%) students got fairly good, eighteen (60%) students got fair, three (10%) students got poor and there was none of students who got very poor.

In control class, the students' score was one (3.3%) students got good, seven (23.4%) students got fairly good, eighteen (60%) students got fair, four (13.3%) students got poor, and there was none of students who got very poor.

Table 4.2 The Rate Percentage and Frequency of Students' Score of Post-Test in Experimental and Control Class

Classification	Score	Experimental class		Control class	
		F	P	F	P
Excellent	96-100	0	0	0	0
Very good	86-95	6	20	1	3.4
Good	76-85	12	40	1	3.3
Fairly Good	66-75	5	16.7	12	40
Fair	56-65	7	23.3	15	50
Poor	46-55	0	0	1	3.3
Very poor	0-36	0	0	0	0
Total		30	100	30	100

Based on the data shown in Table 4.2 the result of post-test of experimental class was increased. None (0%) of students got excellent, six (20%) students got very good, twelve (40%) students got good, five (16.7%) students got fairly good, seven (23.3%) students got fair and there was none students who got poor and very poor.

b. The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of the Students' Pre-Test and Posttest

The following tables were the result of the students' scores of pre-test and post-test in control and experimental group. The tables showed the difference score on mean score and standard deviation of both of groups.

Table 4.3 The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of the Students' Pre-Test

Group	Sample	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
-------	--------	------------	--------------------

Experimental	30	62.50	6.85
Control	30	61.53	6.51

Based on the table 4.5 the mean score of pre-test in control group was 61.53 which was categorized as fair based on the scoring system by UKI and experimental group was 62.53 which was also categorized as fair. In line with this, the researcher can conclude that both experimental and control group were nearly at the same level in writing achievement.

In this case, the post-test score was analyzed at the significant level 0.05 or equals to 0.05 by using inferential statistic through SPSS program version 20.0. The result of post-test as follows:

Table 4.4 The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of the Students' Post-Test

Group	Sample	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Experimental	30	76.13	10.44
Control	30	66.33	6.97

Table 4.4 showed that the mean scores of both experimental and control group were different after treatments. The mean score of experimental group was 76.13 ( $62.50 < 76.13$ ) whereas the control group was 66.33 ( $61.53 < 66.33$ ). The mean score of post-test for experimental group was higher than the control group ( $76.13 > 66.33$ ) and the standard deviation for experimental group was 10.44 and control group was 6.97. The mean score both of groups shows that both experimental and control were in different category based on the scoring system of UKI. The experimental group was categorized as good classification while control group was categorized as fairly good.

c. The Components of Writing in Experimental and Control Group

Table 4.5 The difference between Pre-Test and Post-Test of Experimental and Control Group in Five Components of Writing

Components of Writing	Mean score					
	Experimental			Control		
	Pre-test	Post- test	Improvement	Pre-test	Post- test	Improvement
Content	18.60	23.40	4.8	17.93	19.77	1.84
Organization	14.27	15.97	1.7	13.40	14.60	1.2
Vocabulary	13.33	16.00	2.67	13.40	14.47	1.07
Language use	13.77	17.43	3.66	14.03	14.70	0.67
Mechanic	2.53	3.33	0.8	2.77	2.80	0.03
Total	62.50	76.13	13.63	61.53	66.33	4.8

Based on the result, the highest improvement in experimental of components of writing was content. The score was 4.8 while the lowest was mechanic, it was only 0.8 point. In control class, the highest was also content; it was 1.84 point while the lowest is mechanic, it was 0.03 point.

d. Test of significant (t-test)

The hypotheses were tested by using inferential analysis. In this case, the researcher used t-test (test of significance) for independent sample. This test was used to know the significant difference between the result of the students' scores in pre-test and post-test in control group and experimental group. The level of significance (0.05) with degrees of freedom (df) =  $n_1 + n_2 - 2 = 60$ , where n = number of subject (30), then the result of the t-test is presented in the following table:



Table 4.6 The Probability Value of t-test of Pre-test in Experimental and Control Group

Variable	Probability Value	( )
Pre-test of control and Experimental group	.578	
Post-test of control and Experimental group	.000	0.05

Based on the result of data analysis as summarized in Table 4.6 in pre-test and post-test of experimental and control group were found that the probability value was higher than alpha ( ). The result of pre-test was  $(0.578 > 0.05)$  which means that there was no significant difference both groups. The researcher also found that the probably value in post-test was lower than alpha ( )  $(0.000 > 0.05)$  which means that there was significant difference in post-test of both of groups.

Thus, the alternative hypothesis (H1) was accepted and the null hypothesis (H0) was rejected. It showed that the use of STAD was able to give significantly improvement to the students' writing achievement.

## 2. The analysis data of the students' motivation

Questionnaire is one of the popular medium for collecting data in education and social research. The distribution of questionnaire in this research aims to find out whether the students are motivated in learning writing by using STAD. The questionnaire was distributed to the students in experimental group after the treatment. In this research the questionnaire included 20 items which were expected to find out the motivation of the students in learning writing by using STAD.

The questionnaire was responded the students individually refer to the students' opinion after the treatment using STAD. The motivations of the fourth semester class F students of UKI Toraja in learning writing by using STAD showed a great positive. Refers to the data analysis of the questionnaire items, the mean score of questionnaire were 80.26 and categorized into motivated classification. The data analysis can be seen in the following table.

Table 4.7 The Rate Percentage of the Students' Motivation

No.	Classification	Rang Score	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Strongly motivated	85-100	9	30

2.	Motivated	69-84	19	63.33
3.	Fairly Motivated	52-68	2	6.67
4.	Unmotivated	36-51	0	0
5.	Strongly unmotivated	20-35	0	0
Total			30	100

Based on the data on the Table 4.7 the analysis data questionnaire of the experimental group stated that none of the students responded in negative statement toward the use of STAD, it showed that 9 (30%) of students were strongly motivated, then 19 (63.33%) of students who were motivated and 2 (6.67%) students were fairly motivated. Based on the score of the students in questionnaires, it was found that the highest score was 93 which were categorized as strongly motivated. And the lowest score was 63 which was categorized fairly motivated and most of the students indicated strongly agree and agree as positive statement about the use of STAD in learning writing. Then, it could be concluded that the use of STAD is motivated the students of UKI Toraja in learning writing.

The researcher presents the description of the data that gained from the questionnaire based on students' motivation toward using STAD in learning writing.

#### 1. The students' writing achievement

Based on previous finding on all writing components, it showed that the writing achievement of fourth semester students of UKI Toraja improved especially for experimental class. It was also supported by the students' frequency and rate percentage of the students' pre-test and post-test.

The description of the students' writing in the pre-test of both of experimental and control group in term of the five components of writing can be seen in the following.

The first is content aspect; both in experimental and control class, most of the students could not illustrate the topic well. They had limited knowledge of the topic and little substance. They also could not develop the topic well. So, that's why the means score of content aspect in experimental and control was 18.48 and 17.93 which categorized as fair to poor.

The second is organization aspect; some students have the main ideas but they were loosely organization. Besides that, many students could not give support of ideas and the ideas were

not clear and confused. The categorized of this term was good to average with 14.06 score in experimental and 13.4 score in control.

The third is vocabulary aspect; the categorized of this aspect was fair to poor, the score was 13.23 and 13.4. Most of students found difficulties in the use of suitable and correct words to convey intended information given related to the topic, as the result, the meaning of message which written was not clear and confused. They also lacked in the use of idiom form.

The fourth is language aspect; both of students in experimental and control group have the similar problem. They had difficulties to make well-formed and complete sentences, tenses, and pronouns. They also got lack to use article such as *a*, *an*, and *the* correctly.

The fifth is mechanic; both of the groups made frequent errors or spelling, punctuation, capitalization and the meaning confused. They also had poor writing which was not enough to evaluate.

## 2. The students' motivation

Referring to the findings about the motivation of the students in experimental group, the researcher analyzed that the students are motivated in learning writing skill by using STAD. The data (Table 4.7) showed that nineteen students or 63.33% of 30 students were motivated and 9 students or 30% were strongly motivated and 2 students or 6.67% were fairly motivated. It means that most of the students have positive respond about the use of STAD in learning writing. It means that the students of UKI Toraja were motivated in learning writing by using STAD.

## **E. CONCLUSION**

1. Based on the findings and discussion in the previous chapter, the researcher concluded that the use of STAD improve students' achievement in writing skill at fourth semester of UKI Toraja in experimental class.
2. The motivations of the fourth semester students of UKI Toraja as experimental class showed a great positive in learning writing by using STAD. So, it can be concluded that the use of STAD motivated the students in writing for the fourth semester of UKI Toraja.

## F. REFERENCE

- Arrahmania (2011) *Using PBL Strategy to Improve Students' Writing Skill in Senior High School*. Unpublished thesis. FPBS UNM.
- Brown. H. D. 1994. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. Englewood Cliffs. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Dietsch, B. M. 2005. *Reasoning & Writing Well*. New York: Marion Technical College.
- Donough, Mcat all (1993) Oxford. *Materials and Method in ELT*: Black Week Publisher.
- Gay, L.R. 2006. *Education Research, Competencies for Analysis and Application*, Eight Editin. Colombus. Ohio: Charles E, Merril Publishing.
- Harmer. J. 1991. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. New York: Longman Inc.
- Heaton, JB. 1998. *Writing English Language Tests*. New Edition. New York: Longman Published.
- Hernawati. 2012. *The Effects of Demonstration Method toward Students' Ability to Write Procedure Texts*. Unpublished thesis. FPBS UNM
- Hil, S. & Hill, T. 1990. *The collaborative Classroom: A Guide to Cooperative Learning*. Portsmouth. NH: Heinemann.
- Hornby. J.B. 1995. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. New York. Oxford University Press.
- Islamiah, A. R. A. 2007. *Using Songs in Teaching Writing to Third Semester Students of English Literature of Adab Faculty of State Islamic University of Alauddin Makassar*. Unpublished Thesis. FPBS UNM
- Jacobs, H. L. 1981. *Testing ESL Composition: A Practical Approach*. Rowly, Massachusetts, London: Newbury House Publisher, Inc.

- Johnson, D. W. 1994. *Learning Together and Alone: Cooperative, Competitive, and Individualistic Learning*, New Jersey: A Paramount Communication Company.
- Karim, Hasanuddin. 2013. *Using STAD Type of cooperative Learning Method to Improve Students' Achievement in Writing Procedure Text at SMP Negeri 3 Bua*. Unpublished Thesis. FPBS UNM
- Kemendikbud. 2014. *Pedoman Penilaian Hasil Belajar oleh Pendidik*, (online), (<http://www.slideshare.net/wincibal/permendikbud-tahun2014-nomor104lampiran-penilaian-hasil-belajar>). Accessed on 27 January 2014)
- Keshavarz, S.M, Shahrokhi, M., & Talebi Nejad, M. R. 2014. *The Effect of Cooperative Learning Techniques on Promoting Writing Skill of Iranian EFL Learners*. IJLLALW (online), Vol. 5 (1). [www.ijllalw.org](http://www.ijllalw.org). Accessed on March, 2014.
- Kiranawati. 2007. *Metode investigasi Kelompok (Group Investigation)*. Available online (<http://gurupkn.wordpress.com/2007/11/13/metode-investigasi-kelompok-group-investigation>). Accessed on January 22, 2015
- Lindblom, P. 1983. *Writing with Confidence*. New York: Harper Collins Publisher.
- Muadin. 1994. *The Ability to Produce Complex Sentences in Writing by Students of English Department FPBS*. Unpublished thesis. FPBS UNM.
- Noni, Nurdin. 1987. *The Writing Ability of the Sixth Semester Students of the English Departments of the Tarbiyah Faculty of IAIN Alauddin Ujung Pandang*. Unpublished Thesis. FPBS UNM.
- Nunan, D. 1995. *Language Teaching Mythology – A Textbook for Teachers*. New York: Phoenix ELT
- Raimes, A. 1983. *Techniques in Teaching Writing*. England: Oxford University Press. Inc.

- Reid, G. 2007. *Motivating Learners in the Classroom: Ideas and Strategies*. London. Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Sahin, A. 2010. *Effect of Jigsaw II Technique on Academic Achievement and Attitudes to Written Expression Course*. Published Thesis. Turkey. Ataturk University (*online*). <http://www.academic.journals.org>. Accessed on November 19, 2014
- Slagle, D. R. 2009. *The Use of the Cooperative Learning Strategy STAD to Promote Academic Achievement In a High School Social Studies Class*. Arts in Education Program Defiance College.
- Slavin, E. R. 1994. *Educational Psychology Theory and Practice*. Johns Hopkins University.
- Sugiyono. 2008. *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Pollard, Lucy. 2008. *Teaching English*. E-book.