

The Effects of STAD Method on Chinese Students' Motivation in Learning English Communicative Competence

Yingting Zhang^{1,2}, Subadrah Madhawa Nair¹, & Walton Wider³

¹ Faculty of Education and Liberal Studies, City University Malaysia, Petaling Jaya, Selangor, Malaysia

² Guangdong Polytechnic of Science and Technology, Guangdong, China

³ Faculty of Business and Communications, INTI International University, Nilai, Negeri Sembilan, Malaysia

Correspondence: Yingting Zhang, Faculty of Education and Liberal Studies, City University Malaysia, 46100 Petaling Jaya, Selangor, Malaysia.

Received: May 27, 2022

Accepted: July 6, 2022

Online Published: July 7, 2022

doi:10.5430/wjel.v12n6p39

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v12n6p39>

Abstract

Many studies revealed that students have difficulties in learning English communicative competence and some are even resistant in learning the language. This study aimed to examine the effects of the STAD method in students' motivation towards learning English communicative competence. The study adopted a quasi-experimental design lasting for 8 weeks which compared the performance between the Experimental Group taught using the STAD method and the Control Group taught using the conventional method. The sample were 80 first-year non-English major students from two polytechnic colleges in Guangdong, China. The samples were chosen as intact-groups (40 students in the Experimental Group and 40 students in the Control Group). The questionnaire on learning motivation was adapted from Keller's ARCS model. The questionnaire was used to gauge student's motivation in learning English communicative competence before and after the intervention. SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) Program for Windows version 25 was applied to analyze the data using the independent-samples t-test. The findings of this study revealed that the students in the Experimental Group showed significantly higher motivation in learning English communicative competence than the Control Group in their overall motivation and in all the ARCS components (Attention, Relevance, Confidence and Satisfaction). This empirical study has strong pedagogical implication as it suggests that STAD method can be used by English lecturers to enhance students' motivation in learning English communicative competence.

Keywords: the STAD method, learning motivation, ARCS, English communicative competence, college students in China

1. Introduction

English teaching is to help students with linguistic fluency and accuracy, communicative appropriateness and effectiveness. College English courses in China pay equal attention to language training and communicative competence nowadays (Xu & Fan, 2017). College English Courses are instrumental with its main purpose to further improve students' English listening, speaking, reading, writing, and translation skills. Students are expected to acquire academic or vocational communication skills related to their major or future work by learning English. On the other hand, College English Courses are humanistic in a sense as it focuses on the education of communicative skills. Language is not only a linguistic tool, but a bridge of communication among people (Bonvillain, 2019). It brings about the realization of one's thoughts and emotions being able to be perceived by others.

1.1 Problem Statement

Chinese students rarely speak English due to lack of practice or opportunities to communicate with foreigners (Shi & Li, 2019). Gradually, some students find it difficult to speak the language (Shi & Li, 2019). Some other students are reluctant to speak English because they are afraid of making mistakes. Their vocabulary is limited and their English is poor, not to mention their communication skills. However, the less they speak, the worse they do, and this has become a vicious circle. In Chinese vocational colleges, the vast majority of English teachers are Chinese. There are very few foreign teachers. Most students have few opportunities to practice English in their daily lives. The quality of foreign language learning and the development of students' English communicative competence are closely related

to the learning conditions and environment (Rubtsova, 2019). This poor learning environment also has a significant negative impact on learners' motivation as students in Chinese vocational institutions as they have little opportunity to use the language. They rarely have the chance to practice English or observe real-life English communication.

When students resist learning English or communicating in the language, there are signs of learning anxiety such as being distracted in class, reluctance to participate in class activities, reluctance to talk, blushing, and trembling (Young, 1991). Teachers should be fully aware of students' learning anxiety. Long-term anxiety can distract students and reduce their confidence and even their interest in learning (Trang, Moni & Baldauf, 2012). In contrast, appropriate anxiety can stimulate students' motivation to learn and help them improve their academic performance (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1989). Motivation can serve as a catalyst for students to improve their learning outcome. Therefore, it is necessary for teachers to choose more effective teaching methods to enhance students' motivation to learn English communicative competence. This will not only help to stimulate students' interest in learning but also motivate them to learn. In English teaching, there are many scholars who have tried to use the STAD method to improve students' English language skills (Firnanda, Gani & Samad, 2019; Wiraningsih, 2016; Ibrahim & Adna, 2019; Sirisrimangkorn & Suwanthep, 2013; Yunita, 2016). Based on their academic contributions, this study aims to investigate the effects of the STAD method on students' motivation to learn English communicative competence.

1.2 Research Questions

Five research questions were formulated based on the objective of this study:

RQ1. Is there any significant difference in the overall mean scores for motivation towards learning English communicative competence between the Experimental Group using the STAD method and the Control Group using the conventional teaching method?

RQ2. Is there any significant difference in the mean scores of Attention towards learning English communicative competence between the Experimental Group using the STAD method and the Control Group using the conventional teaching method?

RQ3. Is there any significant difference in the mean scores of Relevance towards learning English communicative competence between the Experimental Group using the STAD method and the Control Group using the conventional teaching method?

RQ4. Is there any significant difference in the mean scores of Confidence towards learning English communicative competence between the Experimental Group using the STAD method and the Control Group using the conventional teaching method?

RQ5. Is there any significant difference in the mean scores of Satisfaction towards learning English communicative competence between the Experimental Group using the STAD method and the Control Group using the conventional teaching method?

2. Literature Review

2.1 Constructivist Learning Theory

Vygotsky's cognitive theory laid the psychological foundation for the development of constructivist learning theory. Piaget (1976) stated that when children learn, they try to maintain a balance between assimilation and adaptation. The purpose of learning is to assimilate new things on the basis of our own icons; assimilation and adaptation occur when our own icons are not receptive to new things and we must modify our own icons (Piaget, 1976).

Social constructivists are concerned with the social process of construction. Communication (especially with more people) is the primary method of forming symbolic relations (Keaton & Bodie, 2011). Thus, social constructivism emphasizes the role of language in the internalization process, reflecting the development of cognition from interpersonal to intrapersonal. The focus on the enhancement of learning ability is also a characteristic of constructivism (Keaton & Bodie, 2011). According to Vygotsky (1987), learning is a process of meaning making. More importantly, students acquire knowledge through interaction with others (Yuen & Hau, 2006). The individual's ability to communicate and negotiate during the learning process as well as the ability to control and discriminate knowledge becomes the main object of learning assessment. Therefore, it is recommended that teachers provide opportunities for students to interact with each other.

2.2 The Teaching of English Communicative Competence

Chomsky distinguishes between "linguistic competence" and "linguistic behavior" (qtd. in Fillmore, Kempler & Wang, 2014). Chomsky's research focused not on the specifics of linguistic communication but on the ability to

translate and generate grammatical rules (Fillmore et al., 2014). Hymes (1972) proposed the theory of "communicative competence". He argued that language research should focus on practical issues, as a result, it is necessary to describe "social and cultural factors" (Hymes, 1972). Similarly, Canale, and Swain (1981) argued that communicative competence includes grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence and strategic competence. The ultimate goal of developing communication competence is to reach the English proficiency of educated native English speakers (Benzie, 2010).

Lazaraton (2001) proposed six commonly used oral language teaching activities: discussion, presentation, role-playing, conversation, audio oral diary, and other activities based on accuracy. Bailey (2006) provides three strategies for oral English teaching: first, to provide learners with topics to talk about which are closely related to life; second, to create opportunities for students to speak English through group cooperation or peer cooperation; third, to change the teaching environment, such as Innovative seating arrangements. Teachers should be effective in helping students improve pronunciation in oral language teaching, because when the learner's words can be understood and communicated successfully with others, it can enhance his or her self-confidence (Goodwin, 2001). Emotional factors of learners, such as liking the topic and self-confidence, will have an impact on oral performance (Bohlke, 2014). This means that when the learner's learning motivation is stronger, the learner's attitude towards oral language learning will be more positive.

2.3 The STAD Method

The concept of group cooperative learning was first proposed by Glasser (1987) to the United States in 1969 to improve race relations and reform classroom organizational structure to improve the quality of education. Johnson and Johnson (1986) stated that cooperative learning was the use of group teaching in conventional teaching, so that students in groups can greatly improve their learning by working together. Guskey (1990) believed that cooperative learning was essentially an effective teaching form and teaching strategy.

The studies of cooperative learning mentioned above paved the way for the proposal of the STAD method by Slavin (1978). Based on task division and group grading, the STAD method involve students of different learning levels selected to form several groups. After the teacher's lesson introduction, the groups would work together and share their ideas in order to reach a common goal. The teacher then checks the performance of each group and recognizes and rewards the best groups. The five basic elements of the STAD method are classroom presentations, teamwork, quizzes, individual improvement scores, and team recognition (Slavin, 1978).

Karweit and Slavin (1981) demonstrated in their ninth grade practice that the STAD cooperative learning model can improve student performance. In addition, the research by Karweit and Slavin (1981) has shown that STAD groups who take into account individual responsibility show more significant improvements than other groups. The study by Newman (1982) found that educated individuals in the STAD model achieved better results in completing tasks or solving problem. The STAD cooperative learning model is more effective in promoting student achievement than conventional teaching methods (Slavin, 1995). Conventional teaching methods are more likely to cause classroom boredom (Slavin, 1995; He, 2021; Moezzi, Rezaei & Nezaminia, 2021).

Findings by Madden and Slavins (1983) indicated that students' self-esteem levels were higher in the STAD cooperative learning model than in the Control Group. The STAD model in cooperative learning ensures active participation of all group members in the learning process, which results in students showing greater interest in learning (Newman, 1982; Uno, Panjaitan & Lamatenggo, 2019). Slavin (1992) suggested that the STAD cooperative learning model can be effective in promoting students' intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. The STAD cooperative learning model is not only a teaching method but also an effective way to manage the classroom (Slavin, 1994; Khan & Inamullah, 2011). This method allows all students in the class to make progress (Slavin, 1994; Budiyo & Ngumarno, 2019)

Firnanda et al. (2019) investigated the effectiveness of the STAD method in improving students' speaking skills in English language teaching and also to understand students' attitudes towards the application of the STAD method in speaking instruction. It was concluded that the use of the STAD method improved students' speaking skills compared to traditional methods of teaching English as a foreign language (Firnanda et al., 2019). What's more, the STAD method increased students' confidence in speaking English (Firnanda et al., 2019). Firnanda et al. (2019) also found that students need to do as much English practice as possible to improve key aspects of speaking skills such as vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation and fluency in order to understand English better. Using the STAD method can motivate students to speak English and can effectively lead to progress in language skills, creating an interactive and fun classroom (Firnanda et al., 2019).

Similarly, Wiraningsih, Manurung, and Budi (2016) also conducted an experimental teaching to examine the effects of the STAD method on students' speaking skills. The researcher used a pre-experimental design. The analysis of their research revealed that the use of STAD method was effective in improving the speaking skills of the 11th grade students in the experiment. Likewise, Husamah and Pantiwati (2014) demonstrated in their study that the STAD method improved students' learning outcomes. Moreover, Husamah and Pantiwati (2014) concluded that the implementation of the STAD method improved all four components of the ARCS model.

Ibrahim and Adna (2019) critically examined the potential of the STAD approach in improving the oral performance of ESL learners. It supports the potential of the STAD method in improving learners' performance and satisfaction with teamwork (Ibrahim and Adna, 2019).

Sirisrimangkorn and Suwanthep (2013) confirmed that drama-based role play combined with the STAD method greatly helped students' improve speaking skills, motivation and self-esteem. To be more specific, the STAD method provides opportunities for language learners to interact with other students, which can lead to communication among them while increasing students' self-esteem and motivation to learn (Sirisrimangkorn & Suwanthep, 2013). STAD-based classroom activities are conducive to increasing students' active participation in the classroom not only to develop their speaking skills but their discussion and writing skills. Based on collaboration, the STAD method fosters students' work ethic and interpersonal relationships (Sirisrimangkorn & Suwanthep, 2013).

Yunita's (2011) study came up with several conclusions about conventional teaching methods among students: a) students do not like listening instruction b) students find that listening is difficult c) there is no variation in the materials teachers use d) teachers do not manage time effectively for various tasks. Yunita (2011) argued that the STAD method motivates students to encourage and help each other to master the skills presented by the teacher. The results of Yunita's (2011) study were that the implementation of the STAD method using Podcasts improved students' listening skills. In addition, students showed enthusiasm and motivation during the teaching process using the STAD method (Yunita, 2011). Yunita (2011) inferred that the STAD method was not only effective in improving students' listening skills, but also in increasing their engagement in the learning process. Therefore, Yunita (2011) suggested English teachers to apply this strategy as it was beneficial in providing motivation for students to improve their listening skills.

2.4 Keller's ARCS Model of Motivation

The ARCS model was proposed by John M. Keller (2010) in the 1980s. The four basic elements are highly correlated and explain the influences and processes of motivation generation (Keller, 2009). In this regard, "attention" refers to the learner's ability to pay conscious and selective attention to the learning content and have an interest and active desire to explore the learning objectives and content. "Relevance" refers to the fact that the learning objectives and the learning content meet the objective needs of the learners. "Confidence" refers to the learner's understanding of the learning objectives and the learner's face. "Satisfaction" refers to the fact that the learning outcome meets the learner's expectations and produces positive results, which is an important factor in maintaining motivation. "Satisfaction" can be gained from a sense of accomplishment, praise or reward, which in turn promotes motivation to learn, creating a virtuous cycle (Khan, Johnston & Ophoff, 2019; Afjar & Syukri, 2020; Ma & Lee, 2021).

Kurt (2015) examined the effects of the ARCS model (Keller, 2010) on the motivation of college preparatory students. Kurt (2015) found that incorporating the ARCS model into language instruction had a positive effect on students' learning motivation in all categories. As for the results of the Instructional Materials Motivation Survey (IMMS), students' motivation was also found to be significantly higher after incorporating the ARCS model into instruction (Kurt, 2015).

Similarly, Zhang (2015) suggested that in English listening courses, learners' autonomous motivation is mainly based on their perception of the value of the listening behavior. Adjusting intrinsic motivation and appropriately stimulating extrinsic conditions based on the ARCS model can motivate and sustain learners' motivation for English listening (Zhang, 2015). Moreover, it can give them more confidence and thus pave the way for successful learning outcomes (Zhang, 2015; Akbari & Sahibzada, 2020). Therefore, teachers must design sound instructional strategies based on the ARCS model (Zhang, 2015).

Hariyanto, Joyoatmojo, Nurkamto and Gunarhadi (2019) investigated the correlation between midwifery students' motivation and English language performance. Their study was conducted at Harapan Mulya Ponorogo College of Midwifery in East Java, Indonesia (Hariyanto et al., 2019). They found a significant correlation between motivation to learn and English language achievement (Hariyanto et al., 2019). Therefore Hariyanto et al. (2019) suggested that English teachers should adopt appropriate teaching methods and materials to improve students' motivation based on

the ARCS model.

Martasari (2018) used a case study approach in order to identify factors that may affect students' motivation and ways to motivate them to learn English. Martasari (2018) found that ARCS is one of the appropriate methods that teachers can use because ARCS can be used as a tool to increase students' motivation and students will be interested in English teaching and learning process and they can motivate themselves to learn English actively (Martasari, 2018).

3. Research Methodology

This quantitative study employed a quasi-experimental design for collection and analysis. The sample were 80 first-year non-English majors students from two polytechnic colleges in Guangdong, China. They were selected as intact groups because random sampling is not allowed as it interferes with the timetable. These students were divided into two groups, namely, 40 students in the Experimental Group (from college A) using the STAD method and another 40 students in the Control Group (college B) using the conventional teaching method. The experiment lasted for eight weeks. The pre-test and post-test questionnaires on motivation used in the pre-test and post-test was adapted from the motivation questionnaire by Keller (2010). The same questionnaire was used in the pre-test (prior to the intervention) and post-test (after the intervention). It consists of 34 items and is consists of four components of Keller's ARCS model (Attention, Relevance, Confidence and Satisfaction).

4. Data Analysis and Results

RQ1: Is there any significant difference in the overall mean scores for motivation towards learning English communicative competence between the Experimental Group using the STAD method and the Control Group using the conventional teaching method?

Table 1. Comparison of Overall Mean Scores for Motivation towards learning English communicative competence in the Pre-test

Group	N	Mean	SD	Mean Difference	t-Value	df	p-value
Experimental	40	84.80	11.364	-.150	-.055	78	.956
Control	40	84.95	12.812				

Level of significance is at $p < 0.5$

Table 1 shows students' overall mean scores for motivation to learn English communicative competence prior to the experiment. The overall mean score for the experimental group was 84.80 while the overall mean score for the control group was 84.95. The results of the independent t-test showed that there was no significant difference between the two groups in their overall mean scores in motivation to learn English communicative competence before the intervention ($t = -.055$, $df = 78$, $p = .956$).

Table 2. Comparison of Overall Mean Scores for Motivation towards learning English communicative competence in the Post-test

Group	N	Mean	SD	Mean Difference	t-Value	df	p-value
Experimental	40	105.38	13.617	15.000	8.250	78	.000
Control	40	80.38	13.488				

Level of significance is at $p < 0.5$

Table 2 illustrates the overall mean scores in motivation to learn English communicative competence after the intervention. The Experimental Group had an overall mean score of 105.38, while the counterpart had an overall mean score of 80.38. The results of the independent samples t-test showed that there was a significant difference in the overall mean scores of the students in the Experimental Group and the Control Group in their overall motivation in learning English communicative competence after the intervention ($t = 8.250$, $df = 78$, $p = .000$). Thus, research question 1 is answered. The results shown in Table 2 implied that the use of the STAD method in teaching English communicative competence significantly improved the overall motivation score of the Experimental Group compared with the Control Group who were taught using the conventional method. These findings are consistent with findings by Slavin (1994), Khan and Inamullah (2011) and Husamah and Pantiwati (2014) which indicated that the utilization of the STAD method had significantly enhanced students' learning motivation. Besides, the implementation of the STAD method makes it possible for every student to make progress in the class (Slavin, 1994; Budiyo & Ngumarno, 2019) and create a fun, interactive classroom atmosphere (Firnanda et al., 2019).

RQ2: Is there any significant difference in the mean scores of Attention towards learning English communicative competence between the Experimental Group using the STAD method and the Control Group using the conventional

teaching method?

Table 3. Comparison of the mean scores in Attention towards learning English communicative competence in the Pre-test

Group	N	Mean	SD	Mean Difference	t-Value	df	p-value
Experimental	40	29.75	3.947	-.725	-.726	78	.470
Control	40	30.48	4.935				

Level of significance is at $p < 0.5$

Results in Table 3 show that the average scores in Attention to learn English communicative competence of both the groups in the pre-test. The Experimental Group had a mean score of 29.75 whereas their counterpart had a mean score of 30.48. The results of the independent samples t-test confirmed that there was no significant difference between the Experimental Group and the Control Group in their mean scores in Attention to learn English communicative competence before the intervention ($t = -.726$, $df = 78$, $p = .470$).

Table 4. Comparison of the mean scores of Attention towards learning English communicative competence in the Post-test

Group	N	Mean	SD	Mean Difference	t-Value	df	p-value
Experimental	40	36.93	4.451	9.750	8.894	78	.000
Control	40	27.18	5.315				

Level of significance is at $p < 0.5$

Table 4 shows the average scores of the students' Attention to learn English communicative competence after the intervention. The mean score of the Experimental Group was 36.93 while that of the Control Group was 27.18. The results of the independent samples t-test demonstrated that the mean scores in Attention to learn English communicative competence showed a significant difference between the Experimental Group and the Control Group ($t = 8.894$, $df = 78$, $p = .000$). Thus, the research question 2 is answered. The findings mentioned in Table 4.4 showed that the utilization of the STAD method in teaching college English significantly enhanced the mean scores of the students' in the Experimental Group in Attention towards learning English communicative competence as compared to the Control Group who were taught using the conventional methods. These findings are parallel with findings by Slavin (1995), He (2021), and Moezzi et al. (2021) who stressed that the application of the conventional teacher-centered teaching approaches usually led to a disciplined, maybe dull and boring classroom where discussion were tedious or less open. On the other hand, using the STAD method which is student-centered easily motivate students to pay full attention to the learning process and hence increase students' interest and attention in learning (Newman, 1992; Uno et al., 2019).

RQ3: Is there any significant difference in the mean scores of Relevance towards learning English communicative competence between the Experimental Group using the STAD method and the Control Group using the conventional teaching method?

Table 5. Comparison of the mean scores of Relevance towards learning English communicative competence in the Pre-test

Group	N	Mean	SD	Mean Difference	t-Value	df	p-value
Experimental	40	21.50	3.762	-.550	-.640	78	.524
Control	40	22.05	3.929				

Level of significance is at $p < 0.5$

The mean scores in Relevance towards learning English communicative competence in the pre-test (prior to intervention) is presented in Table 5. As for the mean score of Relevance, the Experimental Group scored 21.50, while the mean score of the Control Group was 22.05. Results of the data analysis using independent t-tests clearly indicated that there is no significant difference between the two groups before the intervention ($t = -.640$, $df = 78$, $p = .524$).

Table 6. Comparison of the mean scores of Relevance towards learning English communicative competence in the Post-test

Group	N	Mean	SD	Mean Difference	t-Value	df	p-value
Experimental	40	24.63	4.775	5.175	5.304	78	.000
Control	40	19.45	3.909				

Level of significance is at $p < 0.5$

The mean scores in Relevance for learning English communicative competence in the post-test (after the intervention) can be obtained from Table 6. The students of the Experimental Group averagely scored 24.63 whereas those from the Control Group scored an average of 19.45. The test results obtained from independent samples t-test showed that there was a significant difference in the mean score of Relevance between the students in the Experimental Group and those in the Control Group after the intervention ($t = 5.304$, $df = 78$, $p = .000$). Thus, research question 3 is answered. The results of the studies mentioned in Table 6 show that the use of the STAD method in the teaching of English communicative competence significantly improved the Relevance scores of the Experimental Group compared to the Control Group taught using the conventional method. These findings support findings by MacIntyre and Gardner (1989) and Martasari (2018) which indicated that learning motivation can call for students' driving force to learn and being positively involved in learning activities. Therefore, using the STAD method allows students to cooperate in a small group and motivate them to help each other learn the content which are embedded in various forms of activities (Sirisrimangkorn & Suwanthep, 2013). Students all work together to accomplish a common learning goal (Firnanda et al., 2019).

RQ4: Is there any significant difference in the mean scores of Confidence towards learning English communicative competence between the Experimental Group using the STAD method and the Control Group using the conventional teaching method?

Table 7. Comparison of the mean scores of Confidence towards learning English communicative competence in the Pre-test

Group	N	Mean	SD	Mean Difference	t-Value	df	p-value
Experimental	40	22.10	3.657	-.800	-.935	78	.352
Control	40	22.90	3.986				

Level of significance is at $p < 0.5$

The mean scores for Confidence in learning English communicative competence before the intervention are revealed in Table 7. The mean score gained by the Experimental Group was 22.10 whereas the Control Group scored an average of 22.90. Based on the results of the independent samples t-test in the pre-test, it was suggested that there was no significant difference between the mean scores of students between both the groups before the intervention ($t = -.935$, $df = 78$, $p = .352$).

Table 8. Comparison of the mean scores of Confidence towards learning English communicative competence in the Post-test

Group	N	Mean	SD	Mean Difference	t-Value	df	p-value
Experimental	40	26.68	2.615	6.450	9.218	78	.000
Control	40	20.23	3.570				

Level of significance is at $p < 0.5$

It can be seen from Table 8 that the mean score in Confidence on learning English communicative competence after the intervention. The Experimental Group achieved an average score of 26.68 while the Control Group scored an average of 20.23. Corresponding results obtained by independent samples t-test showed that the difference between the Experimental Group and the Control Group after the intervention was significant in their mean scores for Confidence in learning English communicative competence ($t = 9.218$, $df = 78$, $p = .000$). Thus, the research question 4 is answered. The findings in Table 8 indicated that the application of the STAD method in teaching college English significantly enhanced the Experimental Group's scores in Confidence towards learning English communicative competence as compared to the Control Group who were taught utilizing the conventional method. These findings are parallel with finding by Zhang (2015) and Akbari and Sahibzada (2020) who found that if learners' autonomy and confidence are promoted, it will help increase learners' motivation and learning effects. As a result, the STAD method is an effective teaching strategy which creates a cooperative relationship where students become more and more confident by working together and improving together (Sirisrimangkorn & Suwanthep, 2013).

RQ5: Is there any significant difference in the mean scores of Satisfaction towards learning English communicative competence between the Experimental Group using the STAD method and the Control Group using the conventional teaching method?

Table 9. Comparison of the mean scores of Satisfaction towards learning English communicative competence in the Pre-test

Group	N	Mean	SD	Mean Difference	t-Value	df	p-value
Experimental	40	14.43	1.907	-.050	-.109	78	.913
Control	40	14.48	2.172				

Level of significance is at $p < 0.5$

The mean score in satisfaction on learning English communicative competence before intervention can be known from the data in Table 9. Specifically, the average score of the Experimental Group was 14.43 and that of the Control Group was 14.48. This study adopted an independent samples t-test to analyze the data which indicated that before the intervention the mean score of satisfaction with learning English communicative competence failed to show a significant difference between the experimental group and the control group (Mean Difference = $-.050$, $t = -.109$, $df = 78$, $p = .913$).

Table 10. Comparison of the mean scores of Satisfaction towards learning English communicative competence in the Post-test

Group	N	Mean	SD	Mean Difference	t-Value	df	p-value
Experimental	40	16.55	3.869	3.025	4.219	78	.000
Control	40	13.53	2.364				

Level of significance is at $p < 0.5$

The mean scores in satisfaction on learning English communicative competence after the intervention are presented in Table 10. The Experimental Group scored an average of 16.55 while the Control Group scored an average of 13.53. The results obtained from the independent sample t-test revealed that there was a significant difference in the average score in satisfaction on learning English communicative competence between the Experimental Group and the Control Group after the intervention (Mean difference = 3.025 , $t = 4.219$, $df = 78$, $p = .000$). Thus, the research question 5 is answered. The findings in Table 10 showed that the usage of the STAD method in teaching college English significantly enhanced the Experimental Group's mean scores of Satisfaction towards learning English communicative competence as compared to the Control Group who were taught using the conventional teaching method. These finding are consistent with finding by Khan et al. (2019), Afjar and Syukri (2020), Ma and Lee (2021) which claimed that if the learning process could improve students' satisfaction from realizing their own initial learning expectation, students' motivation as well as their willingness to learn will be enhanced, which in turn will promote learners' self-confidence and enhance learning outcomes. Based on this, the application of the STAD method makes it possible to increase individual satisfaction and teamwork satisfaction at the same time by involving students into different types of cooperative activities aiming at fulfilling a shared learning objectives (Ibrahim & Adna, 2019; Yunita, 2011).

5. Conclusion

In this research, the questionnaire adapted from Keller (2010) was used to compare the effects of utilizing the STAD method and the conventional method on students' motivation in learning college English. The findings of this study clearly indicate that the students in the Experimental Group were significantly more motivated than the Control Group in all the components of ARCS model and as well as an overall motivation mean score. On the other hand, the Control Group who were taught using conventional method failed to surpass the Experimental Group since they showed less progress in their learning motivation. Therefore, the results affirmed that the STAD method is effective in enhancing students' motivation in learning English communicative competence.

It is crucial to realize some limitations of this research because it can provide suggestions and references for future studies. Firstly, the sample size is small as such, future studies can employ a larger sample for better generalization. Secondly, this study only focused on the STAD method and the conventional method, therefore future researchers can compare the effects of three methods on students' motivation in learning English communicative competence. Finally, due to the time frame, the experiment of this research was merely carried out for 8 weeks. If conditions permitted, future researchers may extend the duration of the experiment to study the effects of STAD method on retention of motivation in learning English communicative competence.

References

Afjar, A. M., & Syukri, M. (2020). Attention, relevance, confidence, satisfaction (ARCS) model on students' motivation and learning outcomes in learning physics. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 1460(1), 012119.

- IOP Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1460/1/012119>
- Akbari, O., & Sahibzada, J. (2020). Students' self-confidence and its impacts on their learning process. *American International Journal of Social Science Research*, 5(1), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.46281/aijssr.v5i1.462>
- Bailey, K. M. (2006). Issues in teaching speaking skills to adult ESOL learners. *Review of adult learning and literacy*, 6, 113-164.
- Benzie, H. J. (2010). Graduating as a 'native speaker': International students and English language proficiency in higher education. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 29(4), 447-459. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294361003598824>
- Bohlke, D. (2014). Fluency-oriented second language teaching. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*, 3, 121-135
- Bonvillain, N. (2019). *Language, culture, and communication: The meaning of messages*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Budiyono, S., & Ngumarno, N. (2019). Improving student learning achievements through application of the student teams achievement divisions (STAD) method. *Journal of Applied Studies in Language*, 3(2), 140-147.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1981). *A Theoretical Framework for Communicative Competence*.
- Fillmore, C. J., Kempler, D., & Wang, W. S. (Eds.). (2014). *Individual differences in language ability and language behavior*. Academic Press.
- Firnanda, R., Gani, S. A., & Samad, I. A. (2019). The impact of Student Team Achievement Department (STAD) in developing students' speaking skills. *Journal of English Education*, 10(1), 46-66..
- Glasser, W., & Gough, P. B. (1987). The key to improving schools: An interview with William Glasser. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 68(9), 656-662.
- Goodwin, J. (2001). Teaching pronunciation. In M. Celce-Murcia (ed.). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*, 3, 117-137.
- Guskey, T. R. (1990). Cooperative mastery learning strategies. *The Elementary School Journal*, 91(1), 33-42. <https://doi.org/10.1086/461636>
- Hariyanto, H., Joyoatmojo, S., Nurkamto, J., & Gunarhadi, G. (2019). Correlation of learning motivation based on ARCS model with English achievement of midwifery students. *Lingua Cultura*, 13(3), 161-166. <https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v13i3.5571>
- He, L. (2021). Application of English Situational Teaching in Classroom. *Advances in Vocational and Technical Education*, 3(2), 142-146.
- Husamah, H., & Pantiwati, Y. (2014). Cooperative learning STAD-PJBL: Motivation, thinking skills, and learning outcomes of biology department students. *International Journal of Educaiaon Learning and Development*, 2(1), 68-85.
- Hymes, D. (1972). On Communicative Competence. *sociolinguistics*, 269293, 269-293.
- Ibrahim, I. S., & Adnan, N. H. (2019). The role of student team-achievement department (Stad) in improving English as a second language (ESL) learners' speaking performance. A Critical Review. *Creative Education*, 10(12), 2840. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2019.1012210>
- Johnson, R. T., & Johnson, D. W. (1986). Cooperative learning in the science classroom. *Science and children*, 24(2), 31-32.
- Karweit, N., & Slavin, R. E. (1981). Measurement and modeling choices in studies of time and learning. *American Education Research Journal*, 18(2), 151-157. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312018002157>
- Keaton, S. A., & Bodie, G. D. (2011). Explaining social constructivism. *Communication Teacher*, 25(4), 192-196. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17404622.2011.601725>
- Keller, J. M. (2009). *Motivational design for learning and performance: The ARCS model approach*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Keller, J. M. (2010). *Motivational design for learning and performance: The ARCS model approach*. New York: Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-1250-3>
- Khan, G. N., & Inamullah, H. M. (2011). Effect of student's team achievement division (STAD) on academic

- achievement of students. *Asian Social Science*, 7(12), 211-215. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v7n12p211>
- Khan, T., Johnston, K., & Ophoff, J. (2019). The impact of an augmented reality application on learning motivation of students. *Advances in Human-Computer Interaction, 2019*. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2019/7208494>
- Kurt, P. Y. (2015). *The effects of ARCS motivational model on student motivation to learn English* (Doctoral dissertation, Anadolu University (Turkey)).
- Lazaraton, A. (2001). Teaching oral skills. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*, 3, 103-115.
- Ma, L., & Lee, C. S. (2021). Evaluating the effectiveness of blended learning using the ARCS model. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 37(5), 1397-1408. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12579>
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1989). Anxiety and second-language learning: Toward a theoretical clarification. *Language Learning*, 39(2), 251-275. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1989.tb00423.x>
- Madden, N. A., & Slavin, R. E. (1983) Mainstreaming students with mild handicaps: Academic and social outcomes. *Review of Educational Research*, 53(4), 519-569. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543053004519>
- Martasari, Y. M. (2018). Students' Motivation In Learning English As The First Foreign Language In Indonesia Trough The ARCS. *Widya Wacana: Jurnal Ilmiah*, 13(1).
- Moezzi, M., Rezaei, Z., & Nezaminia, N. (2021). Perception of medical students toward their learning environment, field of study, and career prospects. *Future of Medical Education Journal*, 11(3), 24-29.
- Newman, M. (1982). The sounds of silence in communicative encounters. *Communication Quarterly*, 30(2), 142-149. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01463378209369441>
- Piaget, J. (1976). Piaget's theory. In *Piaget and his school* (pp. 11-23). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-46323-5_2
- Rubtsova, A. (2019). Socio-linguistic innovations in education: productive implementation of intercultural communication. In *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering* (Vol. 497, No. 1, p. 012059). IOP Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1757-899X/497/1/012059>
- Shi, W., & Li, W. (2019). *Pragmatic Failures in Intercultural Communication of Chinese Foreign Language Learners*. <https://doi.org/10.36348/SIJLL.2019.v02i08.003>
- Sirisrimangkorn, L., & Suwanthep, J. (2013). The effects of integrated drama-based role play and Student Team Achievement Division (STAD) on students' speaking skills and emotional engagement. *Scenario. Journal of Drama and Theatre in Foreign and Second Language Education*, 2, 62-76. <https://doi.org/10.33178/scenario.7.2.5>
- Slavin, R. E. (1978). Student teams and achievement divisions. *Journal of research and development in education*, 12(1), 39-49.
- Slavin, R. E. (1992). *Applying educational research: A practical guide*. New York: Longman.
- Slavin, R. E. (1994). *Student teams achievement divisions. Handbook of cooperative learning methods*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Slavin, R. E. (1995). *Cooperative learning: Theory, research, and practice*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Trang, T. T. T., Moni, K., & Baldauf, R. B. (2012). Foreign language anxiety and its effects on students' determination to study English: To abandon or not to abandon? *Foreign language anxiety and its effects on students' determination to study English: To abandon or not to abandon?* 1-14.
- Uno, H. B., Panjaitan, K., & Lamatenggo, N. (2019). Improving Students' Learning Interest and Outcome through STAD Cooperative Learning Model at SDN 8 Elementary School Kwandang of North Gorontalo Regency. In *International Conference on Education Technology (ICoET 2019)* (pp. 313-319). Atlantis Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1987). The Collected Works of L. S. Vygotsky (Vol. 1). In R. W. Rieber & A. S. Carton (Eds.), *Plenum Press*, New York and London.
- Wiraningsih, V., Manurung, K., & Budi (2016). Developing oral skills of 11th grade students through STAD. *ELTS (English Language Teaching Society) e-journal*, 4(2), 1-10. <https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/244471-none-ccf75c61.pdf>
- Xu, J., & Fan, Y. (2017). The evolution of the college English curriculum in China (1985–2015): Changes, trends and

- conflicts. *Language Policy*, 16(3), 267-289. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-016-9407-1>
- Young, D. J. (1991). Creating a low-anxiety classroom environment: What does language anxiety research suggest? *The modern language journal*, 75(4), 426-439. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1991.tb05378.x>
- Yuen, K. M., & Hau, K. T. (2006). Constructivist teaching and teacher-centred teaching: a comparison of students' learning in a university course. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 43(3), 279-290. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703290600750861>
- Yunita, W. (2011). Improving Students' Speaking Skill by Using STAD (Student Teams Achievement Divisions). *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 8(1), 136-153.
- Zhang, J. (2015). Improving English Listening Proficiency: The Application of ARCS Learning-Motivational Model. *English Language Teaching*, 8(10), 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v8n10p1>

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).