

# IMPLEMENTATION OF STUDENT TEAMS ACHIEVEMENT DIVISIONS (STAD) TECHNIQUE: IMPACT ON UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS' ENGLISH SPEAKING SKILL

Fitriyasni Fitriyasni

Universitas Muhammadiyah Aceh, Banda Aceh, Indonesia

\*Corresponding author: fitriyasni.aceh@gmail.com

## ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to investigate whether there was any significant difference in speaking improvement between using Student Teams Achievement Divisions (STAD) and non STAD. The study used the experimental research method and was conducted to the second year students at STAI Tapaktuan of 2017/2018 academic year with an experimental group of 19 students and a control group 20 students, selected through random sampling. Data came from pre-test and post-test which were analyzed by using *t*-test. The results showed that there was a significance difference in speaking improvement between the students who were taught by using STAD and those who were not. The result of *t*-test of the post-test was 0.00, ( $p$ -value<0.05), indicating that  $H_0$  was rejected and  $H_a$  was accepted.


KEYWORDS: *Speaking Skill, Student Team Achievement Divisions, Undergraduate Students.*

---

## INTRODUCTION

English language learners should master the ability to speak English fluently in order to communicate well. Among four English skills, speaking is considered relatively difficult, and most high school students in Indonesia cannot speak English well (Kristina, 2014; Meylina, 2017). In Indonesia, after graduating from high school, it is not guaranteed that students are able to speak English fluently, and even after graduating from university (Amiruddin, 2019; Sawir, 2005).

A preliminary observation and interviews conducted on April 27– 29, 2018 found that the second year students of Sekolah Tinggi Agama Islam (STAI/ College for Islamic Studies) Tapaktuan encountered problems when learning speaking. Many students were not motivated to practice speaking in English as they had lack of English



vocabulary, were afraid of making mistakes, and had fluency and comprehension problems. Most students could not express their ideas fluently and were also difficult to understand utterances produced by a speaker in communication. All of these reasons have caused the students to feel unmotivated to speak in English. Studies by Kurniawan, Syafrizal, and Fernandita (2018) and Wahyuningsih and Afandi (2020) have also discovered other issues among Indonesian students in speaking including grammar, pronunciation, and confidence problems.

In addition, the English learning process was teacher-centered. The teachers did not provide enough time for the students to speak in the class. Besides, the students did not practice real communication, so they were not motivated to speak which ultimately affected their ability in speaking English.

In light of the problems described above, a certain teaching model should be applied to improve the students' speaking skill. Therefore, the author implemented the use of Student Teams Achievement Divisions (STAD) technique in solving the issue.

According to Slavin (1991), STAD is a student team learning technique which is very easy to apply in the teaching and learning process. STAD has several purposes including to encourage students, to support them, and to help them learn the skills taught by the teacher (Agarwal & Nandita, 2011, as cited in Kristina, 2014). When applying STAD to enhance the students' speaking skill, the teacher can mix high achiever and low achiever students in one group so that those smarter students will support and help their peers in learning (Kristina, 2014).

There are some previous studies supporting this current study. A study by Kristina (2014), carried out among vocational high school students at SMKN1 Tampaksiring, Bali, found that students' achievement in speaking had improved significantly through STAD. The students' interest in speaking English was also increased. Also, a study by Ariyani (2016) at SMKN 1 Depok, Yogyakarta also confirmed that the implementation of cooperative learning STAD in teaching speaking showed good results in terms of high school students' speaking. The students had improved their confidence, pronunciation and vocabulary. STAD had contributed to increase the students' participation in small groups in the classroom.

However, this present study differs from the three previous studies in regards with the research method, the focus of study, and also the sample. Those previous studies used classroom action research while this study used the experimental method as the research design. In addition, Ariyani (2016) focused on improving the aspect of speaking skills such as pronunciation, vocabulary mastery and confidence, and



Kristina (2014) used vocational high school students as the sample, whereas this study focused on improving the aspect of speaking skills including grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, fluency, and comprehension with the sample taken was undergraduate students at STAI Tapaktuan, in South Aceh. Here, the study aimed to investigate the use of STAD to improve the students' speaking skill at STAI Tapaktuan.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### *CONCEPT OF SPEAKING*


Speaking, one of the four important language skills, play a key role in communication among English language learners (Goh & Burns, 2012). The competence in learning a language is mostly characterized by the ability to speak the target language properly (Brown, 2001; Richard, 2008). However, speaking is not simply pronouncing words, but it is a more meaningful activity in which the process of communication is involved.

According to Brown (2001) speaking has an "interactive nature" in which the speakers and the listeners involve in developing meaningful utterances (p. 269). In making speaking interactive, a speaker will pass the process to give the message, to make sure that the message is conveyed successfully, and to know how far the topic is reacted. So, the ability to construct the meaning is very crucial in speaking. Harmer (2007) claims that speaking is frequently face-to-face and interactive. Speakers may use non-language features, such as altering their tones, emphasizing, whispering, shouting or speaking faster or slower.

In principle, speaking skill is an important skill that English language learners should master. A language learner can claim to master a language if he/she can speak the language. Therefore, speaking is the ability to express and to use a given language in actual communication.

### *ASPECTS OF SPEAKING*

There are two important features in English speaking skill: fluency and accuracy. According to Nunan (1991) and Richards (2006), fluency is the way of the language naturally used when a speaker delivers the intended information in some conversation in spite of her or his limitation in communication competencies. On the other hand, accuracy is the ability to avoid performance and grammar errors (Ellis, 2009). It means that a fluent and accurate speaker should focus on making correct forms of language use, by using correct grammar and pronunciation.



Another speaking aspect is comprehensibility. Kachru and Smith (2008) describes comprehensibility as “the recognition of meaning attached to a word or utterance ... [which] includes the hearer’s crucial role in recognizing the speaker’s intent” (p. 62). In other words, comprehensibility refers to the ability to understand both spoken and written language. It is also regarded as a language controller, so the less control of the language marked by the number of errors in speaking, the less comprehensibility.

### *TEACHING SPEAKING SKILL*

Teaching speaking is not an easy process to carry out by language teachers as well as for the students to learn. In Indonesia, English is a foreign language, where this language is not applied for real life communication among the people; therefore, both teachers and students in Indonesian schools have to work hard focusing on the development of the speaking skill. The teachers have to guide the students intensively and patiently to pronounce the target language correctly and precisely. Lado (1964) notes that if language learners want to master the target language, they have to use it until they are able to speak. In this regard, Littlewood (1985, p. 83) exposes that teaching speaking also refers to teaching “to converse” as speaking class is inseparable from having “conversation” in the language being learned. In addition, Brown and Yule (1983) state that the goal of teaching speaking is to allow the students to communicate with others in the studied language, including to say greetings and many other expressions.

### *STUDENT TEAMS ACHIEVEMENT DIVISIONS (STAD)*

STAD is a kind of cooperative learning which puts emphasis on the students’ activities in order to gain help and motivation in learning the material to obtain optimum results (Isjoni, 2009 as cited in Kristina, 2014). Slavin (1991) provides the five key components of STAD, they are: “class presentations, teams, quizzes, individual improvement scores, and team recognitions” (p. 20). Besides that, Slavin (1991) also suggests the ideal procedures in conducting STAD, they are:

#### *1. Preparation*

The first thing to be done is preparing materials and other instruments needed in teaching such as; the materials for classroom presentations, the worksheets and answer sheets for students’ exercises, and also the questions for quizzes. The materials used must meet the students’ need and their characteristics. The sources of the materials could be from textbooks, teacher-made materials, or the other references with proper adaptation and adaptation if needed. Next is assigning students to teams. In assigning the students to the teams, the teacher needs to consider: students’ gender, race/ethnicity, and their academic performance. Then after



one marking period ended, the teacher need to reshuffle the team member. This benefits the students with low performance to re-motivate themselves and learn in new situation. Each team is assigned into four to five students with a high performer, two or three average performer, and a low performer of the class. If possible, the team members are balance between male and female students. The students are not allowed to choose their own teams; instead, Slavin (1991) suggests doing the following steps: (1) Make copies of team summary sheets and quiz (pretest) score sheets, (2) Rank students based on summary and quiz sheets (from highest to lowest in performance), (3) Decide on the number of the teams, (4) Assign students to teams, (5) Fill out team summary sheets, and (6) Determining initial base score is the step done to calculate and figure the students' base score. The base scores are the students' average scores of the last assessment.

## 2. STAD Activities

- Teach: presenting the lesson

The teaching process takes one to two class periods and the main idea of it is presenting the lesson, so the material needed is a lesson plan. Slavin (1991) emphasizes that in the lesson, there are three sessions that should be done by the teacher; opening, development, and guided-practice components. The activities in opening are: the teacher should tell the students what they will learn and why it is important, than review briefly any prerequisite skills or information. The Activities in development or core activities are: a) stick close to the objective that is going to be tested, b) actively demonstrate concepts or skills, using aids and many examples, c) frequently asses the students by asking many questions, d) explain why the answer is correct or incorrect e) move rapidly to the next concept as soon as the students have grasped the main idea f) maintain momentum by eliminating interruption and asking many questions. Activities in guided practice are: a) have all the students solve problems or give examples or prepare answers for the questions given b) call on students randomly to make each of them preparing to answer the questions c) only give a short class assignment, one or two problems or examples are enough for the session d) give feedback and ask students to conclude what they have learnt.

- Team study: students studying in their teams

During team practice, each student need to master the material presented in presentation and assisting their friends in mastering the material. They also have to work on their worksheets to practice the skills being taught and to assess themselves and their teammates. While the teachers need to create team rules as follows: a) each students' responsibility is to make sure that each group member learned the material b) the learning activities should not be stopped until all group members master the topic c) discuss all the difficult points or questions the among the teammates before

ask to the teacher d) teammate may talk to each other softly. In this session, the teacher should explain to students the importance of working in and as a group.

- Test or quiz.

Slavin (1991) explains that the quiz/test needs to be taken individually. It indicates the individuals' and the teams' scores. The quizzes are created to assess the knowledge that the students obtained from class presentation and team study. No one is allowed to help each other during the test, to ensure every student being individually responsible for learning and mastering the material given.

### 3. Team Recognition

Team recognition is given in the form of certificates or rewards based on individual improvement scores and team scores. The main idea of team recognition is identifying both individual improvement scores and teams scores and awarding certificates or other team rewards.

## RESEARCH METHODS

The study took place at STAI Tapaktuan in South Aceh. This study used the quantitative method with experimental research design, where there were two groups: control group and experimental group. The population of this study was all the second year students consisted of 67 students. The sample of this study was taken by using random sampling. The researcher took one class as the experimental group with 19 students and one class consisting of 20 students as the control group. The instrument of the study was test.

The tests consisted of pre-test and post-test in order to determine the significant improvement of the students' speaking skill. Both tests were given orally, created based on the syllabus in the English class. The tests consisted of three questions about expressions in describing process, expressions in asking for suggestions and advice, and expressions used in persuading and convincing. In addition, both groups had the same tests. Besides, normality and homogeneity tests were carried out to measure whether the data taken had a normal distribution or not and whether both experimental and control groups came from the same variance population or not.

The scores of pre-test and post-test followed the scale made by Brown (2004) which includes five aspects in speaking: grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, fluency, and comprehension. For every aspect, the highest score is 5 and the minimum scale is 1. The scoring used this formula (students' score =  $\frac{\text{Total Score}}{5} \times 20$ ) in which the maximum score is 100 (Brown, 2004). The t-test was calculated by using SPSS version

20. The  $t$  – test was used to examine the data from the experimental and control groups.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

*RESULTS OF THE TESTS*

The results of the pre-test and post-test for both experimental and control group are shown in the table below.

**Table 1.** Statistical Summary of t-test for Experimental and Control Group

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Post-Test Control & Experiment	Equal variances assumed	1.031	.317	-5.103	37	.000	-3.192	.626	-4.460	-1.925
	Equal variances not assumed			-5.080	35.293	.000	-3.192	.628	-4.467	-1.917

As seen in Table 1, F value on Levene's test for equality for data with assumed equal variances (assumed to be two equal variances) was 1.031 with probability/Sig. of 0.317. Because the probability/Sig. > 0.05, then  $H_0$  was accepted, or both variances were equal.

For the t-test analysis, the hypotheses are described as follows:

$H_0$  : The average of both populations is the same (means of control group and experimental group are the same).

$H_a$  : The average of the two populations is not the same (means of control group and experimental group are not the same).

And, the decision is as follow:

If sig. >  $\alpha$  (alpha) then  $H_0$  is accepted

If sig. <  $\alpha$  (alpha) then  $H_0$  is rejected, or not enough evidence to accept  $H_0$

Furthermore, the t value for the data group with equal variances assumed was -5.103 with probability/Sig. of 0.000. Because the probability/Sig. < 0.05, then  $H_0$  was rejected, or the average of the two populations was not the same.

From the t- test, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between the control and experimental group in the post-test. However, the following table provides the information of mean scores of both groups.

**Table 2.** Results of Mean and Standard Deviation of the Post-Test of Experimental and Control Groups

Dependent Variables	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Experimental – Post-test	19	18.84	2.115
Control – Post-test	20	15.65	1.785

As shown in Table 2, the mean score of the experimental group was higher (18.84) than that of the control group (15.65). Therefore, it reinforces our assumption that the use of STAD improves students' speaking ability.

#### DISCUSSIONS

This study intended to find out whether or not the students' speaking skill at STAI Tapaktuan South Aceh improved after they were taught by using STAD. The students' speaking improvement can be identified from the results of the tests. The t-test analysis of the post-tests of the experimental and control groups is 0.00, smaller than 0.05 ( $0.00 < 0.05$ ) which means  $H_a$  is accepted and  $H_o$  is rejected. It indicates that there is a significant difference in speaking skill scores between the students who were taught by using STAD and those who were not.

Meanwhile, in analyzing the test results of both groups in this study, the researcher conducted at least four different tests for both of groups. The first test was done between the pre-test and the post-test in the control group. The results showed that there was a significant difference between pre-test and post-test within the control group. The mean of pre-test score was 54 and the post-test score was 62.6. The increase reached 8.6 points although the students were not taught by using STAD. The second test was done between pre-test and post-test in the experimental group. The results indicated there was a significant difference between mean scores of pre-test and post-test. The increase was 19.58 points, from 54.74 in pretest and 74.32 in post-test. From the difference test conducted for the control group and experimental group, it can be said that there were differences between pre-test and post-test in both classes. This also showed that there was improvement in both classes.

The third test was performed on the control and experimental group as the pre-tests which showed that the null hypothesis was rejected, suggesting no significant difference between the control and experimental group in the pre-test. The test results indicated that the students' speaking achievement before giving any treatment was the same. And, the fourth test was performed on the control and experimental group as the post-tests which showed a significant difference. The results suggested that the experimental group was better than the control group. In addition, the test result concluded that implementing STAD has given the significant improvement for the students in terms of speaking skill.

The findings above are in line with other researchers. Ariyani (2016) found that the use of STAD improved the students' speaking skills in her study. The students showed




improvement in some aspects such as pronunciation, vocabulary mastery and confidence. Similarly, Kristina (2014) found that the students' achievement in speaking in Cycle II increased significantly through STAD. Also, the study by Firnanda, Gani, and Samad (2019) revealed that the students' speaking ability scores after being taught with STAD.

#### CONCLUSIONS

This experimental study focused on the implementation of STAD in improving the students' speaking skill. The findings indicate that there is a significant difference in speaking improvement between the students who were taught by STAD and those who were not as examined in the *t*-test. The study expects that English language teachers apply STAD to help enhance the students' speaking ability in English in the classroom.

#### REFERENCES

- Amiruddin, A. (2019). Researching students' oral performance: What's wrong with their use of grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation?. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, 6(2), 88-101.
- Ariyani, D. (2016). *The use of cooperative learning STAD to improve speaking skills of accounting program students grade XI in SMKN 1 Depok in the academic year of 2013/2014* (Bachelor's thesis). Retrieved from [http://eprints.uny.ac.id/41036/1/Dwi%20Ariyani %20Thesis.pdf](http://eprints.uny.ac.id/41036/1/Dwi%20Ariyani%20Thesis.pdf)
- Brown, G., & Yule, G (1983). *Teaching the Spoken Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy (2nd ed)*. London, UK: Longman.
- Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices*. London, UK: Longman.
- Ellis, R. (2009). The differential effects of three types of task planning on the fluency, complexity, and accuracy in L2 oral production. *Applied Linguistics*, 30(4), 474–509.
- Firnanda, R., Gani, S. A., & Samad, I. A. (2019). The influence of Student Team-Achievement Division (STAD) in developing students' speaking skill. *English Education Journal*, 10(1), 46-66.
- Goh, C., & Burns, A. (2012). *Teaching speaking: A holistic approach*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *How to Teach English*. Harlow, UK: Longman.

- 
- Kachru, Y., & Smith, L. E. (2008). *Cultures, contexts, and world Englishes*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kristina, K. (2014). *Improving speaking skill through Student Teams Achievement Division (STAD) of the eleventh grade students of SMKN1 Tampaksiring in academic year 2013//2014* (Bachelor's thesis). Retrieved from <http://unmas-library.ac.id/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/SKRIPSI-LENGKAP.pdf>.
- Kurniawan, I., Syafrizal, S., & Fernandita, G. J. (2018). An analysis of students' English speaking skills at coastal schools of Bengkulu city, Indonesia. *The Journal of English Language Studies*, 3(1), 19-31.
- Lado, R. (1964). *Language teaching: A scientific approach*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Littlewood, W. (1985). *Communicative language teaching: An introduction*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Meylina, M. (2017). Challenges of learning spoken English in Minangkabau context. *Proceedings of ISELT FBS Universitas Negeri Padang*, 5, 86-96.
- Nunan, D. (1991). *Language teaching methodology*. London, UK: Prentice Hall International.
- Richards, J. (2006). *Communicative language teaching today*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Sawir, E. (2005). Language difficulties of international students in Australia: The effects of prior learning experience. *International Education Journal*, 6(5), 567-580.
- Slavin, R. E. (1991). *Student team learning: A practical guide to cooperative learning* (3rd ed). Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- Wahyuningsih, S., & Afandi, M. (2020). Investigating English speaking problems: Implications for speaking curriculum development in Indonesia. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 9(3), 967-977.