

BOOSTING STUDENTS' WRITING PROFICIENCY THROUGH THE STUDENT TEAMS ACHIEVEMENT DIVISION (STAD) METHOD: EFFECTIVE STRATEGIES AND OUTCOMES

Desi Puspitasari

*Institut Agama Islam Negeri Ponorogo, Indonesia
desipus@iainponorogo.ac.id*

Elita Pretty Enggal Mayza

*Institut Agama Islam Negeri Ponorogo, Indonesia
elitaprettyenggalmayza@gmail.com*

ABSTRACT

This study aims to determine whether there is a significant difference in the writing skills of tenth-grade students taught using Student Teams Achievement Division (STAD) and students taught using Think Pair Share (TPS). This research employed a quantitative approach with a quasi-experimental design. This study used two classes: one class as an experimental group, while one class was used as a control group. The population taken came from class X students at SMKN 1 Ponorogo, with a total sample of 35 students. Data were collected through tests and then analyzed using the t-test formula to assess whether there was a significant difference in writing skills between students taught using the STAD technique and those taught using the TPS technique. The results of this study showed that the average value of the experimental class was 86.35, while the average value of the control class was 73.67. It indicates a difference in mean scores between the two classes. In addition, the t-test results show a significant value of 0.000, which is smaller than 0.05 ($0.000 < 0.05$). Therefore, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between student writing skills using STAD and those using TPS.

Keywords: cooperative method; STAD; TPS; writing skill; vocational high school.

INTRODUCTION

Learning English at Vocational High Schools aims to improve students' English skills. In the vocational context, they are studying English language learning as it prepares students with the communication skills needed to succeed in their careers and provides a deep understanding of the application of English in specialized vocational or industrial contexts (Muliyah & Aminatun, 2020). In vocational schools, English language learning also often uses technology as a learning tool, allowing students to practice their language

skills and access additional educational resources and content relevant to their vocational field (Siminto, 2023). English language learning in vocational schools also involves developing all aspects of language skills, including writing skills.

In some research, it is found that writing is difficult for students in Indonesia (Susilowati, 2018). Writing is one of the most powerful tools for conveying and demonstrating what students know (Agustiningsih & Andriani, 2021). It is seen as one of the crucial aspects because through learning to write, students can develop writing skills that enable them to adapt to the needs of the job, such as composing reports, letters, or emails in a professional style and presenting information in a structured manner (Afidah Pujiningsih et al., 2019).

Writing skills are crucial for students to learn in the learning process. They are essential in conveying information in writing (Werdingingsih & Sutrisno, 2019). They are essential for students; writing can be used to imagine, create, innovate, and express thoughts. Writing skills are also essential in the world of work. Many jobs require good writing skills like reports, proposals, and emails. By mastering writing skills, students in vocational high schools can prepare themselves for a successful career in the future (Afidah Pujiningsih et al., 2019).

In general, writing is a skill that allows a person to express their thoughts in writing with complete, comprehensive, and clear sentences so that the reader can understand (Santika et al., 2022). According to Dalman, writing skills are the skills of each individual to pour their ideas into writing (Dalman, 2018). It is an essential language skill because it becomes a means of learning, discovering, developing, and perfecting language skills (Purnomo et al., 2019). It is often considered difficult and requires high understanding and accuracy. Teachers find it most difficult to teach writing skills in addition to speaking, listening, and reading skills in the context of language skills. Therefore, selecting learning methods is a critical factor that affects the success of improving students' writing skills (Alawiyah, 2021).

One of the approaches that can be used in teaching learning, especially in writing is the cooperative learning approach. A cooperative learning system is structured group work or a learning system in which several students are members of small groups with different ability levels. In completing their group assignments, each member must work together and help others understand the subject matter (Apriyanti & Ayu, 2020). It is essential because it can increase student interaction, encourage collaboration, and facilitate a deeper understanding of the subject (Sulistio & Haryanti, 2022). By actively involving students in the learning process and supporting each other, cooperative learning creates an inclusive learning environment and triggers intrinsic motivation to learn. In addition, cooperative learning also prepares students to

develop problem-solving skills and promotes respect for diversity of opinions and perspectives.

In cooperative learning methods, various types of techniques can be used. One of the techniques that can be used is Student Teams Achievement Division. The Student's Teams Achievement Division (STAD) technique is widely used in cooperative learning because the practical technique will make it easier to apply. STAD prioritizes collaboration in small groups where students interact and share knowledge to achieve learning goals (Purnomo et al., 2019). Using the STAD technique, students provide feedback, share ideas, and enrich each other's concepts, which can increase their understanding of the topic being studied. Therefore, in learning English, the STAD technique can be used to teach writing skills. By using the STAD technique, students give each other feedback, share ideas, and enrich each other's concepts, which can improve their understanding of the topic being studied. Therefore, the STAD technique can teach writing skills in English language learning.

Based on research conducted by Kastam Syamsi in a journal entitled *The Effectiveness of STAD, TPS, and CIRC Learning Strategies on Writing Skill*, it is said that the Student Teams Achievement Division (STAD) technique is more effective in improving students' writing skills (Syamsia & St Nurbayab, 2020). Moreover, a research journal conducted by Lidia Denta with the title *The Effect of Student Teams Achievement Divisions (STAD) on the Students' Writing Ability on Recount Text* also said that the STAD technique can improve students' writing skills (Barus & Niswa, 2020). These two studies show that the STAD learning technique improves students' writing skills.

Apart from that, there are also other types of cooperative methods that teachers can use to develop writing skills, such as Think Pair Share (TPS). The TPS technique allows students to be actively involved in learning by thinking, collaborating with friends, and sharing ideas with classmates (Santika et al., 2022). TPS is a cooperative learning technique that involves students working in pairs. They are asked to think about a topic and share their ideas with their partner. This way, they can convey and share these ideas with the whole class or in groups (Abidah, 2019). The results of research conducted by Suhrowardi prove that the TPS technique can effectively improve students' writing skills (Suhrowardi, 2020). Based on research conducted by Santika in a journal entitled *Teaching Writing Skill by Using Think Pair Share Technique*, she said that the TPS technique can improve students' writing skills (Santika et al., 2022).

Based on the researcher's interview, it was found that at SMKN 1 Ponorogo, the students tend to learn in groups rather than individually. They said that learning in groups will gather another perspective and thought. Furthermore, during the researcher's observation of the teaching-learning

process, it was found that students faced various difficulties in writing. These difficulties include using inappropriate vocabulary, grammatical errors, word spelling errors, and improper sentence construction.

Therefore, the researcher utilized a cooperative learning method using STAD and TPS learning techniques to enhance students' writing skills. This study aims to determine which technique improves students' writing ability more effectively. From these problems, the researcher is interested in raising the research title "Boosting Students' Writing Proficiency through the Student Teams Achievement Division (STAD) Method: Effective Strategies and Outcomes."

METHODS

This study used a quasi-experimental approach with a pre-test and post-test design. Nevertheless, this study fulfilled the criteria of experimental research because it aimed to overcome learning problems in the classroom. In quasi-experiments, the investigator uses control and experimental groups (Creswell, 2023). The experimental group taught using the Student Teams Achievement Division (STAD) method, while the control group also received learning using the Think Pair Share (TPS) method. The pre-test was conducted before the learning session began, and the post-test was conducted after the learning activities were completed.

This research was conducted in the even semester of the 2023/2024 academic year in class X of SMK Negeri 1 Ponorogo, which is located at Jalan Jenderal Sudirman No.10, Krajan, Pakunden, Ponorogo. The researcher chose this school because it was one of the favorite vocational schools in Ponorogo. This study's population consisted of all tenth-grade students of SMKN 1 Ponorogo. Meanwhile, the sample of this study consisted of X AK 1 class students, totaling 36 students as the experimental class, and X AK 3 class students, totaling 36 students as the control class.

This study used a purposive sampling technique. Purposive sampling is a method with specific considerations, goals, and intentions (Rai & Thapa, 2015). The use of the purposive sampling technique in this study was based on information from the X-grade English subject teacher, which showed that students in the experimental and control classes had relatively similar abilities and characteristics based on the results of daily tests and midterm assessments.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

In this study, researchers focused on grade X students at SMKN 1 Ponorogo in the 2023/2024 academic year. The AK department at SMKN 1 Ponorogo had five classes: X AK 1, X AK 2, X AK 3, X AK 4, and X AK 5.

Researchers chose X AK 1 and X AK 3 classes as research samples. Class X AK 1, with 36 students, was the experimental class, and class X AK 3, with 34 students, was the control class.

Based on the research that had been conducted, the researcher found a problem in students' writing skills. Students had difficulty developing their ideas. It happens because teachers always encourage them to think critically without providing enough support to build their confidence. As a result, students' ideas and creativity were not well conveyed, which resulted in difficulties in developing writing skills due to limited ideas and creativity. Therefore, an intervention was needed to help students overcome this problem and improve their writing skills. The researcher assumed that using the STAD technique could improve students' writing skills.

The teaching and learning process began with the material about narrative text under the same conditions in both classes. After that, the researcher gave treatment to both classes. In the control class, students were taught using the TPS technique, while in the experimental class, students were taught using the STAD technique.

In the control class, there were 34 students. The students were taught with the TPS technique. At the first meeting, students were given a pre-test by the researcher. This pre-test checked the student's ability to master the material to be taught. In the second meeting, students were taught narrative text material. The focus of the material was on basic information related to narrative text. Through a text the researcher provided, students could identify the elements of narrative text, such as definition, text structure, and language features. In addition, during the second meeting, students were given a question sheet related to the material that had been explained. Students were given time to think independently. After that, students were asked to pair up with their classmates to discuss or exchange opinions on the questions the teacher gave. The last step was that each student was asked to come forward to the front of the class to paste the discussion results.

In the third meeting, the researcher re-communicated the material related to narrative text to students. Students were given a 4-minute video. The researcher asked students to rewrite the story in the video. The researcher asked students to pair up with their peers to discuss the answers. Then, students joined the groups that had been formed. Students, together with their groups, shared answers or shared related to their answers.

At the fourth meeting, the researcher prepared a fill-in sheet like the pre-test. It is because the fourth meeting agenda is post-test testing. This post-test concept used the same system as the pre-test. The aim was to measure the student's knowledge of the material that has been taught. Thus, the pre-test and post-test results would show whether there was a significant difference. The

table below reported the pre-test and post-test scores of students in the control class.

The pre-test scores obtained by respondents had a fairly wide range. The lowest score obtained was 57, while the highest score was 72. The total number of pre-test scores was 2078, with an average (mean) of 67.03. It showed that the pre-test scores have a relatively normal distribution. In addition, it also showed that the post-test scores have a wider range than the pre-test scores. The lowest score obtained was 69, while the highest score was 79. The total post-test scores were 2284, with an average (mean) of 73.67. It showed that the post-test scores also had a relatively normal distribution and had an increase in mean compared to the pre-test scores.

In this study, the researcher chose to use an experimental design to determine the effectiveness of the STAD strategy in improving students' writing skills. For this reason, the researcher gave a pre-test at the first meeting in the experimental class to determine the extent of students' ability in writing before being given treatment. Then, in the second and third meetings, the researcher provided treatment using the STAD strategy, which contained a series of activities designed to improve students' writing ability. In the last meeting, the researcher gave a post-test to see the students' writing ability after treatment. Thus, the researcher could find out whether the STAD strategy significantly affects students' writing ability.

At the first meeting in the experimental class, the researcher started by welcoming all students. Next, the researcher invited students to pray together to start learning activities in a peaceful, relaxed atmosphere. Then, the researcher checked the students' attendance to ensure that all students were present. After that, the researcher explained the learning activities that would be carried out so that students could understand the purpose and content of the activities to be carried out. Next, the researcher gave sheets of paper containing pre-test questions to the students to find out the extent of their ability in writing. Students were given time to work on one question, and then submit the answer sheet that had been done to the teacher. Thus, the researcher can monitor the students' abilities before being given the treatment and determine whether the treatment significantly affects the student's abilities.

In the second meeting, the researcher conducted ice-breaking by asking sparking questions related to the picture given, such as 'Do you know what kind of picture it is?' and 'Have you ever heard about the deer story?' to stabilize the atmosphere and build students' awareness of the material to be learned.

Furthermore, the researcher explained the learning objectives or competencies to be achieved, as well as conveying an outline of the scope of the

material and an explanation of the activities that students would do. The researcher also explained the learning objectives to be achieved and displayed power points in front of the class to solidify the material related to the narrative text. After that, the researcher asked students to divide into groups by counting from 1 to 4 and explained the activities that students would carry out. Then, the researcher distributed question sheets about the material that had been learned and asked students with their groups to discuss the questions given by the teacher. Each group discussed for approximately 15 minutes and the researcher supervised each group.

After the discussion, the researcher asked each group representative to come forward to present the group discussion results and evaluate each group's results. Furthermore, the researcher rewarded each group and reflected on the students about the conclusion of today's activities.

In the third meeting, the researcher asked students questions about the material learned in the previous meeting to stabilize the atmosphere and build students' awareness of the material to be learned. Furthermore, the researcher also repeated the material delivered at the previous meeting and gave a short video related to the fabled story to solidify the material learned.

After that, the researcher asked students to rewrite the story independently and work on the questions independently first. Then, the researcher asked students to pair up with their peers to discuss the results of their writing, provided supervision, and monitored the participants. After the discussion, the researcher gave scores to evaluate the student's work and rewarded the students' writing. Before the lesson was closed, the teacher reflected on the conclusion of today's activity and asked the students to pray together.

At the last meeting in the experimental class, the researcher started by giving students sheets of paper containing post-test questions. This post-test question aims to determine the extent of students' ability to write after being given treatment. Students were given time to do 1 question and then handed over the question sheet that had been done to the teacher.

After the students finished working on the questions, the researcher thanked the students for doing the test well. The researcher also prayed with students before closing the class to stabilize the atmosphere and build students' awareness of the importance of learning activities. In the end, the researcher said goodbye to the students. Thus, the researcher hopes that students can improve their writing skills after treatment and become better in various aspects of life.

This study used the Student Teams Achievement Division (STAD) strategy to improve students' writing ability in the experimental class. This

STAD strategy focuses on developing students' ability to collaborate and share knowledge to achieve learning objectives.

In the experimental class, the pre-test score was taken in the first meeting to determine the extent of students' writing ability before treatment. Then, in the second and third meetings, students were required to work in teams and share knowledge to achieve learning objectives. Students were monitored and given feedback to improve their abilities during this process.

In the end, the post-test score was taken at the last meeting to determine the extent of students' ability in writing after the treatment. The pre-test and post-test results in the experimental class are shown in the table below to compare the student's abilities before and after the treatment.

The highest score in the experimental class pre-test was 72, while the lowest was 52. Meanwhile, the highest score on the post-test was 94, and the lowest score was 83. In line with this, the average value of the pre-test was 66.85, and the post-test was 86.35. From the table above, it can be seen that there was a difference in average scores between the pre-test and post-test. So, it could be concluded that student scores in the experimental class changed after treatment using the STAD technique.

The researcher explained the results of the hypothesis testing conducted in this study. The researcher used the IBM SPSS Statistics 22 program to describe the statistical calculations more accurately and to ensure that the data used in the analysis was appropriate and accurate. In the first stage, researchers conducted a normality test to ensure that the data used in the analysis had a normal distribution under statistical assumptions. This normality test was conducted to ensure that the data used did not have an abnormal distribution, such as binomial or Poisson distribution, which could affect the analysis results.

In the second stage, the researcher conducted a homogeneity test to ensure that the data used in the analysis had the same variance and that no significant differences existed between groups. This homogeneity test was conducted to ensure that the data used in the analysis did not have different variants that could affect the results.

Descriptive statistics include maximum score, minimum score, average (mean), and number of students. Pretest data was obtained from 28 experimental and 31 control class students. Data processing was carried out using Microsoft Excel software to obtain the pretest data.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistic of Pre-Test

Descriptive Statistic	Experiment	Control
Mean	66,857	67,032
Minimum	52	57
Maximum	73	78

Based on Table 1, the pretest data of students' writing ability was obtained. The data shows that the mean score of the experimental class pretest was 66.857, while the mean score of the control class pretest was 67.032. So, the initial writing ability of experimental and control class students was not much different and it could be interpreted that the initial ability of students' mathematical creative thinking in both classes was relatively the same.

Inferential statistics in this study used parametric statistics, namely the normality test, homogeneity test, and two mean tests. If the pretest data in the normality test were not normally distributed, non-parametric statistics would be used, namely the Mann-Whitney test. Inferential statistics were tested using SPSS software

The normality test determined whether the pretest data was normally distributed. The hypothesis used in testing pretest data was as follows:

Ho: Pretest data is normally distributed

Hi: Pretest data is not normally distributed.

The normality test used Shapiro-Wilk with the basis for decision-making as follows:

A significance value < 0.05 means Ho is rejected

A significance value > 0.05 means Ho is accepted

The results of the normality test of students' writing skills pretest scores can be seen in the following SPSS output:

Table 2. Test of Normality Data Pre-Test

	Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig
pretest of control class	.983	28	.921
pretest of experiment class	.861	28	.002

It shows that the calculation result of the normality test in the control class is 0.921, which means the significant value was greater than 0.05. So, it could be concluded that the data in the control class were normally distributed.

Post-test data was used to determine the final ability of experimental and control class students on narrative text material. The pretest value was obtained by giving questions to create narrative text based on the picture given. The following was descriptive statistical data of post-test data of students' writing ability.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of Posttest

Descriptive Statistics	Experiment	Control
Mean	86,357	73,677
Minimum	83	69
Maximum	94	79

To determine the difference in the improvement of students' writing skills between the experimental class and the control class, it needed some analysis. The following was a descriptive statistic for N-Gain data obtained from the pretest and posttest results of students' writing skills in experimental and control classes.

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics of N-Gain

		N-Gain of Experimental Class	N-Gain of Control Class
N	Valid	28	31
	Mean	0,579	0,191
	Minimum	0,370	-0,045
	Maximum	0,8	0,372

The table shows that the average N-Gain score of the experimental class was 0.579, while the average N-Gain score of the control class was 0.191. Based on this average, it could be concluded that there is a significant difference between students' writing skills in experimental and control classes.

The normality test was used to determine whether the distribution of N-Gain data was normally distributed. The hypothesis used in testing N-Gain data was as follows.

H_0 : Data N-Gain is normally distributed

H_1 : Data N-Gain is not normally distributed

The normality test used Shapiro-Wilk with the basis for decision-making as follows.

A significance value $< 0,05$ means that H_0 is rejected.

A significance value $> 0,05$ means H_0 is accepted.

The results of the normality test of the N-Gain score of students' mathematical creative thinking ability were seen in the following SPSS output.

Table 5. The Result of the Normality Test of N-Gain

Class	Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.
N-gain of control class	.954	28	.244
N-gain of experiment class	.988	28	.982

Based on the normality test results, the probability value in the N-Gain data significance column for the control class is $0.244 > 0.05$. Then, the probability value in the significance column of the N-gain data for the experimental class is $0.982 > 0.05$. It shows that H_0 was accepted and H_1 was rejected, so it could be obtained that the experimental class and control class N-Gain data were normally distributed. So, the data analysis continued with the homogeneity test.

The homogeneity test was used to determine whether the two data were identical. The hypothesis used in testing pretest data is as follows:

H_0 : Homogeneous pretest data

H_1 : Pretest data is not homogeneous

The homogeneity test used Levene with the basis for decision-making as follows:

A significance value < 0.05 means H_0 is rejected.

A significance value > 0.05 means H_0 is accepted.

Table 6 shows the result of the Homogeneity Test of N-Gain

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
0.694	1	57	.408

Based on the results of the homogeneity test using Levene, it could be seen that the significant value of the n-gain data obtained a result of $0.408 > 0.05$. It showed that H_0 was accepted, so H_1 was rejected. It could be concluded that the n-gain score data of the two classes were homogeneous.

The homogeneity test results showed that the group data was homogeneous. Therefore, the test for the similarity of the two averages uses the t-test, namely the Independent Sample T-test. The Independent Sample T-test using Shapiro-Wilk with the basis for decision-making is as follows.

Significance value < 0.05 means H_0 is rejected

A significance value > 0.05 means H_0 is accepted.

Based on the data analysis, it was known that the average pre-test score of the control class was 67.032, and the average post-test score of the control class increased to 73.677, showing an increase in the control class. Meanwhile, the average pre-test score of the experimental class was 66.857, and the average post-test score was 86.357, which also showed an increase in the experimental class. From this explanation, both the control and experimental classes experienced an increase. Furthermore, researchers analyzed the data using SPSS, and the results of the n-gain data t-test showed a value of $0.00 < 0.05$. It showed that H_0 was rejected. So, there was a significant difference in improving students' writing skills between those taught using the STAD learning technique and those taught using the TPS learning technique.

Discussion

The researcher conducts this study to determine the influence of STAD learning techniques on improving students' writing skills. This study discusses the use of STAD learning techniques on the writing skills of class X students at SMKN 1 Ponorogo.

The research result shows that the highest score in the experimental class pre-test is 72, while the lowest is 52. Meanwhile, the highest score on the post-test is 94, and the lowest score is 83. In line with this, the average value of the pre-test is 66.85, and the post-test is 86.35. It can be seen that there is a difference in average scores between the pre-test and post-test. So, it can be concluded that student scores in the experimental class change after the treatment using the STAD technique. The average pre-test score of the control class is 67.032, and the average post-test score of the control class increases to 73.677, showing an increase in the control class. Meanwhile, the average pre-test score of the experimental class is 66.857, and the average post-test score is 86.357, which also shows an increase in the experimental class. From this explanation, both the control and experimental classes experience an increase.

In addition, the results of the pretest and posttest scores are obtained, and the N-Gain value is then continued to be calculated. The N-Gain value is obtained by comparing the difference between the posttest and pretest scores with the ideal maximum difference and the pretest score. The N-Gain value is used to answer the hypothesis, which is used as a reference for concluding this study. The N-Gain data is then tested for normality to determine the data distribution and get normal data results in the experimental and control classes. The next following test is the homogeneity test. After tested for homogeneity, the results show that the data in the experimental and control classes are homogeneous. They are then processed to the T-test (independent sample t-test). Data testing uses SPSS software. The results of the n-gain data t-test show

a value of $0.00 < 0.05$. It shows that H_0 is rejected. So, it can be concluded that there is a difference in improving writing skills between students who use the STAD learning technique and students who use the TPS learning technique model.

According to Slavin (2013), the Student Teams Achievement Division (STAD) is a cooperative learning strategy that allows students to work together in small groups of different ability levels to achieve a common learning goal. Several findings show that this strategy is effective in teaching using the STAD strategy. Firstly, he says that in the STAD technique, students are motivated to help and encourage each other to learn in a team or group work. It allows students to freely convey and share their ideas, feelings, and opinions and can improve their writing skills.

Secondly, Syamsia & St Nurbayab (2020) states that STAD in teaching writing can enhance students' writing skills. In addition, Nair & Sanai (2018) found that the Student Teams Achievement Division (STAD) can develop students' writing skills. Thus, the STAD strategy in teaching writing can help improve students' skills in writing effectively.

Based on Slavin's theory, the STAD technique is effective in language learning (Slavin, 2013). The STAD technique in writing learning is also effective. There is a difference in grades between students who are taught using the STAD technique and those who do not. This technique helps students boost their motivation to improve their writing skills.

Furthermore, from the above data, the researcher can conclude that the alternative hypothesis is accepted and the null hypothesis is rejected. In other words, using the STAD technique provides a significant difference. It can be seen from the data results in the control and experimental classes. Thus, using the STAD technique can improve the writing skills of tenth-grade students of SMKN 1 Ponorogo.

Based on the findings, the distinctions between STAD and TPS are highlighted in the aspects of collaboration and confidence, engagement and motivation, and skill development. In collaboration and confidence, STAD promoted teamwork, enabling students to exchange ideas and learn from one another. It not only improves the students' confidence but also their ability to generate and refine ideas collaboratively. In contrast, TPS relies more on individual efforts, with limited scope for group collaboration.

Second is the engagement and motivation. The competition and reward of the STAD motivate students to actively participate. It emphasizes group achievements and fosters a sense of accountability, which is less prominent in the TPS. At last, the skill development. The experimental class demonstrates an

improvement in writing. The N-gain analysis shows the improvement, describing a significantly higher score for the STAD group.

This study demonstrated that the STAD technique is a highly effective strategy for improving students' writing skills. By fostering a collaborative and supportive learning environment, STAD helped students overcome challenges in idea generation and creativity. The significant improvements in the experimental class underscore the potential of cooperative learning approaches in addressing skill gaps in education. Adopting such methods in classrooms can empower students to achieve their full potential, both academically and socially.

CONCLUSION

The research results indicate a significant difference between the post-test results in the control and experimental classes. So, it can be said that there is a significant difference in the writing skills of students taught with the STAD technique compared to students taught using the TPS technique. STAD technique motivates students to help and encourage each other to learn in a team or group work. It allows students to freely convey and share their ideas, feelings, and opinions and can improve their writing skills. This technique helps students boost their motivation to improve their writing skills. Finally, it is suggested that English teachers use STAD as the alternative method in the teaching and learning process to improve the student's English writing ability, especially in narrative text.

REFERENCES

- Abidah, M. (2019). The Effect of Think Pair Share (TPS) Technique to Improve Students' Writing Skill on Descriptive Text at Tenth Grade of SMAN 2 Kab. Tangerang in Academic Year 2018/2019. 2(1), 5.
- Afidah Pujiningsih, N., Maryadi, M. A., & Fathoni, A. (2019). *Pengelolaan Pembelajaran Bahasa Inggris Di Kelas X SMK Negeri 1 Surakarta*, Kota Surakarta [PhD Thesis]. Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta.
- Agustiningsih, N., & Andriani, F. (2021). A Study on Direct Corrective Feedback in Improving Students' Writing Performance and Motivation at MTs YP KH Syamsuddin Ponorogo. *AJMIE: Alhikam Journal of Multidisciplinary Islamic Education*, 2(1), 1-13.
- Alawiyah, S. (2021). Model Pembelajaran Model Pembelajaran Think Talk Write dan Menulis Karangan Argumentasi pada Era Disrupsi. *Jurnal Inovasi Penelitian*, 1(8), 1691-1700.

- Apriyanti, D., & Ayu, M. (2020). Think-Pair-Share: Engaging Students in Speaking Activities in Classroom. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 1(1), 13-19.
- Barus, L. D. G., & Niswa, K. (2020). The Effect of Student Teams Achievement Divisions (STAD) to the Students' Writing Ability on Recount Text. *Journal of English Education and Teaching*, 4(4), 536-547.
- Creswell, J. (2023). *Research Design*. Sage Publications.
- Dalman. (2018). *Menulis Karya Ilmiah*. Rajawali Pers/PT Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Muliyah, P., & Aminatun, D. (2020). Teaching English for Specific Purposes in Vocational High School: Teachers' Beliefs and Practices. *Journal of English Teaching*, 6(2), 122-133.
- Nair, S. M., & Sanai, M. (2018). Effects of Utilizing the STAD Method (Cooperative Learning Approach) in Enhancing Students' Descriptive Writing Skills. *International Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(4), 239-252.
- Purnomo, A. E., Harmanto, B., & Indriastuti, N. R. (2019). The Use of Student Team Achievement Division (STAD) in Improving Writing Ability at the Eleventh Grade of SMAN 1 Nawangan in Academic Year 2019/2020. *EDUPEDIA*, 3(2), 48-55.
- Rai, N., & Thapa, B. (2015). A Study on Purposive Sampling Method in Research. *Kathmandu: Kathmandu School of Law*, 5(1), 8-15.
- Santika, M. L., Kasim, U., & Burhansyah, B. (2022). Teaching Writing Skill by Using Think Pair Share Technique. *Research in English and Education Journal*, 7(4), 135-145.
- Siminto, S. (2023). A Review of English for Vocational High School in Curriculum Merdeka. *Atmosfer: Jurnal Pendidikan, Bahasa, Sastra, Seni, Budaya, Dan Sosial Humaniora*, 1(3), 127-139.
- Slavin, R. E. (2013). Cooperative Learning and the Cooperative School. *Educational Leadership*, 45(3), 7-13.
- Suhrowardi, S. (2020). Improving Writing Skills; An Implementation of "Think Pair Share" for Islamic Junior Schools Students. *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 8(3), 287-296.
- Sulistio, A., & Haryanti, N. (2022). *Model Pembelajaran Kooperatif (Cooperative Learning Model)*. Eureka Media Aksara.
- Susilowati, T. (2018). Building Fluency in Writing II Based on Micro and Macro Skills of Writing by Using Peer Assessment. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 7(3), 129-139.

- Syamsia, K., & St Nurbayab, S. P. (2020). The Effectiveness of STAD, TPS, and CIRC Learning Strategies on Writing Skill. *Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 14(3), 1166–1181.
- Werdiningsih, E., & Sutrisno, E. (2019). Peningkatan Keterampilan Menulis Menggunakan Pendekatan Komunikatif bagi Siswa Kelas X SMK Multimedia Nurul Huda Poncokusumo Malang. *Likhitaprajna*, 21(1), 15–24.