

# The Effects of Student Teams Achievement Division (STAD) on Motivation of Saudi EFL Adult Learners

Muhammad Ishtiaq<sup>1\*</sup>, Zuraina Ali<sup>2</sup>, Muhammad Salem<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Human Sciences, Unaizah Community College, Qassim University, 4394 Unaizah 51911, Saudi Arabia.

<sup>2</sup>Centre for Modern Languages & Human Sciences, Universiti Malaysia Pahang, 26600 Pekan, Pahang, Malaysia.

## Article Information

Received 4 September 2015  
Received in revised form 11  
December 2015  
Accepted 15 December 2015

## Abstract

Students Teams Achievement Division (STAD) is a cooperative learning strategy in which learners work in heterogeneous groups to achieve a common goal. It has been widely used in teaching different subject areas under different settings. This study aimed at investigating the effects of STAD on motivation of Saudi EFL learners. Two intact groups of 1<sup>st</sup> semester students were selected. One group worked as the experimental group and the other one as the control group. A questionnaire was administered to both groups at the beginning of the semester. The experimental group was taught with STAD whereas the control group was taught with the traditional whole class teacher-fronted method. The treatment was administered for two weeks. The same questionnaire was re-administered after the treatment. The data was analyzed using independent samples t-test. Findings revealed that there was no significant difference ( $p = 0.36 > 0.05$ ) between the experimental and the control groups in terms of motivation.

© 2015 Penerbit Universiti Malaysia Pahang

*Keywords:* Cooperative learning; Motivation; Student Teams Achievement Division (STAD)

## INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, motivation has been one of the major research subjects due to its importance in second language (L2) learning. It has gained a lot of consideration since Gardner and Lambert's study in 1959 (in Brander, 2013). Researchers have been trying to find the role of motivation in L2 acquisition. Babee (2012) argues that the importance of motivation in L2 learning and acquisition is invaluable. According to Kreishan and Al-Dhaimat (2013), motivation serves as a stimulus that helps the learners to persist during their L2 learning. It is a driving force that is needed to complete an action. Hashemian and Heidari (2013) point out that motivation plays a pivotal role in the success or failure of a task in L2 learning. There is a large volume of published research that has explored the different aspects of motivation.

More recent studies have confirmed that L2 motivation helps in enhancing learners' performance during a course. Babee (2012) argues that studying L2 motivation is important because without motivation some very capable learners may not be able to achieve long term goals. Thus motivation has a special place in L2 language acquisition. According to Kreishan and Al-Dhaimat (2013), if a learner is intrinsically motivated, he has an internal drive and self-confidence to achieve his academic goals.

---

\* Corresponding author. Tel.: +00966-163622295; Fax: +00966-163623393.

E-mail address: [m\\_ishtiaq\\_f@yahoo.com](mailto:m_ishtiaq_f@yahoo.com) [Ishtiaq, M.]; [zuraina@ump.edu.my](mailto:zuraina@ump.edu.my) [Ali, Z.]; [Solyman15@gmail.com](mailto:Solyman15@gmail.com) [Salem, M.].

Dornyei (2010) argues that in many cases some very good language learners may not attain a certain level of language proficiency if they do not have sufficient motivation; on the contrary, learners with high level of motivation may achieve their goals even though they may have a low language aptitude. Therefore, EFL teachers need to explore the factors that affect motivation of EFL learners.

Cooperative learning (CL) and motivation have long been discussed together. The literature on CL suggests that it enhances motivation and improves the effectiveness of classroom activities (Mohseny & Jamour, 2012). Some researchers have tried to explain the effects of CL on different aspects of motivation. According to Zhou (2012), CL instills motivation in learners in three ways: first, students work harder if they know that their work will be scrutinized by their peers, secondly, they will learn their course content with greater depth if they themselves are required to explain to their peers and third, they will have self-confidence if they work in a relaxed atmosphere. Thus, CL produces more autonomous, more hardworking and more self-confident learners. Krause, Stark and Mandl (2009) point out that cooperative learning enhances positive interdependence which in turn enhances motivation. Thus, different CL strategies may be applied in classrooms to explore their effects on motivation of EFL learners in different socio-culture backgrounds.

Numerous studies have attempted to explain the role of CL in L2 learning. Dornyei and Ushioda (2013) argue that cooperative learning promotes autonomy which is a strong contributor to motivation. Autonomous learners believe in their capabilities and can take the responsibility for their own learning. According to Dornyei and Ushioda (2013), individual structures of learning promote personal progress whereas cooperative learning methods enhance progress and self-efficacy among all the members. Thus, CL may develop self-efficacy among English as a foreign language (EFL) learners which may help them achieve their academic goals. Jacobs and McCafferty (2006) point out that cooperative learning enhances motivation and student-student interaction in language learning classrooms. This interaction develops a social bond among the group members and they start taking care of one another. According to Mohseny and Jamour (2012), as the learners are required to work in teams and cooperate with one another, they feel motivated to learn. As a result, the overall progress of the class improves.

Student Teams Achievement Division (STAD) is a cooperative learning strategy developed by Slavin (1995) at John Hopkins University (Van Wyk, 2012). In STAD, learners work in small heterogeneous groups (of five to six members) and help one another to comprehend the given material. Individual quizzes are given at the end of the week and the best group is rewarded on the basis of individual improvement. The reward is given in different forms; their names may be written on the bulletin board or they may be given certificates at the end of every week.

Due to its simplicity and flexibility, STAD has been the choice of a number of researchers from different fields. According to Tiantong and Teemuansai (2013), STAD has been used in a variety of subjects and on a variety of students from grade two to college level students. Slavin (1995) investigated 22 studies out of which 17 supported the effectiveness of STAD. However, Alijanian (2012) argues that majority of the past studies were not conducted in the EFL context. Similarly Kreishan and Al-Dhaimat (2013) point out that research on motivation has been largely conducted in the first language (L1) context (where the target language is widely used, e.g. America, Canada and some other western countries). The use of STAD and other cooperative learning strategies is still under-researched in Saudi Arabia and many countries where English is taught as EFL.

Saudi Arabia is deeply religious, conservative and traditional society. Though the government is trying hard to catch up with the world in all walks of life, time is still not ripe for ELT to penetrate into this culture. Arabic is the official language of the country and the medium of instruction even in EFL classrooms. English is treated as a subject and not as a living language to be spoken in daily conversations (Liton, 2013). Many factors can be held responsible for such apathetic attitude towards English language. In a study conducted by Springsteen (2014), majority of the teachers considered 'lack of motivation' and 'lack of confidence' as the two general factors that had negative effects on Saudi EFL learners. There are other factors as well that contribute to the low language aptitude of Saudi learners.

EFL classrooms are still taught with traditional methods in Saudi Arabia. According to Abdel Rauf (2010), Grammar-Translation Method is excessively used in EFL classrooms all over the Arab world.

STAD may be seen as a novel strategy in such teacher-centered classrooms. Owing to the lack of such studies in Saudi Arabia, the study may be more significant in the kingdom. It may give a chance to Saudi EFL learners to work in a cooperative atmosphere which may have an effect on their motivation, self-confidence and their linguistic competence in the long run. Thus, the current study may fill a gap in the literature by investigating the effects of STAD as a cooperative learning strategy on Saudi EFL learners' motivation.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

A considerable amount of literature has been published on motivation and cooperative learning in recent years. Historically, the focus of studies on motivation has been on the dichotomy of motivation-integrative or instrumental motivation. However, later researchers tried to investigate different aspects of motivation. Similarly, studies on cooperative learning reveal that majority of the previous studies have focused on reading or writing skills. Some of the relevant studies are mentioned here.

Moskovsky and Alrabai (2009) attempted to investigate the role of intrinsic motivation on Saudi EFL learners. Fifty-five students randomly selected from intermediate, secondary and college level were requested to complete the survey. Their ages ranged from 12 to 27. A 27-item questionnaire, designed on a 5-point Likert scale (ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree) was administered. Findings revealed that Saudi students have high intrinsic motivation as compared to other types of motivation. However, majority of the participants belonged to schools and very few students were selected from the universities. Moreover, the study focused mainly on intrinsic motivation giving little importance to other variables of motivation.

Al-Shamy (2012) conducted a study on attitudes and motivation of Saudi EFL learners. There were 101 informants (73 males and 28 females) who completed the questionnaires. Twelve participants (all males) were interviewed in this study. A 40-item questionnaire on seven-point Likert scale was adopted from Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMBT) developed by Gardner (2004). The interviews were conducted in a written form. The data was analyzed using a mixed method. Findings revealed that males were more motivated to learn English as compared to the females. However, it should be noted here that the author used Preparatory Year Program (non-English majors) in his study.

Al-Zayid (2012) attempted to explain the role of motivation on L2 acquisition of Saudi students. He recruited seven Saudi students studying in the United States for his qualitative study. The data was gathered using semi-structured interviews and a questionnaire. The results reveal that motivation is dynamic in nature and that there are many factors that affect motivation e.g. learning environment, economic factor and the role of teachers/parents or peers. However, the study was conducted on Saudi students studying in America whose outlook would be quite different from the ones studying inside the kingdom.

Pan and Wu (2013) conducted an experimental study to investigate the effectiveness of cooperative learning in reading comprehension and motivation of EFL learners. The experiment was conducted in freshman English reading course. This quasi-experimental study had 44 students in the experimental group and 34 in the comparison group. Both of these groups were intact classes comprising female students only. The instruction was given for two hours per week for a full semester. The experimental group was taught with reciprocal cooperative learning (RCL) whereas the comparison group was taught with traditional lecture method. Both groups took three English reading achievement tests and responded to an English learning motivation scale. One of the researchers was the instructor of both groups. The findings indicated that the students in cooperative learning group outperformed the students in traditional learning group in reading comprehension. Motivation scale showed a significant difference in favor of the experimental group. However, participants were not from English majors; they belonged to different departments. In addition, all the participants were females.

Aljjanian (2012) studied the effects of STAD on English achievement of Iranian EFL learners. The study was conducted for eight weeks. The sample consisted of 60 female third grade junior high school students. The groups were assigned randomly; one class was made experimental group (n=30) and the

other the control group (n=30). The treatment was carried out for two 90 minute classes each week for eight consecutive weeks. A questionnaire and a teacher-made achievement test were administered before and after the treatment. The data was analyzed using paired and independent t-test. The results indicated that there was a significant difference between the experimental group and the control group in favor of the experimental group. However, the participants in this study were junior high school students.

Mahmoud (2014) investigated the effectiveness of cooperative learning in enhancing writing skills of Saudi students. The study adopted one-group pre-test-post-test design. Participants were twenty sophomore students in one section. A writing test of 45 marks was used before and after the treatment. The test was validated by three EFL experts. The second instrument was a 34 item questionnaire on 3 point Likert scale (agree, neutral and disagree). The questionnaire was distributed at the end of the treatment. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test was used to compare the mean scores of the students. The treatment was carried out for 14 weeks. Though the results were in favor of using cooperative learning for writing, there were two serious limitations to this study. Firstly, there was only an experimental group with the absence of a control group which raises some concerns about the internal validity of the study. Secondly, the sample was very small; twenty students started the course but only 15 completed it.

A careful study of the literature reveals that majority of the previous studies primarily concentrated on the role of motivation or attitudes and motivation. Far too little attention has been paid to find out the effects of different teaching and learning strategies on motivation. Moreover, there is dearth of such studies especially in Saudi Arabia. As far as the studies on cooperative learning are concerned, the majority of the previous studies had some limitations in terms of sampling. Some of the studies used non English majors as their sample, others used a very small sample size, and still others selected only junior high school students. In addition, one of the studies depended only on female participants.

## 2.1 Research Questions

The present study used a larger sample (n=64) as compared to the previous studies. Instead of non-English majors, EFL undergraduates participated in this study. Moreover, it utilized solely male participants. In addition, the effects of STAD were investigated on Saudi EFL learners' motivation: the area of research that has rarely been investigated in this context. The study attempts to answer the following questions:

What is the effect of student team achievement division (STAD) on motivation of Saudi EFL adult learners? This question can be divided into the following sub-questions:

1. Is there any significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group (taught with STAD) and that of the control group (taught with traditional method) on the post-test in terms of motivation of Saudi EFL adult learners?
2. Is there any significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group (taught with STAD) on the pre-test and that of the same group on the post-test in terms of motivation of Saudi EFL adult learners?
3. Is there any significant difference between the mean scores of the control group (taught with traditional method) on the pre-test and that of the same group on the post-test in terms of motivation of Saudi EFL adult learners?

## METHODOLOGY

This section presents information on the research design, treatment, and instrument used in this study.

### **3.1 Research Design**

The study used the quasi-experimental pre-test post-test control group design (Creswell, 2009). A questionnaire was administered before and after the treatment to find out any difference between the experimental and the control group in terms of motivation level.

Two sections (intact groups) of intensive course (1<sup>st</sup> semester) students were selected for the study. “Reading and vocabulary building” (a subject of the curriculum) was taught by one of the researchers to both of the groups. The same textbook was used to teach both of the groups. A questionnaire was administered to both of the groups at the beginning of the research. After the questionnaire, the treatment was administered in the experimental group.

A strategy of cooperative learning known as Student Teams Achievement Division (STAD) was used in the experimental group whereas the control group was taught with teacher-fronted instruction. Student Teams Achievement Division (STAD) is a cooperative learning strategy in which small groups of learners with different achievement levels work together on different tasks. The treatment lasted for two weeks during class hours as it was planned to serve as a pilot study for the main experiment to be conducted afterwards. After the treatment, the same questionnaire was re-administered to both of the groups.

### **3.2 Instructional Treatment**

The experimental group was taught using Student Teams Achievement Division (STAD). After the introduction and warm up, instruction was given to the students. They were divided into teams of fives and sixes (5+5+5+6+6+6=33) comprising high, average and low achievers based on their scores on the pre-test. The students were asked to help one another to understand and answer the activities given in the textbook. At the end of the class, the students were given individual quizzes. The instructor collected the sheets and compared their scores with the previous scores. Individual scores were accumulated and contributed to their team scores. At the end of the week, the high scoring team was announced and their names were written on the bulletin board.

### **3.3 Instrument**

Only one instrument was used in the study—a questionnaire survey. It was divided into two parts—a demographic part and the main part. The main part of the questionnaire was further divided into 5 sections. It included 40 statements designed according to the five-point Likert-scale format. Participants were requested to tick the appropriate box ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The questionnaire was validated by ten professors who recommended some changes. These recommendations were considered and necessary changes were made before administering the questionnaire. The students were given Arabic version of the questionnaire for their ease. The questionnaire was piloted on 15 students and was found to be reliable ( $\alpha = 0.938$ ).

### **3.4 Population and Sampling**

Students in their first semester (also known as intensive course students) in Unaizah Community College volunteered to participate in the study. All participants were male as there is gender-segregated education system in Saudi Arabia. These students are termed as intensive course students as they have 25 contact hours of English per week. They have studied English for seven years from grade six to grade twelve (6<sup>th</sup> primary to secondary school). They get admission in colleges and universities after passing the secondary school.

The study was conducted in Unaizah Community College which is a branch college of Al-Qassim University. It is located in Unaizah- a small town in Al-Qassim province, Saudi Arabia. Two sections of the first semester students were selected for the study. There were 64 students –33 in the experimental group and 31 in the control group. Majority of the students ranged from 18-20 years.

### 3.5 Data Collection

Data was collected during the second semester of the academic year 2014-2015. A 40-item questionnaire was prepared by the researchers and was used for collecting the data. Two intact groups of the students were selected for the study and they were randomly assigned to two groups— the experimental and the control group. The questionnaire was administered at the beginning of the semester. The experimental group was taught with STAD (a strategy of cooperative learning) for two weeks. The control group was taught with teacher-fronted or whole class instruction. After the treatment, the same questionnaire was re-administered.

The data was analyzed using SPSS 21. Independent Samples t-test was used to compare the means of the two groups. The reliability of the questionnaire was found out through Cronbach's alpha. The questionnaire was found to be highly reliable ( $\alpha= 0.922$ ).

## RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

The following findings emerged from the statistical analysis of the data. Table 1 shows the results of the independent samples t-test between the experimental and the control groups after the treatment.

**Table 1.** Results of independent-samples *t*-test of the post-test comparing the experimental and control groups.

	<i>n</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	Sig
Post-test Experimental	33	4.26	.39	.914	.364
Post-test Control	31	4.18	.42		

The comparison of the experimental group and the control group shows that there is a very small difference between their post-questionnaire responses in terms of motivation. The mean score of the experimental group (4.26) is slightly higher than the mean score of the control group (4.18). However, this difference is not significant at 0.05 level ( $p= 0.364 > 0.05$ ). Therefore, it can be concluded that Student Teams Achievement Division (STAD) has no effect on motivation of Saudi EFL Adult learners.

Table 2 illustrates a detailed analysis of the experimental group and the control group after the treatment:

*Self-confidence:* The comparison of the experimental and the control group shows that there is a difference between the post-questionnaire responses in terms of self-confidence. The mean score of the experimental group (3.93) is slightly higher than the mean score of the control group (3.71). However, this difference is not significant at 0.05 level ( $p=.113>0.05$ ).

*Self-efficacy:* The comparison of the experimental group and the control group shows that there is a difference between the post-questionnaire responses in terms of self-efficacy. The mean score of the experimental group (3.86) is slightly higher than the mean score of the control group (3.74). However, this difference is not significant at 0.05 level ( $p=.429>0.05$ ).

**Table 2.** Descriptive statistics of the experimental and control groups on the post-test.

Elements	Group	n	Mean	SD	t	Sig
Self-confidence	Experimental Group	33	3.94	0.47	1.607	.113
	Control Group	31	3.71	0.63		
Self-efficacy	Experimental Group	33	3.86	.58	.796	.429
	Control Group	31	3.74	.62		
Integrative motivation	Experimental Group	33	4.54	.44	.821	.415
	Control Group	31	4.44	.59		
Interest	Experimental Group	33	4.53	.43	.015	.988
	Control Group	31	4.53	.47		
Instrumentality	Experimental Group	33	4.35	.52	.393	.696
	Control Group	31	4.41	.53		

*Integrative motivation:* The comparison of the experimental group and the control group shows that there is a difference between the post-questionnaire responses in terms of integrative motivation. The mean score of the experimental group (4.54) is slightly higher than the mean score of the control group (4.44). However, this difference is not significant at 0.05 level ( $p=.415>0.05$ ).

*Interest:* The comparison of the experimental group and the control group shows that there is no significant difference between the post-questionnaire in terms of interest of the participants. Both the groups scored almost the same (4.53).

*Instrumentality:* While comparing the instrumentality, the experimental group and the control group show a different result than the other four variables. The result shows that the control group performed better than the experimental group. The mean score of the control group (4.40) is slightly higher than the mean score of the experimental group (4.35). However, this difference is not significant at 0.05 level ( $p=.696 > 0.05$ ).

Therefore, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group (taught with STAD) and that of the control group (taught with traditional method) on the post-test in terms of motivation of Saudi EFL adult learners.

**Table 3.** Results of independent-samples *t*-test of the experimental group comparing the pre-test and post-test.

	n	Mean	SD	t	Sig
Pre-test	33	4.166	.365	-1.008	.317
Post-test	33	4.260	.391		

Table 3 illustrates the results of the independent samples *t*-test of the experimental group on the pre-test and the post-test. The comparison, of the pre- and post-test responses of the experimental group by applying statistical analysis, reveals that there is a small difference between the pre- and post-questionnaire responses of the experimental group in terms of motivation. The mean score of the experimental group on the post-test (4.26) is higher than the mean score of the same group on the pre-test (4.17). However, this difference is not significant at 0.05 level ( $p = 0.317 > 0.05$ ). This means that there is no significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group on the pre-test and that of the same group on the post-test in terms of motivation.

Table 4 shows a detailed analysis of the experimental group before and after the treatment.

**Table 4.** Descriptive statistics of the experimental group on pre-test and post-test.

Elements	Test ( <i>n</i> = 33)	Mean	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	Sig
Self-confidence	Pre-test	3.77	.404	-1.577	.120
	Post-test	3.94	.470		
Self-efficacy	Pre-test	3.63	.518	-1.730	.088
	Post-test	3.86	.577		
Integrative Motivation	Pre-test	4.55	4.55	.103	.92
	Post-test	4.54	.44		
Interest	Pre-test	4.46	.478	-.598	.552
	Post-test	4.53	.434		
Instrumentality	Pre-test	4.32	.534	-.233	.816
	Post-test	4.35	.52		

*Self-confidence:* The comparison of the pre- and post-questionnaire responses of the experimental group shows that there is a difference between the pre- and post-questionnaire responses in terms of self-confidence. The mean score on the post-questionnaire (3.94) is slightly higher than the mean score on the pre-questionnaire (3.77). However, this difference is not significant at 0.05 level ( $p=.120 > 0.05$ ).

*Self-efficacy:* The comparison of the pre- and post-questionnaire responses of the experimental group shows that there is a small difference between the pre- and post-questionnaire responses in terms of self-efficacy. The mean score on the post-questionnaire (3.86) is slightly higher than the mean score on the pre-questionnaire (3.63). However, this difference is not significant at 0.05 level ( $p=.088 > 0.05$ ).

*Integrative motivation:* The comparison of the pre- and post-questionnaire responses of the experimental group shows that there is a small difference between the pre- and post-questionnaire responses in terms of integrative motivation. The score on integrative motivation has slightly dropped on the post-test. The mean score on the post-questionnaire (4.54) is slightly lower than the mean score on the pre-questionnaire (4.55). However, this difference is not significant at 0.05 level ( $p=.918 > 0.05$ ).

*Interest:* The comparison of the pre- and post-questionnaire responses of the experimental group shows that there is a small difference between the pre- and post-questionnaire responses in terms of interest. The mean score on the post-questionnaire (4.53) is slightly higher than the mean score on the pre-questionnaire (4.46). However, this difference is not significant at 0.05 level ( $p=.552 > 0.05$ ).

*Instrumentality:* The comparison of the pre- and post-test responses of the experimental group shows that there is a small difference between the pre- and post-questionnaire responses in terms of instrumentality. The mean score on the post-questionnaire (4.35) is slightly higher than the mean score on the pre-questionnaire (4.32). However, this difference is not significant at 0.05 level ( $p=.816 > 0.05$ ).

Therefore, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group (taught with STAD) on the pre-test and that of the same group on the post-test in terms of motivation of Saudi EFL adult learners.

**Table 5.** Results of independent-samples *t*-test of the control group on the pre-test and post-test.

	<i>n</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	Sig
Pre-test	31	4.165	13.290	-.201	.842
Post-test	31	4.184	16.855		

Table 5 shows the results of the independent samples *t*-test of the control group on pre- and post-questionnaire. The comparison of the pre- and post-questionnaire responses of the control group, shows that there is a very small difference between the pre- and post-questionnaire responses of the control group. However, the difference between the mean scores of the control group on the pre-test (4.17) and that of same group on the post-test (4.18) is not significant at 0.05 level ( $p = 0.842 > 0.05$ ). This means that there is no significant difference between the mean scores of the control group on the pre-test and that of the same group on the post-test in terms of motivation.

Table 6 shows a detailed analysis of pre- and post-test responses of the control group.

**Table 6.** Descriptive statistics of the control group on the pre-test and post-test.

Elements	Test ( <i>n</i> = 31)	Mean	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	Sig
Self-confidence	Pre-test	3.65	.40	.514	.609
	Post-test	3.71	.63		
Self-efficacy	Pre-test	3.53	.60	1.331	.188
	Post-test	3.74	.62		
Integrative motivation	Pre-test	4.59	.44	1.159	.251
	Post-test	4.44	.59		
Interest	Pre-test	4.46	.45	.582	.563
	Post-test	4.53	.47		
Instrumentality	Pre-test	4.48	.45	.622	.536
	Post-test	4.41	.52		

*Self-confidence:* The comparison of the pre- and post-questionnaire responses of the control group shows that there is a small difference between the pre- and post-questionnaire responses in terms of self-confidence. The mean score on the post-questionnaire (3.71) is slightly higher than the mean score on the pre-questionnaire (3.65). However, this difference is not significant at 0.05 level ( $p=.609 > 0.05$ ).

*Self-efficacy:* The comparison of the pre- and post-questionnaire responses of the control group shows that there is a small difference between the pre- and post-questionnaire responses in terms of self-efficacy. The mean score on the post-questionnaire (3.74) is slightly higher than the mean score on the pre-questionnaire (3.53). However, this difference is not significant at 0.05 level ( $p=.188 > 0.05$ ).

*Integrative motivation:* The comparison of the pre- and post-questionnaire responses of the control group shows that there is a small difference between the pre- and post-questionnaire responses in terms of integrative motivation. The score on integrative motivation has slightly dropped on the post-test. The mean score on the post-questionnaire (4.44) is slightly lower than the mean score on the pre-questionnaire (4.59). However, this difference is not significant at 0.05 level ( $p=.251 > 0.05$ ).

*Interest:* The comparison of the pre- and post-questionnaire responses of the experimental group shows that there is a small difference between the pre- and post-questionnaire responses in terms of interest. The mean score on the post-questionnaire (4.53) is slightly higher than the mean score on the pre-questionnaire (4.46). However, this difference is not significant at 0.05 level ( $p=.563 > 0.05$ ).

*Instrumentality:* The comparison of the pre- and post-questionnaire responses of the experimental group shows that there is a small difference between the pre- and post-questionnaire responses in terms of instrumentality. The score on the instrumentality has also slightly dropped. The mean score on the post-questionnaire (4.41) is slightly lower than the mean score on the pre-questionnaire (4.48). However, this difference is not significant at 0.05 level ( $p=.536 > 0.05$ ).

Therefore, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the mean scores of the control group (taught with traditional method) on the pre-test and that of the same group on the post-test in terms of motivation of Saudi EFL adult learners.

## DISCUSSION

The post-test scores of the experimental group and the control group showed that there was no significant difference between the two groups at 0.05 level. Both of the groups were almost equal in terms of motivation. The difference between the mean scores of the experimental group and the control group was not significant at 0.05 level. Therefore, it can be concluded that STAD has no effect on motivation of Saudi EFL adult learners.

Table 1 and 2 revealed no significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group and that of the control group on the post administration of the motivation questionnaire. The students in the experimental group were not better or worse than those in the control group in terms of motivation. This result is in line with those reached by Zain, Subramaniam, Rashid and Ghani (2009) and Khan and Inamullah (2011) that showed that there was no significant difference between the students using cooperative learning method and those using conventional method.

Table 3 and 4 showed no significant difference between the means scores of the experimental group on the pre-test and that of the same group on the post-test. The experimental group students on the post-test performed no better or worse than they did on the pre-test. This result is supported by the studies of Zain et al. (2009) and Khan and Inamullah (2011).

Table 5 and 6 showed no significant difference between the mean scores of the control group on the pre-test and that of the same group on the post-test. The control group students on the post-test performed no better or worse than they did on the pre-test in terms of motivation. The result is supported by the studies of Zain et al. (2009) and Khan and Inamullah (2011).

The results of the present study are inconsistent with the previous research findings of cooperative learning (Law, 2011; Mahmoud, 2014; Khan, Javaid and Farooq, 2015; Pan and Wu, 2013; Wang, 2012). Results of the abovementioned studies showed that students in cooperative learning groups developed group cohesion, which in turn enhanced their motivation to learn. Thus they performed better than the students in the control groups. The inconsistency between the results of the present study and those of the previous studies can be attributed to treatment duration. The treatment given in the present study as compared to the previous studies lasted for a very short period of time (two weeks). This was probably not sufficient for developing students' sense of belonging, social skills, and group processing skills, which are essential for cooperative learning to be effective. Results of this study might have been different if the treatment duration had been longer. Some other factors might have resulted in such inconsistent results.

The first and the foremost factor that should also be considered is that majority of the previous studies were conducted with non-English majors (Al-Shamy, 2012; Al-Zayid, 2012; Zhou, 2012). The results might be different when the CL strategies are used with English majors. Another possible factor that might have led to such inconsistent results may be the cultural differences. Kreishan and Al-Dhaimat (2013) analyzed different studies (Coleman, 1995; Dodick, 1996; Richard-Armato, 1998; Svanes, 1987)

and came to a point that different cultures react differently towards a target language. Thus, studying motivation also requires researchers to consider learners' background, culture and the status of language in that particular part of the world. Majority of the previous studies were conducted in the countries where English was taught as the first language. The idea of cooperation may still be considered as new in Saudi EFL classrooms since the students might feel more comfortable with the traditional methods of teaching.

In some cultures, traditional methods of teaching are so popular that they may hinder the success of new strategies. Tan, Sharan, and Lee (2007) conducted a study for six weeks in Singapore and concluded that the students in the traditional teaching method outperformed those in the Group Investigation (GI) method (a strategy of cooperative learning) in a geography class. Therefore, while applying CL strategies, all these issues should be considered before any conclusions are drawn.

## CONCLUSION

The aim of the present study was to investigate the effects of STAD on motivation of Saudi EFL adult learners. The findings suggest that STAD has no significant effect on motivation of Saudi EFL adult learners. Though the students in the experimental group performed better in all the variables except instrumentality (where the mean score of the control group was slightly higher than the experimental group), the difference between the experimental and the control group was not significant. The present study continued for two weeks only. Further research may be carried out for longer duration to find out the effects of STAD and other cooperative learning strategies on Saudi learners' motivation and achievement. Perhaps, repeated use of the cooperative strategies may create space for alternative learning and teaching strategies in teachers-centred classrooms in Saudi Arabia. Since Saudi EFL classrooms are heterogeneous, it is an opportunity for EFL teachers to try STAD and other cooperative learning strategies in different subject areas.

## REFERENCES

- Abdel Rauf, A. (2010). Grammar-translation method: Still alive in Arab TEFL classroom. *TESOL Arabia Perspectives*, 17 (1), 13-18.
- Alijanian, E. (2012). The effect of student teams achievement division technique on English achievement of Iranian EFL learners. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(9), 1971-1975.
- Al-Shamy, A.A.M. (2012). *Attitudes and motivation of EFL learners towards English: A case study of PYP Saudi university students*. (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Sunderland, United Kingdom.
- Al-Zayid, A. (2012). *The role of motivation in the L2 acquisition of English by Saudi students: A dynamic perspective* (Unpublished master's thesis). Retrieved from [http://works.bepress.com/ali\\_alzayid/1/](http://works.bepress.com/ali_alzayid/1/)
- Babee, N. (2012). Motivation in learning English as a second language: A literature review. *Canadian Journal for New Scholars in Education*, 4(1), 1-7.
- Brander, A. (2013). *Developing Language Learners with Dörnyei: A Study of Learning Environments and Motivation at a Swedish Upper-secondary School*. (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Höskolan, Sweden.
- Coleman, J. A. (1995). Progress, proficiency and motivation among British university language learners. *CLCS Occasional Paper*, 40. Retrieved from [https://archive.org/stream/ERIC\\_ED383221/ERIC\\_ED383221\\_djvu.txt](https://archive.org/stream/ERIC_ED383221/ERIC_ED383221_djvu.txt)
- Creswell, J.W. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- Dodick, D. J. (1996). A study of the attitudes and motivation of high school foreign language students. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 52, 577-595.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2010). Researching motivation: From integrativeness to the ideal L2 self. In S. Hunston & D. Oakey (Eds.). *Introducing Applied Linguistics: Concepts and Skills*. London: Routledge.

- Dörnyei, Z. & Ushioda, E. (2013). *Teaching and researching: Motivation*: New York, U.S.A. Routledge.
- Gardner, R. C. (2004) *Attitude/motivation test battery: International AMTB research project*. Canada: University of Western Ontario. Retrieved from <http://publish.uwo.ca/~gardner/docs/englishamtb.pdf>
- Hashemian, M. & Heidari, A. (2013). The relationship between L2 learners' motivation/attitude and success in L2 writing. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70, 476-489.
- Jacobs G. M. & McCafferty S.G. (2006). Connections between cooperative learning and second language learning and teaching. In S. G. McCafferty, G. M. Jacobs & A.C. DaSilvaIddings (Eds.), *Cooperative Learning and Second Language Teaching* (pp.18-29), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 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.
- Khan, S.A., Javaid, M.A. & Farooq, U. (2015). Evaluation of the effectiveness of cooperative learning method versus traditional learning method on the writing ability of the students. *Asian Journal of Management Sciences & Education*, 4 (1), 23-32.
- Krause, U.M., Stark, R. & Mandl, H. (2009). The effects of cooperative learning and feedback on e-learning in statistics. *Learning and Instruction*, 19(2), 158-170.
- Kreishan, L.J. & Al-Dhaimat, Y. (2013). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, orientation and achievements in 12 of Arab learners of English, French and German: A study from Jordan. *International Education Studies*, 6(12), 52-63.
- Law, Y. K. (2011). The effects of cooperative learning on enhancing Hong Kong fifth graders' achievement goals, autonomous motivation and reading proficiency. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 34(4), 402-425.
- Liton, H.A. (2013). EFL teachers' perceptions, evaluations and expectations about English language courses as EFL in Saudi universities. *International Journal of Instruction*, 6(2), 19-34.
- Mahmoud, M.M.A. (2014). The effectiveness of using the cooperative language learning approach to enhance EFL writing skills among Saudi university students. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 5(3), 616-625.
- Mohseny, A. & Jamour, F. (2012) The impact of student team achievement division on vocabulary learning of Iranian EFL pre-intermediate learners. *International Electronic Journal for the Teachers of English*, 2(6), 105-129.
- Moskovsky, C. & Alrabai, F. (2009). Intrinsic motivation in Saudi learners of English as a foreign language. *The Open Applied Linguistics Journal*, 2(1), 1-10.
- Pan, C.Y. & Wu, H.Y. (2013). The cooperative learning effects on English reading comprehension and learning motivation of EFL freshmen. *English Language Teaching*, 6(5), 13-27.
- Richard-Armato, P. A. (1988). *Making it Happen: Interaction in the Second Language Classroom*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Slavin, R.E. (1995). *Cooperative Learning: Theory, Research, and Practice* (2nd Ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Springsteen, S. M. (2014). *Examining student motivation in Saudi Arabia*. (Unpublished master's thesis). SIT Graduate Institute. Brattleboro, Vermont, United States.
- Svanes, B. (1987). Motivation and cultural distance in second language acquisition. *Language Learning*, 37, 341-359.
- Tan, I.G.C., Sharan, S., & Lee, C.K.E. (2007). Group investigation effects on achievement, motivation, and perceptions of students in Singapore. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 100(3), 142-154.
- Tiantong, M. & Teemuangsai, S. (2013). Student team achievement divisions (STAD) technique through the Moodle to enhance learning achievement. *International Education Studies*, 6(4), 85-92.
- Van Wyk, M.M. (2012). The effects of the STAD-cooperative learning method on student achievement, attitude and motivation in economics education. *Journal of Social Science*, 33(2), 261-270.
- Wang, M. (2012). Effects of cooperative learning on achievement motivation of female university students. *Asian Social Science*, 8(15), 108-114.
- Zain, Z. M., Subramaniam, G., Rashid, A. A., & Ghani, E. K. (2009). Teaching economics using cooperative learning approach: Accounting students' performance and attitude. *Canadian Social Science*, 5(6), 92-102.
- Zhou, H. (2012). Enhancing non-English majors' EFL motivation through cooperative learning. *Procedia Environmental Sciences*, 12, 1317-1323.

## Appendix: Questionnaire

Please tick  $\surd$  in the appropriate box.

1. Age: 15-20  21-25  26-30
2. Qualification: Secondary School Certificate  Others
3. Education outside the kingdom: Yes  No

<b>Section A (Linguistic self-confidence)</b>					
Statements	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
	1	2	3	4	5
1. I feel I am making progress in my subject 'Reading and Vocabulary Building' this semester.					
2. I believe I will get good grades in 'Reading and Vocabulary Building' this semester.					
3. I often experience a feeling of success in 'Reading and Vocabulary Building' class.					
4. In 'Reading and Vocabulary Building' class, I usually understand what to do and how to do it.					
5. I am sure that one day I will be able to speak English.					
6. This semester, I think I am good at this subject.					
7. I am worried about my ability to do well in 'Reading and Vocabulary Building' class.					
8. I often volunteer to do speaking presentations in 'Reading and Vocabulary Building' class.					
<b>Section B (Self-efficacy)</b>					
9. I think I understand the content that my 'Reading and Vocabulary Building' teacher teaches.					
10. I think I am able to help others in 'Reading and Vocabulary Building' class.					
11. I think I can offer useful opinions in 'Reading and Vocabulary Building' class.					
12. I am satisfied with my performance in this subject.					
13. I think I learn a lot from discussions with my classmates and teacher in this class.					
14. I feel a great sense of accomplishment when I finish my assignment in this class.					
15. I think I am able to express my ideas clearly in English in this class.					
<b>Section C (Integrative Motivation)</b>					
16. I want to know about the values and customs of English culture.					

17. Studying English can be important to me because it will allow me to be more at ease with native speakers of English.					
18. I am interested in English films and TV programs.					
19. I want to communicate with native speakers of English.					
20. I am interested in life style of native speakers English.					
21. I want to travel to English speaking countries.					
22. I want to read and write in English.					
23. I want to learn English because I will be able to understand and appreciate English art and literature.					
<b>Section D (Interest in L2)</b>					
24. I am very much interested in learning English.					
25. I always think it is worthwhile to spend more time studying English.					
26. I am pleased to take English classes.					
27. I like to speak English with my classmates.					
28. I expect to learn more English.					
29. I often feel the time passing quickly in 'Reading and Vocabulary Building' class.					
30. Studying English is an enjoyable experience.					
31. If I were visiting an English speaking country, I would like to be able to speak English.					
32. I wish I could speak English fluently.					
<b>Section E (Instrumentality)</b>					
33. I think studying English can be important to me because it will someday be useful in getting a good job.					
34. I think studying English can be important to me because English proficiency is necessary for promotion in the future.					
35. I think studying English can be important to me because with English I can work globally.					
36. I think studying English can be important to me because with a high level of English proficiency I will be able to make a lot of money.					
37. I think studying English can be important for me because I will need it for further studies on my major.					
38. I think studying English can be important to me because I would like to spend a longer time living abroad (e.g. studying and working).					
39. I think studying English can be important for me because I am planning to study abroad.					
40. I think the things I want to do in the future require me to use English.					