



LOGHAT ARABI

Jurnal Bahasa Arab dan Pendidikan Bahasa Arab

<https://journal.iaiddipolman.ac.id/index.php/loghat/index>



The Effectiveness of the Student Teams Achievement Divisions (STAD) Cooperative Learning Model in Improving Students' Arabic Writing Skills / Efektivitas Model Pembelajaran Kooperatif *Student Teams Achievement Divisions (STAD)* dalam Meningkatkan Keterampilan Menulis Bahasa Arab Siswa

M. Fikri Aziz^{1*}, R. Taufiqurrochman, Nur Hasaniyah³

^{1,2,3} Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang, Indonesia

Article Information:

Received : 25 Mei 2026

Revised : 26 Mei 2026

Accepted : 25 Juli 2026

Keywords:

Arabic Language Learning;
Arabic Writing Skills;
Cooperative Learning;
Structured Writing;
Student Teams Achievement
Divisions (STAD)

*Correspondence Address:

Vikry0609@mail.com

Abstract: This study aimed to examine the effectiveness of the Student Teams Achievement Divisions (STAD) cooperative learning model in improving students' structured Arabic writing skills at Madrasah Aliyah Al-Khoiriyah Malang. This study employed a quantitative approach with a quasi-experimental, non-equivalent control group design. The participants consisted of 52 tenth-grade students divided into an experimental group ($n = 27$) and a control group ($n = 25$). The experimental group received instruction through the STAD model, whereas the control group received conventional instruction. Data were collected through pre-tests, post-tests, observation, and documentation. Students' Arabic writing performance was assessed based on vocabulary selection, sentence construction, grammatical accuracy, spelling, organization, and neatness. The results showed that the mean score of the experimental group increased from 56.11 in the pre-test to 78.07 in the post-test, whereas the control group increased from 54.80 to 55.84. The mean N-Gain score was 0.51 for the experimental group, categorized as moderate, and 0.02 for the control group, categorized as low. The independent-samples test showed a statistically significant difference in post-test scores between the two groups ($p < 0.001$), while the Welch test also showed a significant difference in N-Gain scores ($p < 0.001$). These findings indicate that the STAD model produced significantly greater improvement in students' structured Arabic writing performance than conventional instruction under the conditions of this quasi-experimental study. The findings suggest that STAD can support Arabic writing instruction through peer interaction, collaborative practice, individual accountability, and structured feedback.

Abstrak: Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menguji efektivitas model pembelajaran kooperatif *Student Teams Achievement Divisions (STAD)* dalam meningkatkan keterampilan menulis terstruktur bahasa Arab siswa di Madrasah Aliyah Al-Khoiriyah Malang. Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan kuantitatif dengan desain kuasi-eksperimental non-equivalent control group. Partisipan penelitian berjumlah 52 siswa kelas X yang terdiri atas kelompok eksperimen sebanyak 27 siswa dan kelompok kontrol sebanyak 25 siswa. Kelompok eksperimen memperoleh pembelajaran dengan model STAD, sedangkan kelompok kontrol memperoleh pembelajaran konvensional. Data dikumpulkan melalui pre-test, post-test, observasi, dan dokumentasi. Keterampilan menulis bahasa Arab dinilai berdasarkan pemilihan kosakata, konstruksi kalimat, ketepatan tata bahasa, ejaan, organisasi, dan kerapian. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa rata-rata skor kelompok eksperimen meningkat dari 56,11 pada pre-test menjadi 78,07 pada post-test, sedangkan kelompok kontrol meningkat dari 54,80 menjadi 55,84. Nilai rata-rata N-Gain kelompok eksperimen sebesar 0,51 dengan kategori sedang, sedangkan kelompok kontrol sebesar 0,02 dengan kategori rendah. Hasil uji beda menunjukkan adanya perbedaan yang signifikan secara statistik pada skor post-test antara kedua kelompok ($p < 0,001$). Uji Welch juga menunjukkan adanya perbedaan yang signifikan pada skor N-Gain ($p < 0,001$). Temuan ini menunjukkan bahwa model STAD menghasilkan peningkatan keterampilan menulis terstruktur bahasa Arab yang secara signifikan lebih besar dibandingkan pembelajaran konvensional dalam kondisi penelitian kuasi-eksperimental ini. Temuan tersebut menunjukkan bahwa STAD dapat mendukung pembelajaran menulis bahasa Arab melalui interaksi teman sebaya, latihan kolaboratif, tanggung jawab individual, dan umpan balik yang terstruktur.



Loghat Arabi: Jurnal Bahasa Arab dan Pendidikan Bahasa Arab

Vol. 7, No. 2, Juli 2026 | DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36915/la.v7i2.797>

This is an open access journal, licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License
<https://journal.iaiddipolman.ac.id/index.php/loghat/index>

Introduction

Arabic plays an important role in Islamic education because it is the language of the Qur'an, Prophetic traditions, and various Islamic sciences. Arabic language instruction is therefore not limited to vocabulary and grammatical knowledge but also aims to develop learners' ability to use the language in oral and written communication. Among the four language skills, writing occupies an important position because it requires learners to integrate linguistic knowledge and intellectual processes in producing meaningful written expression.¹

Arabic writing is a complex productive skill. Learners are required to express ideas through written symbols while simultaneously paying attention to vocabulary selection, word order, grammatical structure, spelling, punctuation, and the logical organization of ideas. Consequently, writing cannot be developed merely through memorization of vocabulary and grammar. It requires gradual practice, continuous feedback, correction, revision, and appropriate instructional guidance.²

In the context of Arabic language learning at Madrasah Aliyah Al-Khoiriyah Malang, students continue to experience difficulties in producing correct Arabic sentences and organized written texts. The difficulties include selecting appropriate vocabulary, arranging words, applying grammatical patterns, and organizing ideas into short paragraphs. These difficulties indicate that students need learning activities that provide not only teacher explanation but also opportunities for guided practice, interaction, correction, and repeated writing practice.³

The instructional method used in the classroom is an important factor in addressing these difficulties. Conventional instruction that primarily relies on teacher explanation and individual exercises may provide limited opportunities for students to discuss ideas, exchange linguistic knowledge, and receive immediate feedback from peers. Cooperative learning offers an alternative approach by organizing students into

¹ Iskandarwassid dan Dadang Sunendar, *Strategi Pembelajaran Bahasa* (Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya, 2018), p. 226–233; Ahmad Fuad Effendy, *Metodologi Pengajaran Bahasa Arab* (Malang: Misykat, 2017), p. 98–105.

² Henry Guntur Tarigan, *Menulis sebagai Suatu Keterampilan Berbahasa* (Bandung: Angkasa, 2013), p. 22–37; Dalman, *Keterampilan Menulis* (Jakarta: Rajawali Pers, 2018), p. 3–17.

³ Ahmad Muradi, *Pembelajaran Menulis Bahasa Arab dalam Perspektif Komunikatif* (Jakarta: Kencana, 2020), p. 56–64; Iskandarwassid dan Dadang Sunendar, *Strategi Pembelajaran Bahasa*, p. 287–294.

small groups to work collaboratively while maintaining individual responsibility for learning outcomes.⁴

One cooperative learning model that is particularly relevant to writing instruction is Student Teams Achievement Divisions (STAD). Developed by Robert E. Slavin, STAD generally involves class presentation, heterogeneous team study, individual assessment, individual improvement scores, and team recognition. The model combines group cooperation with individual accountability. Through team activities, students can discuss vocabulary, arrange words, construct sentences, and correct errors before completing individual writing tasks. At the same time, individual assessment ensures that each student remains responsible for his or her own learning progress.⁵

Previous studies have reported positive relationships between cooperative learning and writing development. Studies of STAD in writing instruction have shown that collaborative discussion and peer correction can support students' ability to develop ideas and organize written texts. Research in Arabic language learning has also indicated that cooperative learning can support vocabulary use, sentence construction, and written expression. However, previous studies have differed in context, instructional focus, and research design. The present study specifically examines the effectiveness of STAD in structured Arabic writing among tenth-grade students at Madrasah Aliyah Al-Khoiriyah Malang using a quasi-experimental comparison between an experimental group and a control group.⁶

The research gap addressed in this study lies in the limited empirical examination of the effectiveness of the STAD model for structured Arabic writing in the Madrasah Aliyah context through a comparison of learning improvement between students receiving STAD instruction and those receiving conventional instruction. Unlike studies that primarily describe the implementation of cooperative learning, this study

⁴ Rusman, *Model-Model Pembelajaran: Mengembangkan Profesionalisme Guru* (Jakarta: Rajawali Pers, 2018), p. 201–214; Wina Sanjaya, *Strategi Pembelajaran Berorientasi Standar Proses Pendidikan* (Jakarta: Kencana, 2019), p. 239–252.

⁵ Robert E. Slavin, *Cooperative Learning: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 2nd ed. (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1995), p. 71–87; Rusman, *Model-Model Pembelajaran*, p. 213–220.

⁶ Muhammad Ardiansyah, Faizatun Sholihah, dan Leny Marlina, "Implementing the Cooperative Learning Type Scramble Method to Enhance Arabic Sentence Writing Skills," *Kalamuna: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Arab dan Kebahasaaraban* 5.2 (2024): 137–156; Lailatul Hayatunisa, "Student Teams Achievement Divisions (STAD) Technique in Teaching Writing Narrative Text," *Journal of English and Education* 2.1 (2014): 17–26.

quantitatively examines differences in students' writing performance before and after instruction.⁷

Accordingly, this study aims to examine whether the STAD cooperative learning model is more effective than conventional instruction in improving students' structured Arabic writing skills. The research hypothesis is as follows.

Methods

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative approach with a quasi-experimental design. A non-equivalent control group design was used because the study was conducted in existing classroom groups and individual random assignment was not possible.⁸

The research design was structured as follows:

Group	Pre-test	Treatment	Post-test
Experimental	O ₁	X	O ₂
Control	O ₃	—	O ₄

The experimental group received instruction using the STAD cooperative learning model, whereas the control group received conventional instruction.⁹

Participants

The participants consisted of 52 tenth-grade students from two existing classes at Madrasah Aliyah Al-Khoiriyah Malang. Class X-A, consisting of 27 students, served as the experimental group, while Class X-B, consisting of 25 students, served as the control group.

The experimental group consisted of 10 male and 17 female students, whereas the control group consisted of 17 male and 8 female students. Gender was not analyzed as an independent variable because the focus of this study was the effect of the instructional model on Arabic writing performance.¹⁰

⁷ John W. Creswell dan J. David Creswell, *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*, 5th ed. (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2018), p. 167–176; Sugiyono, *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif* (Bandung: Alfabeta, 2023), p. 130–145.

⁸ John W. Creswell and J. David Creswell, *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*, 5th ed. (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2018), p. 167–176; Sugiyono, *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif* (Bandung: Alfabeta, 2023), p. 130–142.

⁹ Sugiyono, *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif*, 145–151; Cohen, Louis, Lawrence Manion, and Keith Morrison, *Research Methods in Education*, 8th ed. (London: Routledge, 2018), p. 402–410.

¹⁰ Suharsimi Arikunto, *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*, rev. ed. (Jakarta: Rineka Cipta, 2019), p. 173–180.

Variables

The independent variable in this study was the STAD cooperative learning model, while the dependent variable was students' structured Arabic writing performance.

Students' writing performance was assessed through several components, including:

- vocabulary selection;
- sentence construction;
- grammatical accuracy;
- spelling;
- organization of ideas; and
- neatness.

An analytical scoring approach was used because Arabic writing performance consists of several interrelated components that should be evaluated separately to obtain a comprehensive assessment of students' writing ability.¹¹

Data Collection

Data were collected through pre-tests, post-tests, observation, and documentation. The pre-test was administered before the instructional treatment to measure students' initial Arabic writing performance. The post-test was administered after the instructional treatment to measure changes in students' writing performance.¹²

The writing tasks required students to produce structured Arabic writing based on the assigned topics. The pre-test topic was Introduction, while the post-test topic was Hajj and Umrah.

Observation and documentation were used to support the description of the instructional process and to verify that the learning activities were implemented according to the research design.¹³

Instructional Treatment

The experimental group was taught using the STAD cooperative learning model. The instructional process consisted of the following activities:

¹¹ Burhan Nurgiyantoro, *Penilaian Pembelajaran Bahasa Berbasis Kompetensi* (Yogyakarta: BPFE, 2016), p. 431–447; Henry Guntur Tarigan, *Menulis sebagai Suatu Keterampilan Berbahasa* (Bandung: Angkasa, 2013), p. 22–37.

¹² Sugiyono, *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif*, p. 216–223; Nana Sudjana, *Penilaian Hasil Proses Belajar Mengajar* (Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya, 2019), p. 35–47.

¹³ Suharsimi Arikunto, *Prosedur Penelitian*, p. 274–281.

1. Class presentation: The teacher introduced the learning material, vocabulary, sentence structures, and writing requirements.
2. Heterogeneous team formation: Students worked in small groups consisting of members with different levels of academic ability.
3. Team study: Students discussed vocabulary, arranged words, constructed sentences, and corrected grammatical errors collaboratively.
4. Individual writing task: Each student completed an individual writing assignment to demonstrate his or her own learning achievement.
5. Individual improvement: Students' individual progress was considered in evaluating learning improvement.
6. Team recognition: Group achievement was determined based on the improvement of individual members.¹⁴

The control group received conventional instruction. The teacher explained the material, provided examples, and assigned individual writing exercises without structured cooperative learning activities.¹⁵

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive analysis included the mean, minimum score, maximum score, and standard deviation.¹⁶

The normality of the data was examined using the Shapiro–Wilk test. Homogeneity of variance was examined using Levene's test. For comparisons between groups, an independent-samples *t*-test was used when the assumption of equal variances was met. When the homogeneity assumption was violated, Welch's *t*-test was used.¹⁷

The normalized gain (N-Gain) was calculated using the following formula:

¹⁴ Robert E. Slavin, *Cooperative Learning: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 2nd ed. (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1995), p. 71–87; Rusman, *Model-Model Pembelajaran: Mengembangkan Profesionalisme Guru* (Jakarta: Rajawali Pers, 2018), p. 213–220.

¹⁵ Wina Sanjaya, *Strategi Pembelajaran Berorientasi Standar Proses Pendidikan* (Jakarta: Kencana, 2019), p. 239–252.

¹⁶ Sugiyono, *Statistika untuk Penelitian* (Bandung: Alfabeta, 2019), p. 29–45.

¹⁷ Andy Field, *Discovering Statistics Using IBM SPSS Statistics*, 5th ed. (London: Sage Publications, 2018), p. 379–410; Ghazali, Imam, *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan Program IBM SPSS* (Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro, 2021), p. 31–47.

$$\text{N-Gain} = \frac{\text{Post-test score} - \text{Pre-test score}}{\text{Maximum score} - \text{Pre-test score}}$$

The statistical significance level was set at $\alpha = 0.05$.¹⁸

Results and Discussion

Description of the Participants

The study involved 52 tenth-grade students from two existing classes. Class X-A, consisting of 27 students, was assigned as the experimental group, while Class X-B, consisting of 25 students, was assigned as the control group.

Class	Group	N	Male	Female	Instructional Treatment
X-A	Experimental	27	10	17	STAD cooperative learning
X-B	Control	25	17	8	Conventional instruction

The number of students in the two groups was relatively comparable, with a difference of only two students. The study focused on comparing students' Arabic writing performance before and after instruction rather than examining gender differences.¹⁹

Instructional Treatment

The instructional activities were conducted using structured writing tasks. Both groups completed a pre-test and post-test using writing activities designed to assess vocabulary selection, sentence construction, grammatical accuracy, organization, and the production of short Arabic texts.²⁰

In the experimental group, instruction was organized around the STAD model. The teacher first presented the learning material and introduced vocabulary and sentence structures related to the writing topic. Students then worked in heterogeneous teams to discuss vocabulary, arrange words, construct sentences, and correct errors. After the collaborative activity, each student completed an individual writing task.²¹

¹⁸ Richard R. Hake, "Interactive-Engagement versus Traditional Methods: A Six-Thousand-Student Survey of Mechanics Test Data for Introductory Physics Courses," *American Journal of Physics* 66.1 (1998): 64–74; Sugiyono, *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif*, p. 238–245.

¹⁹ Creswell, John W., and J. David Creswell. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. 5th ed. Thousand Oaks, (CA: Sage Publications, 2018), p. 169–172.

²⁰ Nana Sudjana, *Penilaian Hasil Proses Belajar Mengajar* (Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya, 2019), p. 35–47.

²¹ Robert E. Slavin, *Cooperative Learning: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 2nd ed. (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1995), p. 71–87.

In the control group, the teacher explained the material, provided examples, and assigned individual writing exercises. Unlike the experimental group, the control group did not receive structured cooperative team activities.²²

Pre-test Results

The pre-test was administered to measure students' initial Arabic writing performance before the instructional treatment.²³

Group	N	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	SD
Experimental	27	56.11	40	70	9.64
Control	25	54.80	35	75	10.36

The mean difference between the two groups was 1.31 points. The experimental group obtained a mean score of 56.11, while the control group obtained 54.80. The independent-samples *t*-test showed that the difference was not statistically significant, $t(50) = 0.47, p = 0.638$.²⁴

This result indicates that the two groups had comparable initial writing performance before the instructional treatment.²⁵

Post-test Results

After the instructional treatment, a post-test was administered to measure students' Arabic writing performance.

Group	N	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	SD
Experimental	27	78.07	60	95	[insert actual SD]
Control	25	55.84	[insert]	[insert]	[insert]

The mean score of the experimental group increased from 56.11 to 78.07. In contrast, the control group increased only from 54.80 to 55.84.

The independent-samples *t*-test showed a statistically significant difference between the two groups in the post-test, $t(50) = 8.29, p < 0.001$. According to

²² Wina Sanjaya, *Strategi Pembelajaran Berorientasi Standar Proses Pendidikan* (Jakarta: Kencana, 2019), p. 239–252.

²³ Sugiyono, *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif* (Bandung: Alfabeta, 2023), p. 216–223.

²⁴ Andy Field, *Discovering Statistics Using IBM SPSS Statistics*, 5th ed. (London: Sage Publications, 2018), p. 397–405.

²⁵ Creswell and Creswell, *Research Design*, p. 173–176.

conventional statistical interpretation, this finding indicates that the probability of obtaining such a difference by chance is very small under the null hypothesis.²⁶

The result indicates that the experimental group achieved significantly higher post-test performance than the control group after receiving instruction through the STAD cooperative learning model.

N-Gain Analysis

To examine the relative improvement in students' writing performance, the normalized gain (N-Gain) score was calculated using the difference between pre-test and post-test scores.²⁷

Group	Mean N-Gain	Minimum	Maximum	SD	Category
Experimental	0.51	0.27	0.83	0.14	Moderate
Control	0.02	-0.07	0.12	0.05	Low

The experimental group obtained a mean N-Gain score of 0.51, which falls within the moderate improvement category. Meanwhile, the control group achieved a mean N-Gain score of only 0.02, indicating low improvement according to Hake's normalized gain classification.²⁸

The Welch test showed a statistically significant difference in N-Gain scores between the two groups, $t(32.275) = 17.50$, $p < 0.001$. Therefore, students taught using the STAD cooperative learning model demonstrated substantially greater learning improvement than those who received conventional instruction.²⁹

Normality Test

The Shapiro–Wilk test was used to examine whether the research data were normally distributed before conducting parametric statistical analysis.³⁰

²⁶ Imam Ghozali, *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan Program IBM SPSS* (Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro, 2021), p. 31–47.

²⁷ Richard R. Hake, "Interactive-Engagement versus Traditional Methods: A Six-Thousand-Student Survey of Mechanics Test Data for Introductory Physics Courses," *American Journal of Physics* 66.1 (1998): 64–74.

²⁸ Hake, *Interactive-Engagement versus Traditional Methods*, p. 65–67.

²⁹ Field, *Discovering Statistics Using IBM SPSS Statistics*, p. 420–427.

³⁰ Ghazali, *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan Program IBM SPSS*, p. 161–166.

Data	Group	W	p	Interpretation
Pre-test	Experimental	0.93	0.058	Normally distributed
Pre-test	Control	0.97	0.755	Normally distributed
Post-test	Experimental	0.97	0.718	Normally distributed
Post-test	Control	0.98	0.910	Normally distributed
N-Gain	Experimental	0.96	0.323	Normally distributed
N-Gain	Control	0.94	0.162	Normally distributed

Because all significance values exceeded 0.05, the null hypothesis of normality was retained, indicating that the distributions did not significantly deviate from normality.³¹

Homogeneity Test

Levene's test was used to examine the equality of variances between the experimental and control groups prior to conducting the independent-samples comparison.³²

Data	Levene Statistic	p	Interpretation
Pre-test	0.00	0.973	Homogeneous
Post-test	0.48	0.491	Homogeneous
N-Gain	14.43	<0.001	Heterogeneous

The pre-test and post-test data satisfied the homogeneity assumption. However, the N-Gain scores did not satisfy this assumption because the significance value was below 0.05. Consequently, Welch's *t*-test, which does not assume equal variances, was selected for comparing the N-Gain scores between the two groups.³³

Discussion

The results showed that the STAD cooperative learning model produced significantly greater improvement in students' structured Arabic writing performance than conventional instruction. The experimental group's mean score increased from 56.11 in the pre-test to 78.07 in the post-test, while the control group showed only a limited increase from 54.80 to 55.84. The N-Gain analysis also indicated a substantial difference in improvement between the two groups, with a mean score of 0.51 for the experimental

³¹ Field, *Discovering Statistics Using IBM SPSS Statistics*, p. 180–189.

³² Field, *Discovering Statistics Using IBM SPSS Statistics*, p. 248–252.

³³ George D. Ruxton, "The Unequal Variance *t*-Test Is an Underused Alternative to Student's *t*-Test and the Mann–Whitney U Test," *Behavioral Ecology* 17.4 (2006): 688–690.

group and 0.02 for the control group. These findings suggest that the structured collaborative learning environment provided by the STAD model contributed positively to students' Arabic writing achievement.³⁴

The improvement in the experimental group can be understood through the instructional structure of the STAD model. During the class presentation stage, students received explanations of vocabulary, sentence structures, and writing tasks from the teacher. This stage provided the linguistic input necessary for students before they participated in collaborative activities. During the team study stage, students discussed vocabulary, arranged words, constructed sentences, and corrected grammatical errors together. Such collaborative interaction enabled students to obtain immediate feedback from their peers before completing individual writing assignments.³⁵

The combination of collaborative learning and individual accountability represents one of the major strengths of STAD. Students were encouraged to exchange ideas and solve problems together, while individual quizzes and writing tasks ensured that each student remained personally responsible for his or her own learning achievement. This instructional principle distinguishes STAD from cooperative activities that rely solely on group products because every learner is required to demonstrate individual mastery after participating in team discussions.³⁶

The findings are also consistent with the theoretical characteristics of Arabic writing as a productive language skill. Writing requires learners to coordinate vocabulary, morphology, syntax, spelling, punctuation, and the logical organization of ideas simultaneously. Students who encounter difficulties in one linguistic component may benefit from peer interaction because discussion allows them to compare linguistic forms, identify errors, and negotiate meaning before producing written texts independently.³⁷

The positive findings of this study are consistent with previous research indicating that cooperative learning contributes positively to writing development.

³⁴ Robert E. Slavin, *Cooperative Learning: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 2nd ed. (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1995), p. 71–87; David W. Johnson, Roger T. Johnson, and Karl A. Smith, *Active Learning: Cooperation in the College Classroom*, 3rd ed. (Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company, 2006), p. 27–43.

³⁵ Slavin, *Cooperative Learning*, 88–96; Lev S. Vygotsky, *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978), p. 86–91.

³⁶ Slavin, *Cooperative Learning*, 112–128; Rusman, *Model-Model Pembelajaran: Mengembangkan Profesionalisme Guru* (Jakarta: Rajawali Pers, 2018), p. 213–220.

Previous studies have reported that STAD improves students' participation, idea generation, peer correction, and text organization. Similar findings have also been reported in Arabic language education, where cooperative learning has been associated with improvements in vocabulary acquisition, sentence construction, and written expression. The present study extends these findings by providing empirical evidence from a quasi-experimental design involving tenth-grade students at Madrasah Aliyah Al-Khoiriyah Malang.³⁸

From a pedagogical perspective, these findings imply that Arabic writing instruction should not rely exclusively on teacher explanation and individual exercises. Instead, teachers should organize writing instruction through sequential learning activities that begin with vocabulary exploration, followed by sentence construction, collaborative revision, and individual writing practice. Such learning stages provide opportunities for students to construct knowledge collaboratively while maintaining responsibility for individual achievement.³⁹

Despite these positive findings, several limitations should be acknowledged. The study involved only two existing classes within one educational institution, limiting the generalizability of the findings. Furthermore, the study adopted a quasi-experimental rather than a randomized experimental design. In addition, although writing performance was assessed analytically, further information regarding instrument validity, inter-rater reliability, and longer instructional duration would strengthen the methodological rigor of future studies.⁴⁰

Future research should therefore investigate the effectiveness of the STAD model in different educational contexts, with larger samples, longer intervention periods, and more comprehensive writing assessment instruments. Comparative studies involving other cooperative learning models, such as Jigsaw, Think-Pair-Share, or Team Games

³⁷ Henry Guntur Tarigan, *Menulis sebagai Suatu Keterampilan Berbahasa* (Bandung: Angkasa, 2013), p. 22–39; Dalman, *Keterampilan Menulis* (Jakarta: Rajawali Pers, 2018), p. 18–31; Iskandarwassid dan Dadang Sunendar, *Strategi Pembelajaran Bahasa* (Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya, 2018), p. 287–295.

³⁸ Muhammad Ardiansyah, Faizatun Sholihah, dan Leny Marlina, "Implementing the Cooperative Learning Type Scramble Method to Enhance Arabic Sentence Writing Skills," *Kalamuna: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Arab dan Kebahasaaraban* 5.2 (2024): 137–156; Lailatul Hayatunisa, "Student Teams Achievement Divisions (STAD) Technique in Teaching Writing Narrative Text," *Journal of English and Education* 2.1 (2014): 17–26; Robert E. Slavin, *Cooperative Learning*, p. 145–152.

³⁹ Wina Sanjaya, *Strategi Pembelajaran Berorientasi Standar Proses Pendidikan* (Jakarta: Kencana, 2019), 239–252; Rusman, *Model-Model Pembelajaran*, p. 201–220.

⁴⁰ John W. Creswell and J. David Creswell, *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*, 5th ed. (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2018), p. 171–176; Sugiyono, *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif* (Bandung: Alfabeta, 2023), p. 274–281.

Tournament (TGT), may also provide broader insights into effective instructional strategies for Arabic writing instruction.⁴¹

Conclusion

This study found that the Student Teams Achievement Divisions (STAD) cooperative learning model was associated with significantly greater improvement in students' structured Arabic writing performance than conventional instruction. The experimental group demonstrated a substantial increase in mean writing scores from 56.11 in the pre-test to 78.07 in the post-test, whereas the control group showed only a slight improvement from 54.80 to 55.84. Furthermore, the experimental group achieved a moderate N-Gain score (0.51), while the control group obtained a low N-Gain score (0.02). Statistical analyses confirmed that the differences between the two groups were significant, indicating that students who learned through the STAD model experienced greater improvement in Arabic writing performance than those who received conventional instruction.

The findings suggest that the effectiveness of the STAD model lies in its integration of teacher explanation, heterogeneous group discussion, collaborative error correction, individual writing practice, and individual accountability. These instructional components provide students with opportunities to exchange ideas, improve vocabulary selection, construct grammatically correct sentences, and organize written texts before completing individual writing tasks. Consequently, the STAD model represents an effective instructional strategy for developing structured Arabic writing skills in secondary Islamic education.

From a pedagogical perspective, Arabic language teachers are encouraged to incorporate cooperative learning activities into writing instruction in order to increase students' participation, interaction, and writing practice. The use of structured collaborative activities may facilitate not only linguistic development but also students' confidence and motivation to write in Arabic.

Nevertheless, this study has several limitations. The participants were drawn from only one Madrasah Aliyah, and the research employed a quasi-experimental design without random assignment. In addition, future studies should employ larger samples,

⁴¹ David W. Johnson and Roger T. Johnson, *Joining Together: Group Theory and Group Skills*, 12th ed. (Harlow: Pearson, 2019), p. 214–226; Anita Lie, *Cooperative Learning: Mempraktikkan Cooperative Learning di Ruang-Ruang Kelas* (Jakarta: Grasindo, 2017), p. 55–76.

longer intervention periods, and validated writing assessment instruments to strengthen the generalizability of the findings. Comparative studies involving other cooperative learning models may also provide broader evidence regarding effective instructional strategies for Arabic writing instruction.

Overall, this study contributes empirical evidence supporting the implementation of the STAD cooperative learning model as an effective pedagogical approach for improving structured Arabic writing skills among Madrasah Aliyah students. The findings may serve as a reference for Arabic language teachers, curriculum developers, and future researchers seeking to improve the quality of Arabic writing instruction through collaborative learning strategies.

References

- Ahmad Muradi. *Pembelajaran Menulis Bahasa Arab dalam Perspektif Komunikatif*. Kencana, 2020.
- Ardiansyah, Muhammad, Faizatun Sholihah, and Leny Marlina. "Implementing the Cooperative Learning Type Scramble Method to Enhance Arabic Sentence Writing Skills." *Kalamuna: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Arab dan Kebahasaaraban*, vol. 5.2 (2024): 137–156.
- Arikunto, Suharsimi. *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Rev. ed., Rineka Cipta, 2019.
- Cohen, Louis, Lawrence Manion, and Keith Morrison. *Research Methods in Education*. 8th ed., Routledge, 2018.
- Creswell, John W., and J. David Creswell. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. 5th ed., Sage Publications, 2018.
- Dalman. *Keterampilan Menulis*. Rajawali Pers, 2018.
- Effendy, Ahmad Fuad. *Metodologi Pengajaran Bahasa Arab*. Misykat, 2017.
- Field, Andy. *Discovering Statistics Using IBM SPSS Statistics*. 5th ed., Sage Publications, 2018.
- Ghozali, Imam. *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan Program IBM SPSS*. Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro, 2021.
- Hake, Richard R. "Interactive-Engagement versus Traditional Methods: A Six-Thousand-Student Survey of Mechanics Test Data for Introductory Physics Courses." *American Journal of Physics*, 66. 1 (1998): 64–74.
- Hayatunisa, Lailatul. "Student Teams Achievement Divisions (STAD) Technique in Teaching Writing Narrative Text." *Journal of English and Education*, 2.1 (2014): 17–26.
- Iskandarwassid, and Dadang Sunendar. *Strategi Pembelajaran Bahasa*. PT Remaja Rosdakarya, 2018.
- Johnson, David W., and Roger T. Johnson. *Joining Together: Group Theory and Group*

- Skills*. 12th ed., Pearson, 2019.
- Johnson, David W., Roger T. Johnson, and Karl A. Smith. *Active Learning: Cooperation in the College Classroom*. 3rd ed., Interaction Book Company, 2006.
- Lie, Anita. *Cooperative Learning: Mempraktikkan Cooperative Learning di Ruang-Ruang Kelas*. Grasindo, 2017.
- Nurgiyantoro, Burhan. *Penilaian Pembelajaran Bahasa Berbasis Kompetensi*. BPFE, 2016.
- Rusman. *Model-Model Pembelajaran: Mengembangkan Profesionalisme Guru*. Rajawali Pers, 2018.
- Ruxton, George D. "The Unequal Variance t-Test Is an Underused Alternative to Student's t-Test and the Mann–Whitney U Test." *Behavioral Ecology*, 17.4 (2006): 688–690.
- Sanjaya, Wina. *Strategi Pembelajaran Berorientasi Standar Proses Pendidikan*. Kencana, 2019.
- Slavin, Robert E. *Cooperative Learning: Theory, Research, and Practice*. 2nd ed., Allyn & Bacon, 1995.
- Sudjana, Nana. *Penilaian Hasil Proses Belajar Mengajar*. PT Remaja Rosdakarya, 2019.
- Sugiyono. *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif*. Alfabeta, 2023.
- Sugiyono. *Statistika untuk Penelitian*. Alfabeta, 2019.
- Tarigan, Henry Guntur. *Menulis sebagai Suatu Keterampilan Berbahasa*. Angkasa, 2013.
- Vygotsky, Lev S. *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Harvard University Press, 1978.