ESTEEM Journal of English Study Programme
E-ISSN: 2622-2213
P-ISSN: 2622-9323

# THE EFFECTS OF COOPERATIVE LEARNING METHOD AND LEARNING MOTIVATION: IMPROVING READING COMPREHENSION

**Hayani[1], Tahrun[2], Mulyadi[3]**

[1]MTs Negeri 2 Ogan Komering Ilir
[2,3]Universitas PGRI Palembang
Email: hayanicole88693@gmail.com[1], runtah98@yahoo.com[2], mulyadialiusman@gmail.com[3]

Accepted:

10 November 2024

Published:

10 January 2024

Corresponding Author:

Hayani

Email Corresponding:

hayanicole88693@gmail.com

**ABSTRACT**

The purpose of this study was to look into how eighth-grade students at MTs. Negeri 2 Ogan Komering Ilir's cooperative learning and learning motivation strategies affected their reading comprehension skills. The study investigated the effects of two independent variables—methods and learning motivation—using a 2x2 factorial design (with two levels: high motivation and low motivation). Four different groups were created out of the participants: class without treatment-low motivation, class without treatment-high motivation, cooperative learning-low motivation, and cooperative learning-high motivation. Tests and questionnaires were used to gather information about the participants' reading comprehension abilities. The results showed that students with varying levels of learning desire, as well as those who participated in cooperative learning and attended class without receiving any instruction, had differing reading comprehension abilities. Nevertheless, it was not discovered that there was a statistically significant interaction between cooperative learning and learning motivation. These findings imply that although learning motivation and cooperative learning both have an independent impact on reading comprehension, their combined effect could not have a substantial effect on students' performance in this specific situation. The results advance our knowledge of how technique and student motivation interact to improve reading comprehension abilities.

***Keyword: Cooperative Learning, Learning Motivation, Reading Comprehension***

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Decoding written or printed linguistic symbols, like letters and words, in order to derive meaning and understand the information presented in the text, is the process of reading. Reading is the process of identifying and deciphering words, phrases, and full chapters in order to learn new information, amass knowledge, or appreciate literary masterpieces. By extending information across time, reading activities promote ongoing development and advancement of individual knowledge (Senen et al., 2021). When people are not interested in reading, they find it challenging to extract knowledge or information from texts (Kamiliyah, 2019).

The capacity to comprehend written texts is an essential language skill because academic success in reading materials depends on students' ability to do so (Takaloo & Ahmadi, 2017). In the context of reading lessons, comprehension-focused activities are given a lot of weight. This emphasis is based on the concept that students' ability to read texts acts as a stimulant for the growth of their knowledge and their ability to learn new material. Drawing from the previously presented data, it may be concluded that the primary objective of reading in language instruction is to comprehend the meaning or substance of a work. Instead than concentrating on the meaning of individual

Vol 8 No. 1 (2025): ESTEEM

words or sentences, reading comprehension entails deriving meaning from a written text to obtain a complete knowledge of its content (Wolley, 2011, a referenced in Mustika, 2020). On the other hand, student motivation has an impact on how well they understand a material through reading. Lack of passion for learning can lead to poor reading or reading failure. The zeal or zealousness that propels people to participate in and stick with the learning process is known as learning motivation. If the students are motivated to read, they can read actively. Motivation can be defined as an innate drive that enables a person to choose and direct their own attitude. The phenomena entails the logical interaction of wants and motives within a specific situation, with the aim of achieving the individual's desired outcomes. Over time, this mechanism develops dynamically (Prihartanta, 2015).

In general, the teacher found students' motivation toward reading is still poor. They can finish reading a book but they cannot comprehend the text well. The problems above may come up because of the monotonous reading comprehension activities in classroom, students sit in rows four hour and asked to pay attention to verbal input that make their learning motivation decreased. The activities do not tap students various need in trying to comprehend reading text. They neglect the nature of the students who are unique and different from one another. Comprehension process is also neglected. Since we know that 2013 curriculum applied in Indonesia is intended to allow students to understand what is written in daily content and access knowledge.

According to the information from the English teacher interview, numerous students scored below the minimum achievement standards in reading comprehension. The results of the reading test for eighth graders revealed that most students scored below the passing grade. The passing grade is 75. The scores of the students got from written test which was done by the teacher. KEMENDIKBUD (2017) stated that a written test is a test used for measuring cognitive skills. The writer found students' reading assessment in the preliminary study who got score more than 86 were only 2 students. Those who got between 75 and 85 were 5 students, and the other students got less than 75 from totally 22 students in that class. It means many students got under the minimum passing grade (KKM: Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimal) of reading. Moreover, the direct observation previously done in class when the teacher reviewed the lesson by giving them some questions concerning reading comprehension, only few of them could answer those questions and the others tented to keep silent.

Referring to the data above, it is evident that eighth graders at MTs Negeri 2 Ogan Komering Ilir struggled to understand the content of the reading texts. Many students encountered difficulties when dealing with English texts, which is a foreign language for them, as observed in the preliminary study. Several factors contributed to the students' unsatisfactory reading comprehension results. Firstly, many students did not understand the meanings of numerous words in the text. Secondly, they were unable to grasp the content, making it hard to identify crucial information such as the topic, explicit and implicit details, and references. Thirdly, the students lacked knowledge of effective reading strategies and were not taught how to read properly. Additionally, the teacher employed a conventional teaching method, offering only brief explanations of the text. Lastly, the students were unmotivated, making the approach ineffective for promoting language acquisition. These issues significantly impacted the students' low reading achievement and need to be addressed.

An effective teaching strategy that lets pupils explore their ideas is required to increase reading comprehension. It takes skill and efficient strategies to read comprehension well. The Cooperative Learning Method is one of these techniques. According to Yassin et al. (2018), each group in cooperative learning is given individual and group learning duties. This means that each student must take on the responsibility of explaining what they have learned to their peers and actively share their knowledge within the group. As a result, group members hold conversations in order to work together to complete tasks, resolve issues, or meet particular objectives that have been specified by the instructor. With an eye toward improving students' comprehension of recount texts, the author conducted a study titled "The effects of cooperative learning method and learning motivation: Improving reading comprehension" in light of the description.

Vol 8 No. 1 (2025): ESTEEM

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Reading is an ability of reception in which the reader deciphers meaning from the author's expressed thoughts (Panggabean, 2022). This skill is classified as receptive, as it involves the reader's process of interpreting and extrapolating meaning from the writer's ideas and language. In the meantime, reading becomes essential for people who want to grow personally and keep up with the abundance of knowledge out there. It becomes an essential component of our professional, academic, and recreational commitments (Klimova & Zamborova, 2020). It conveys the idea that reading is essential for people who want to grow personally and stay informed in the face of an abundance of information.

According to Takaloo and Ahmadi (2017), in order to fully comprehend a written work, one must be able to identify the terminology used in it and draw links between it. It includes the capacity to ascertain the meaning of individual words and then deftly construct significant connections between them. Meniado (2016) went on to say that developing reading comprehension is an essential study ability for college students. Extensive reading is required for both academic and technical courses, highlighting the significance of students' ability to comprehend and analyze the content in order to succeed in their studies and future undertakings. The difficulty pupils have improving their reading comprehension is one of the biggest obstacles they confront when studying English as a second language. Since reading is the primary activity that improves learning, it becomes an increasingly important ability for knowledge acquisition (Saeed & Gull, 2023). To sum up, teaching reading comprehension entails guiding students in the application of appropriate and effective techniques that are customized to their individual reading objectives and assignments. The reader's engagement with the written material is critical to this process. Through the appropriate use of methods, readers can improve their comprehension and interpretation skills.

Furthermore, understanding a text can be influenced by students' motivation to learn. Prihartanta (2015) voiced that motivation can be defined as the actualization of the inner strength within an individual that can activate and direct behavior. It is a manifestation of the integrated interaction between motives and needs with observed situations, serving to achieve the individual's expected goals. This occurs in a dynamic process, where motivation functions to attain desired objectives and unfolds through the interplay of motives, needs, and the observed situation.

Motivation is a comprehensive term that encompasses and is influenced by various factors, including the activation, orientation, and strength of behavior (Wulf & Lewthwaite, 2016). It involves the intricate interplay of elements that not only trigger and energize actions but also determine the direction and intensity of those behaviors.

According to Chambers (as cited in Thao & Long, 2021) integrative motivation is marked by a favorable disposition towards the individuals and culture associated with the target language. In contrast, instrumental motivation involves learning the language for pragmatic reasons, such as securing employment or achieving success in an examination. While instrumental motivation focuses on acquiring a language as a tool for achieving specific objectives, like advancing in a career or comprehending academic texts, integrative motivation centers around seeking acceptance from another community or assimilating into a culture to become an integral part of that society.

In addition, to enhance students' reading comprehension, an appropriate method is required. In this case, the writer has chosen cooperative learning as the method to improve students' ability to comprehend reading texts. Cooperative learning is an educational approach where students collaborate in small groups to assist each other in comprehending the academic content presented in materials (Nurwanti et al., 2019). In addition, Henson (as cited in Keshavarzi & Nejad, 2015), cooperative learning and student-centered instruction may have roots that extend back to the inception of formal education. Further, Roufida (2016) defined that collaborative learning is a key method employed to facilitate the quick acquisition of information when learners study together. Cooperative learning is an educational method wherein students actively engage in small group interactions.

Likewise, Hayati et al., (2023) stating that through cooperative learning with environmental insight, students construct their

Vol 8 No. 1 (2025): ESTEEM

knowledge, analyze the findings, and present the findings in group discussions. Students who actively discuss in groups can express opinions, respond quickly to questions, and can solve problems. As well, Damayanti et al. (2023) noted that in cooperative learning, grouping students based on their achievement levels can potentially lead to dissatisfaction among some students. This dissatisfaction may arise from lower-achieving students becoming dependent on their higher-achieving peers. According to Sanjaya (cited in Rusman, 2014), cooperative learning involves students engaging in group activities. This group learning model consists of various activities carried out by students in designated groups to meet the set learning goals. Savage (cited in Rusman, 2014) also highlighted that cooperative learning is an approach focused on fostering collaboration within groups. This method aligns with social constructivist theory, which posits that knowledge is actively constructed by learners through interaction with others and their environment (Siller & Ahmad, 2024).

In summary, cooperative learning is an instructional method that enhances students' engagement, participation, and collaborative involvement through small group learning. This method promotes a sense of responsibility among students within the community, fostering an environment that emphasizes both individual and group accomplishments simultaneously. Moreover, the cooperative learning system proves beneficial in lessons by reducing the dominance of individual learners and a teacher-centered approach.

## 3. RESEARCH METHOD

### Design and Samples

The author carried out an experimental study. Because there are two components (learning motivation and cooperative learning method) and two levels (low and high motivation), she utilized 2 x 2 (two by two) factorial designs. This study's design uses a random sample selection process. Following the selection of the study sample, the author administers a pre-test. Prior to administering the post-test, the author treats the experimental group. Students' high and low levels of learning motivation serve as moderating variables. In the meantime, the writer does not instruct the control group. Six eighth graders from MTS Negeri 2 Ogan Komering Ilir in the academic year 2023–2024 make up the study's population. Two stage random sampling techniques—cluster random sampling and simple random sampling—were used by the writer to choose the sample. It is standard practice to combine basic random sampling with cluster random sampling. One technique for choosing subjects, groups, or clusters instead of individuals is cluster random sampling (Frankel et al., 2012).

### Instrument and Procedure

The writer used 2 x 2 (two by two) factorial designs because there are two factors (cooperative learning method and learning motivation) and two levels (low and high motivation). In addition, Creswell (2012) "The purpose of this design is to study the independent and simultaneous effects of two or more independent treatment variables on an outcome." The design of the study is as follows:

**Table 1. Factorial Design**

| | |
|---|---|
| Experimental Group<br>Control Group | R $O_1$ X $Y_1$ $O_2$<br>R $O_3$ C $Y_1$ $O_4$ |
| Experimental Group<br>Control Group | R $O_5$ X $Y_2$ $O_6$<br>R $O_7$ C $Y_2$ $O_8$ |

Source: Fraenkel, et al (2012)

In which:

- R refers to random all samples of groups encompassing experimental group and control group are selected at random.
- X refers to teaching treatment experimental group using cooperative learning method.
- C refers to conventional strategy (without treatment).
- O refers to observed variables (O1, O3, O5, O7, and O2, O4, O6, O8).
- O1 and O3 refer to pre test for experimental group and control group in high learning motivation.
- O2 and O4 refer to post test for experimental group and control group in high learning motivation.
- O5 and O7 refer to pre test for experimental group and control group in low learning motivation.

Vol 8 No. 1 (2025): ESTEEM

- O6 and O8 refer to post test for experimental group and control group in low learning motivation.
- Y1 refers to students with high learning motivation.
- Y2 refers to students with low learning motivation.

**Data Analysis**

The reading comprehension scores of the students served as the study's main source of information. Additionally, it is necessary to get the viewpoints of the students. In assessing the experiment's conduct as well as the thoughts of its participants, the students' perspectives are also beneficial. In order to alter learning motivation levels (high motivation and low motivation), the researchers choose to employ questionnaires.

The response options assign a value of 5 points for each strong agreement response, 4 points for agree, 3 points for neutral, 2 points for disagree, and 1 point for strongly disagree. The negative statement's values, on the other hand, were exactly the reverse of the positive statement's for each response option. Whether a statement was strongly disliked or strongly approved depended on its content. The table below displays it.

**Table 2. The Scoring of Questionnaire**

| Favorable Statement | Scale Value |
|---|---|
| Strongly agree | 5 |
| Agree | 4 |
| Undecided | 3 |
| Disagree | 2 |
| Strongly Disagree | 1 |

The maximum score for 20 items is 100 and the minimum score is 20. To ascertain if the students are highly or weakly motivated to study English, the results of their responses to the motivation questionnaire's overall score.

**Table 3. The Interpretation of the Questionnaire Scores**

| Score | Motivation Level |
|---|---|
| 20 – 60 | Low Motivation |
| 61 – 100 | High Motivation |

The writer employed four statistical studies to examine the data they had gathered using the SPSS 25 for windows program. These were the analyses: (1) The statistical on measuring data normality; (2) The Statistical on measuring data homogeneity, and (3) Independent T-test, (4) Two-way ANOVA.

## 4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The author used the test to gather information about the reading comprehension achievement scores of the students. Eight groups were created from the pre- and post-test results on the students' reading comprehension abilities. The results of the pretest scores for the highly motivated students in the experimental group are shown in the first category. The results of the pretest for the experimental group's low-motivation pupils are in the second category. The results of the highly motivated students in the experimental group's post-test scores are included in the third category. The results of the posttest scores for the experimental group's low-motivation pupils are in the fourth category. Conversely, the fifth category comprises the results of the control group's highly motivated students' pretest scores. The results of the pretest for the control group's low-motivation kids are in the sixth category. The results of the posttest scores for the highly motivated control group students are shown in the seventh category. The results of the posttest scores for the control group's low-motivation pupils are found in the eighth category.

The pretest score descriptive statistics for the highly motivated students in the experimental group are displayed in the following Table. A range of 20 is shown by the descriptive statistics for the pretest scores of 15 highly motivated students in the experimental group, with scores ranging from 64 to 84. With a standard deviation of 5.54806, the average score is roughly 74.93, suggesting some variance around the mean. The variance is roughly 30.781, and the total sum of the scores is 1124. These figures give an overview of the reading comprehension performance levels and score distribution within the particular group.

**Table 4. The Result of Pre-test Score of High Motivation in Experimental Group**

**Descriptive Statistics**

Vol 8 No. 1 (2025): ESTEEM

| | N | Range | Min | Max | Sum | Mean | Std. Deviation | Variance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pretest of High Motivation in Experimental | 15 | 20 | 64 | 84 | 1124 | 74.93 | 5.54806 | 30.781 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 15 | | | | | | | |

The descriptive statistics Table below provided for the pretest scores of 15 students with low motivation in the experimental group showcase the following information: The range of scores within this group is 16, with the minimum score recorded as 48 and the maximum score as 64. The sum of all the pretest scores is 840, resulting in average score of approximately 56.00. The standard deviation of 4.78091 indicates a moderate amount of variability in scores around the mean. The variance, calculated at 22.857, further quantities the spread of scores within the group. These statistics offer insights into the performance levels and distribution of scores for the 15 students with low motivation in the experimental group.

**Table 5. The Result of Pre-test Score of Low Motivation in Experimental Group**

**Descriptive Statistics**

| | N | Range | Min | Max | Sum | Mean | Std. Deviation | Variance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pretest of Low Motivation in Experimental | 15 | 16 | 48 | 64 | 840 | 56.00 | 4.78091 | 22.857 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 15 | | | | | | | |

The Table below presents the descriptive statistics of posttest scores for highly motivated students in the experimental group. These statistics indicate that among 15 students with high motivation, the score range is 12, with the minimum score is 84 and the maximum score is 96, with a mean score approximately 90.40 and a standard deviation of 4.48490. The total sum of scores is 1356, and the variance is approximately 20.114. These statistics offer insights into the performance levels and distribution of reading comprehension scores within this specific group.

**Table 6. The Result of Post-test Scores of High Motivation in Experimental Group**

**Descriptive Statistics**

| | N | Range | Min | Max | Sum | Mean | Std. Deviation | Variance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Posttest of High Motivation in Experimental | 15 | 12 | 84 | 96 | 1356 | 90.40 | 4.48490 | 20.114 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 15 | | | | | | | |

The descriptive statistics indicate the characteristics of the post-test scores for 15 students in the experimental group with low motivation. The range of scores within this group is 12, with the lowest score being 64 and the highest score being 76. The total sum of the scores is 1044, and the mean score is approximately 69.60, indicating an average level of performance. The standard deviation of 4.48490 suggests a moderate amount of variation around the mean. The variance is approximately 20.114, further quantifying the spread of scores within the group. In summary, these statistics provide a concise overview of the post-test scores for 15 students with low motivation in the experimental group.

**Table 7. The Result of Post-test of Low Motivation in Experimental Group**

Vol 8 No. 1 (2025): ESTEEM

**Descriptive Statistics**

| | N | Range | Min | Max | Sum | Mean | Std. Deviation | Variance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Posttest of Low Motivation in Experimental | 15 | 12 | 64 | 76 | 1044 | 69.60 | 4.48490 | 20.114 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 15 | | | | | | | |

The Table below demonstrates the descriptive statistics for pretest scores of 15 students with high motivation in the control group indicating a range 20, with scores varying from 60 to 80, the average score is approximately 70.93, with a standard deviation of 5.54806, indicating that there is variability around the average or mean. The total sum of the scores is 1064, and the variance is approximately 30.781. These statistics offered a brief summary of the performance levels and score distribution within this specific control group.

**Table 8. The Result of Pre-tet Scores of High Motivation Control Group**

**Descriptive Statistics**

| | N | Range | Min | Max | Sum | Mean | Std. Deviation | Variance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pretest of High Motivation in Control | 15 | 20 | 60 | 80 | 1064 | 70.93 | 5.54806 | 30.781 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 15 | | | | | | | |

The subsequent Table demonstrates the descriptive statistics for the pretest scores of 15 students with low motivation in the control group which are as follows: The range of scores is 16, with the lowest score being 44 and the highest score being 60. The average score approximately 52.00, with standard deviation of 4.78091, showing a degree of variation around the average. The total sum of the scores is 780, and the variance is approximately 22857. These statistics summarize the performance levels and score distribution among the low motivation students in the control group.

**Table. 9. Pretest Scores of Low Motivation in Control Group**

**Descriptive Statistics**

| | N | Range | Min | Max | Sum | Mean | Std. Deviation | Variance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pretest of Low Motivation in Control | 15 | 16 | 44 | 60 | 780 | 52.00 | 4.78091 | 22.857 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 15 | | | | | | | |

The accompanying Table shows the descriptive statistics providing an overview of the posttest scores for 15 students in the control group with high motivation. The range of the scores extends 12 points, with the lowest score at 72 and the highest at 84. On average, the students achieved a score 78.40, with a standard deviation of 4.48490, indicating some variability in performance. The total sum of the scores is 1176, and the variance is 20.114. These statistics provide understanding regarding the performance levels and score distribution within the control group, demonstrating the range, mean, standard deviation, sum, and variance of the posttest scores.

**Table 10. Post-test Scores of High Motivation in Control Group**

**Descriptive Statistics**

| | N | Range | Min | Max | Sum | Mean | Std. Deviation | Variance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Posttest of High Motivation in Control | 15 | 12 | 72 | 84 | 1176 | 78.40 | 4.48490 | 20.114 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 15 | | | | | | | |

The following table demonstrates the descriptive statistics revealing key insights into the posttest scores of 15 students with low motivation in the control group. The scores span a range 12, with the lowest score recorded at 56 and the highest at 68. On average, the students achieved a posttest score of approximately 61.60, while the standard deviation of 4.48490 indicates some variability around the mean. The total sum of the scores amounts to 924, and the variance is approximately 20.114. These statistics offer a brief summary of the posttest performance of the low motivation students in the control group, highlighting the range, average, variability, and overall distribution of scores within this particular group.

**Table 11. Post-test Scores of Low Motivation in Control Group**

**Descriptive Statistics**

| | N | Range | Min | Max | Sum | Mean | Std. Deviation | Variance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Posttest of Low Motivation in Control | 15 | 12 | 56 | 68 | 924 | 61.60 | 4.48490 | 20.114 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 15 | | | | | | | |

The normality test was employed to ascertain whether the sample originated from a population with a regular distribution. This test was conducted on the data distribution for each experimental and control group to determine if the samples from these groups were appropriately distributed.

**Table 12. The Result of Normality Test**

**Tests of Normality**

| | | Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a] | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Groups | Statistic | Df | Sig. |
| Reading Comprehension | Pretest Experimental | .141 | 30 | .132 |
| | Posttest Experimental | .157 | 30 | .056 |
| | Pretest Control | .141 | 30 | .132 |
| | Posttest Control | .134 | 30 | .180 |

The Table above illustrates that the data of experimental distribution for the pretest and posttest was 0132 and 0.056 (based on the Kolmogorov Smirnov test). On the other hand, the data distribution of pretest and posttest in the control group were 0.132 and 0.180 (based on Kolmogorov Smirnov test). It shows that the reading comprehension scores of 30

Vol 8 No. 1 (2025): ESTEEM

students from the experimental group and 30 students from the control group were normally distributed or had met the standards of the normality test since the Sig level value more than 0.05.

The results of the student′s pretest and posttest scores in the experimental and control groups were used to conduct this homogeneity requirement test. The following Table is an explanation of each homogeneity test.

**Table 13. Pre-test Scores of Experimental and Control Group**

**Test of Homogeneity of Variance**

| | | Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Rading Comprehension | Based on Mean | .000 | 1 | 58 | 1.000 |
| | Based on Median | .000 | 1 | 58 | 1.000 |
| | Based on Median and with adjusted df | .000 | 1 | 58.000 | 1.000 |
| | Based on trimmed mean | .000 | 1 | 58 | 1.000 |

Table above demonstrates that the experimental group and control group all had the same or homogenous group variance for all significant pretest values. Both of the Sig level values, which are higher than 0.05, demonstrates this. As can be seen, based on the mean, the significant value of two data was 1.000, whereas based on median, it was 1.000.

**Table 14. Post-test Scores of Experimental and Control Group**

**Test of Homogeneity of Variance**

| | | Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Rading Comprehension | Based on Mean | 3.089 | 1 | 58 | .084 |
| | Based on Median | 3.089 | 1 | 58 | .084 |
| | Based on Median and with adjusted df | 3.089 | 1 | 58.000 | .084 |
| | Based on trimmed mean | 3.089 | 1 | 58 | .084 |

The table above illustrates the posttest significant values in the experimental and control groups were 0.084 and 0.084, respectively, based on the mean as well as the median. The two Sig level values were greater than 0.05 which indicated that all these values had the same group variance or were homogeneous.

Concisely, the results of the independent sample t-test calculation for groups of students with high learning motivation and students with low motivation in experimental group in terms of reading comprehension achievement are presented in Table below.

**Table 15. Independent Samples Test**

**Independent Samples Test**

Vol 8 No. 1 (2025): ESTEEM

| | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | F | Sig. | t | Df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference |
| Cooperative Learning | Equal variances assumed | .000 | 1.000 | 12.701 | 28 | .000 | 20.800 | 1.638 |

The significance level of 0.000 indicates that the findings of the significance level 0.05, was determined by computing the difference test between the two means of the data and is shown in Table above. As a result, students who had high learning motivation taught using cooperative learning method and those who had low learning motivation taught using cooperative learning method demonstrated significantly different reading comprehension achievement.

Briefly, the results of the independent samples t-test for the students who have high learning motivation and those who have low learning motivation in control group toward reading comprehension achievement are presented in Table below.

**Independent Samples Test**

| | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference |
| Control Group | Equal variances assumed | .000 | 1.000 | 10.259 | 28 | .000 | 16.800 | 1.638 |

The results from Table above show that the Leveneʹs test for homogeneity of variances yields a significance value of 1.000 ($p > 0.05$), indicating that the variances of the two groups were equal. In equal variances assumed, the significance level of 0.000. This can be indicated from the results of the significance level < 0.05. it concluded there was a substantial difference in reading comprehension achievement between the students who have high motivation and those who have low motivation in control group.

The following table demonstrates the results of the independent sample t-test calculation for groups of students with high learning motivation and low learning motivation in the experimental and control group in terms of reading comprehension achievement.

**Independent Samples Test**

| | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | F | Sig. | T | df | Sig. (2- | Mean | Std. |

Vol 8 No. 1 (2025): ESTEEM

| | | | | | | tailed) | Difference | Error Difference |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reading Comprehension | Equal variances assumed | 3.089 | .084 | 3.662 | 58 | .001 | 10.000 | 2.731 |

The observation reveals that the calculation of the test of the difference two means data between students who have high motivation and those who have low motivation in the experimental and control group. The significance levels of 0.001, which indicated that the finding of the significance level 0.05. As a result, students with high motivation and low motivation who were taught using the cooperative learning method and those who had high motivation and low motivation in control group (without treatment) demonstrated significantly different reading comprehension achievement.

The Table below demonstrates the effect of variables, including the independent variable (teaching method) and moderator variables (learning motivation) on the dependent variable (reading comprehension).

**Table 16. Tests of Between-Subjects Effects**

Dependent Variable: Reading Comprehension

| Source | Type III Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Corrected Model | 6861.600[a] | 3 | 2287.200 | 113.710 | .000 |
| Intercept | 337500.000 | 1 | 337500.000 | 16779.119 | .000 |
| Method | 1500.000 | 1 | 1500.000 | 74.574 | .000 |
| Motivation | 5301.600 | 1 | 5301.600 | 263.574 | .000 |
| Method * Motivation | 60.000 | 1 | 60.000 | 2.983 | .090 |
| Error | 1126.400 | 56 | 20.114 | | |
| Total | 345488.000 | 60 | | | |
| Corrected Total | 7988.000 | 59 | | | |

a. R Squared = .859 (Adjusted R Squared = .851)

These findings imply that improved reading comprehension is a function of both the cooperative learning approach and students' individual learning motivation. Reading comprehension is significantly impacted by both motivation ($p < 0.001$) and the cooperative learning approach ($p < 0.001$). Nonetheless, there is no discernible difference in the results between the cooperative learning approach and learning motivation ($p = 0.090$). In conclusion, teachers can confidently employ the cooperative learning approach to help students with reading comprehension, even if they have different levels of motivation.

First, the results of the independent sample t-test indicate that there is a significant difference in reading comprehension achievement between students who were taught using the cooperative learning method and those who had low learning motivation. This is how the writer can interpret the findings above. This result was consistent with the claims made by Hayati et al. (2023) that students build their knowledge, assess the results, and communicate the results in group discussions via cooperative learning with environmental understanding. Second, the findings show that there were disparities in reading comprehension success in the control group—students who did not get any treatment—between students who had high and low learning motivation. According to Wulf and Lewthwaite (2016), the term "motivation" is broad and incorporates a

Vol 8 No. 1 (2025): ESTEEM

variety of elements, including the strength, orientation, and activation of behavior. It involves the complex interactions between variables that not only set off and energize behaviors, but also dictate their course and degree of intensity. Third, the author compared the reading comprehension mean scores of students who received cooperative learning instruction to those of the control group (i.e., students who did not get any therapy). As compared to their counterparts in the control group, students in the cooperative learning group achieved significantly higher mean scores, according to the data. In a similar vein, Damayanti et al. (2023) observed that cooperative learning can improve students' reading comprehension by stimulating their learning behaviors and encouraging their active participation in communication, problem-solving, and learning. Finally, the writer's analysis explored how students' learning motivation and the cooperative learning approach might interact to affect their reading comprehension skills. Analysis of the interaction effect shows that, despite students' differing levels of desire, cooperative learning has a constant influence on reading comprehension. It appears from the non-significant interaction effect that cooperative learning improves reading comprehension for all students equally, regardless of their motivation levels at the beginning. In the future, studies may focus on particular cooperative learning mechanisms that are most important in improving reading comprehension results in various motivated circumstances (Agustini et al., 2013).

## 5. CONCLUSION

These findings underscore the importance of integrating cooperative learning method into educational practices to create inclusive and engaging learning environments. By leveraging collaborative activities and promoting active student participation, educators can enhance both comprehension and critical thinking skills among students. Future research could delve deeper into specific components of cooperative learning that contribute most significantly to improved reading comprehension outcomes, offering further insights into optimizing instructional practices tailored to diverse student needs effectively.

## 6. REFERENCES

Autila, R. (2017). Improving students ' writing skill of recount text through diary writing. *Tell-Us Journal*, 3(1), 45-54. https://doi.org/10.22202/tus.2017.v3i1.2527

Banditvilai, C. (2020). The effectiveness of reading strategies on reading comprehension. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 10(2), 46-50. https://doi.org/10.18178/ijssh.2020.v10.1012

Brown, C., Schildkamp, K., &Hubers, M.(2017). Combining the best of two worlds: A conceptual proposal for evidence-informed school improvement. *Educational Research*, 59(2), 154-172.

Damayanti, E., Nur, F., Anggereni, S., & Taufiq, A. U. (2023). The effect of cooperative learning on learning motivation: A Meta-Analysis. *Buletin Psikologi*, 31(1), 116. https://doi.org/10.22146/buletinpsikologi.59583

Durriyah, R. (2018). The effectiveness of using small group discussion on students ' reading comprehension of recount text. UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta.

Fraenkel, J.R., et al. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. New York : McGraw-Hill.

Hayati, E. M., Purwanto, A., & Hidayat, D. R. (2023). Analysis of the cooperative learning effectiveness on students ' critical thinking skills in science learning for primary students. *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 15(1), 1145 - 1153. https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v15i1.994

Jaya, A. (2022). Exploring the Students' Speaking Ability based on their Different Personalities. *Journal Esteem*, 12.

Keshavarzi, A., & Nejad, S. G. (2015). The effect of cooperative learning on reading comprehension and reading anxiety of pre-university students. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 2(8), 169‑180. www.jallr.com

Kesumawati Nila and Ichwan Aridanu. (2017). *Statistik parametrik penelitian pendidikan*. Palembang: Noer Fikri.

Klimova, B., & Zamborova, K. (2020). Use of mobile applications in developing reading comprehension in second language acquisition −A review study. *Education Sciences*, 10(12), 1 ‑ 11. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci10120391

Lesiana, N., Mulyadi, Aswadi Jaya, & Pratiwi, E. (2023). Classroom Interaction in Communicative Language Teaching of Secondary School. *Esteem Journal of English Education Study Programme*, *7*(1), 61–71. https://doi.org/10.31851/esteem.v7i1.12661

Lestari, I. D. (2019). The implementation of small group discussion in teaching writing recount text for the tenth grade students of SMKN 1 Bendo. *English Teaching Journal : A Journal of English Literature, Language and Education*, 7(1), 20. https://doi.org/10.25273/etj.v7i1.4546

Mardliyah, N., Suryani, N., & Haryati, S. (2014). Perbedaan pengaruh cooperative learning tipe Think pair share ( Tps ) dan metode konvensional terhadap prestasi belajar mata pelajaran bahasa Inggris ditinjau dari motivasi belajar siswa kelas VIII pada MTs Negeri di kabupaten Kudus. 2(2).

Meniado, J. C. (2016). Metacognitive reading strategies, motivation, and reading comprehension performance of Saudi EFL students. English Language Teaching, 9(3), 117. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n3p117

Mustika, Y. (2020). Improving reading comprehension on recount text by using authentic material. *ELTR Journal*, 4(2), 140 - 151. https://doi.org/10.37147/eltr.v4i2.68

Nurwanti, N., Asrifan, A., & Haedar, H. (2019). The application of cooperative learning: Jigsaw II technique in improving students ' reading comprehension of expository text. *Journal of Advanced English Studies*, 2(1), 31. https://doi.org/10.47354/jaes.v2i1.52

Panggabean, E. D. (2022). The effect of using english authentic reading materials on the eighth grade students ' reading comprehension achievement at SMP Negeri 1 Sidikalang. 2(1), 17‑23.

Prihartanta, W. (2015). Teori-teori motivasi prestasi. Universitas Islam Negeri Ar-Raniry, 1(83), 1‑11.

Putri, A. D., Jaya, A., & Marleni, M. (2023). Exploring the Students' Speaking Ability Based on Their Different Personalities. *Esteem Journal of English Education Study Programme*, *6*(1), 10–16. https://doi.org/10.31851/esteem.v6i1.10203

Roufida, C. (2016). Investigating the importance of cooperative learning strategies to improve EFL learners ' reading comprehension skill. 2022 ‑ 2023.

Richards, J. C.,& Schmidt, R. (2013). Longman dictionary of language teaching andapplied linguistics (4th ed.). *Great Britain: Pearson Education*

Vol 8 No. 1 (2025): ESTEEM

*Limited*. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315833835

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in languageteaching: A description and analysis* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge UniversityPress.

Rusman. (2014). *Model-model pembelajaran: Mengembangkan profesionalisme guru*. Rajawali Pers. Jakarta.

Saeed, B., & Gull, M. (2023). Effect of cooperative learning on elementary students' reading comprehension in English. *Pakistan languages and humanities review*, 7(3), 338-351.

Sari, A., Jaya, A., Hermansyah, H., & Mortini, A. V. (2022). Using Mixidea Online Debating Strategy To Promote the Students' Speaking Ability. *Esteem Journal of English Education Study Programme*, *5*(2), 298–303. https://doi.org/10.31851/esteem.v5i2.8591

Senen, A., Sari, Y. P., Herwin, H., Rasimin, R., & Dahalan, S. C. (2021). The use of photo comics media: Changing reading interest and learning outcomes in elementary social studies subjects. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences*, 16(5), 2300 - 2312. https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v16i5.6337

Siller, H. S., & Ahmad, S. (2024). Analyzing the impact of collaborative learning approach on grade six students' mathematics achievement and attitude towards mathemat. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, 20(2). https://doi.org/10.29333/ejmste/14153

Sonia, A., & Fisher, H. (2016). Students' reading techniques difficulties in recount text. *Journal of English and Education*, 4(2), 1-12.

Takaloo, N. M., & Ahmadi, M. R. (2017). The effect of learners' motivation on their reading comprehension skill: A literature review. *International Journal of Research in English Education*, 2(3), 10 - 21. https://doi.org/10.18869/acadpub.ijree.2.3.10

Thao, T. Q., &Long, N. H. C. (2021). English-majored students' motivation in English language learning and their use of reading strategies: Research Perspectives. *VNU Journal of Foreign Studies*, 37(1), 109. https://doi.org/10.25073/2525-2445/vnufs.4661

Wulf, G., & Lewthwaite, R. (2016). Optimizing performance through intrinsic motivation and attention for learning: The OPTIMAL theory of motor learning. Psychonomic Bulletin and Review, 23(5), 1382 - 1414. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-015-0999-9

Yassin, A. A., Razak, N. A., & Maasun, T. N. R. (2018). Cooperative learning : general and theoretical background. 5(August), 642 - 654. https://doi.org/10.14738/assrj.58.5116

Yulianawati, I. (2019). An analysis of students' difficulties in writing recount text (A case study at a senior high school in Indramayu). English Focus: *Journal of English Language Education*, 2(1), 46-59. https://doi.org/10.24905/efj.v2i1.48