# THE EFFECTIVENESS OF CO-OP JIGSAW TEAM PROJECTS TO TEACH SPEAKING VIEWED FROM STUDENTS' SPEAKING ANXIETY

(An Experimental Study at the Tenth Grade of SMA N 2 Lamongan in the Academic Year of 2014/2015)

A Thesis



Diaz Innova Citra Arum S891302015

Submitted to Graduate Program of Sebelas Maret University as a Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements to Obtain the Graduate Degree of English Education

ENGLISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT GRADUATE PROGRAM OF TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION FACULTY SEBELAS MARET UNIVERSITY SURAKARTA

2015

#### APPROVAL

# THE EFFECTIVENESS OF CO-OP JIGSAW TEAM PROJECTS TO TEACH SPEAKING VIEWED FROM STUDENTS' LANGUAGE ANXIETY (An Experimental Study at the Tenth Grade Students of SMA N 2 Lamongan in the Academic Year of 2014/2015)

Written by: Diaz Innova Citra Arum S891302015

This thesis proposal has been approved by the consultants of English Education Department of Graduate Program of Teacher Training and Education Faculty of Sebelas Maret University

Consultant I

Dr. Ngadiso, M. Pd. NIP. 19621231 198803 1 009

Consultant II

Dr. Sujoko, M. Pd. NIP. 19510912 198003 1002

Approved by: The Head of English Education Department of Graduate Program of Teacher Training and Education Faculty

Dr. Abdul Asib, M. Pd. NIP. 19520307 198003 1 005

#### LEGITIMATION

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF CO-OP JIGSAW TEAM PROJECTS TO TEACH SPEAKING VIEWED FROM STUDENTS' SPEAKING ANXIETY (An Experimental Study at the Tenth Grade of SMA N 2 Lamongan in the Academic Year of 2014/2015)

> Written by: Diaz Innova Citra Arum S891302015

This Thesis has been Examined by the Board of Thesis Examiners of English Education Department of Graduate Program of Teacher Training and English Faculty of Sebelas Maret University On February 2015

Board of Examiners

Chairman Dr. Abdul Asib, M.Pd.

Secretary

Dra. Dewi Rochsantiningsih, M.Ed., Ph.D.

Examiners 1. Dr. Ngadiso, M.Pd.

2. Dr. Sujoko, M.A.

Signature

.....

Legalized by eacher Training and of Sebelas Maret sity

Prof. Dr. M Furqon Hidayatullah, M.Pd. NIP. 19600727 198702 1 001

The Head of English Education Department of Graduate School of Teacher training and Education Faculty Sebelas Marge University

Abdul Asib, M.Pd. NP. 19520307 198003 1 005

#### PRONOUNCEMENT

This is to certify that I myself write this thesis entitled "The Effectiveness of Co-op Jigsaw Team Projects to Teach Speaking viewed from Students' Speaking Anxiety (An Experimental Study at the Tenth Grade of SMA Negeri 2 Lamongan in the Academic Year of 2014/2015)". It is not a plagiarism or made by others. Anything related to other's work is written in quotation, the source of which is listed on the references.

If then this pronouncement proves incorrect, I am ready to accept any academic punishment, including the withdrawal or cancelation of my academic degree.

Surakarta, January 2015

Diaz Innova Citra Arum

#### ABSTRACT

Diaz Innova Citra Arum, S891302015. 2015. The Effectiveness of Co-op Jigsaw Team Projects to Teach Speaking viewed from Students' Speaking Anxiety (An Experimental Study at the Tenth Grade of SMA N 2 Lamongan in the Academic Year of 2014/2015). First Consultant: Dr, Ngadiso, M.Pd. second Consultant: Dr. Sujoko, M.A. Thesis Surakarta. English Education Department. Graduate School. Sebelas Maret Univerity.

This research is intended to reveal: (1) whether Coop Jigsaw team Projects is more effective than Direct Instruction method to teach speaking; (2) whether the tenth grade students having low speaking anxiety have better speaking skill that those having high speaking anxiety; and (3) whether there is an interaction between the teaching methods and students' speaking anxiety in teaching speaking.

This research was conducted in SMA Negeri 2 Lamongan in the academic year of 2014/2015. The method used in this research was experimental study. The population of this research was the tenth grade students which were grouped into twelve classes; eight classes of exact students, three classes of social students, and a class of language students. Since the population of this research was grouped into classes, the sampling applied was cluster random sampling. Then, the research sample was two classes which were taken randomly from exact students. They were X MIA 1 and X MIA 2 which acted as experimental and control class. To obtain the data of students' speaking score, a speaking test was conducted and a close questionnaire was used to obtain the data of students' speaking anxiety. Then, those data were analyzed through descriptive and inferential analysis using ANOVA and Tukey test.

The research findings are as follows: (1) Coop jigsaw Team projects is more effective that Direct instruction method to teach speaking for the tenth grade students; (2) both students with low and high speaking anxiety have similar speaking skill; and (3) there is an interaction between teaching methods and students' speaking anxiety in teaching speaking for the tenth grade students.

Based on the research findings, it can be concluded that Coop Jigsaw team Projects is more effective than Direct Instruction to teach speaking. Thus, it is recomended to the teacher to implement CJTP in speaking class since this teaching method is able to enhance the students speaking performance and able to encourage them to be more active in the class. However, for the next researchers who want to conduct the similar research, they can use this research as a reference.

**Keywords**: speaking, Coop Jigsaw Team Projects, Direct Instruction, students' speaking anxiety, experimental study

### ΜΟΤΤΟ

How big is your fault, your failure Then you regret it and want to be a good man You may, you will.. Wake up and be awesome!!

(Arum Ramadhani)

### **DEDICATION**

**Dedicated to** 

My mom.. My dad.. My sister, My niece & nephew My friends of Graduate Program 2013

....,

and I myself.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Alhamdulillahirabbil'alamin. Praise to ALLAH SWT for His blessing that the researcher can accomplish this thesis. In addition, this thesis can never be completed without the help of others. Therefore, she would like to express her deepest gratitude and appreciation to:

- Dean of Teacher Training and Education Faculty of Sebelas Maret University.
- 2. Head of the English Education Department of Graduate Program.
- 3. Dr. Ngadiso, M.Pd., the first consultant, for all his guidance, advice, patience and encouragement during completion of this thesis.
- 4. Dr. Sujoko, M.A., the second consultant, for his guidance and encouragement during the writing process of this thesis.
- 5. Headmaster of SMA Negeri 2 Lamongan.
- All teachers, especially English teachers of tenth grade of SMA Negeri 2 Lamongan.
- 7. Tenth grade students of SMA Negeri 2 Lamongan.
- 8. All friends and everyone who helped the writer in accomplishing the thesis.

The researcher hopes and accepts gratefully every comment and suggestion. Hopefully, this thesis will be useful for the readers.

Surakarta, January 2015.

Diaz Innova Citra Arum

### TABLE OF CONTENT

TITLE	i
APPROVAL	ii
LEGITIMATION	iii
PRONOUNCEMENT	iv
ABSTRACT	v
MOTTO	vi
DEDIACTAION	vii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	viii
TABLE OF CONTENT	ix
LIST OF TABLE	xii
LIST OF FIGURES	xiii
LIST OF APPENDICES	civ

# **CHAPTER 1.** INTRODUCTION

A. Background of the Study	1
B. Identification of the problems	6
C. Limitation of the Problems	7
D. Statements of the Research problems	7
E. Objectives of the Research	8
F. Significance of the Study	8

# **CHAPTER II.** LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Speaking 1	I
1. The Nature of Speaking 1	1
2. Micro and Macro Skills of Speaking 12	2
3. Teaching Speaking 14	4
4. Activities to promote Speaking 19	9
5. The Aspects of Speaking 2.	3
6. Assesing Speaking 24	4
B. Cooperative Learning 29	9

1. The Definition and of Cooperative Learning	29
C. Coop Jigsaw Team Projects	32
1. The Definition and of Coop Jigsaw Team projects	32
2. The Steps of Conducting Coop Jigsaw Team projects	34
3. The Role of Teacher and Students	42
4. The Strengths and Weaknesses of Coop Jigsaw Team	
projects	43
D. Direct Instructional Method	46
1. The Definition and of Direct Instructional Method	46
2. The Steps of Conducting of Direct Instructional	
Method	47
3. The Role of Teacher and Students	50
4. The Strengths and Weaknesses of Direct Instructional	
Method	51
E. Comparison in Teaching Speaking using Coop	
Jigsaw Team projects and Direct Instruction	
method	52
F. Speaking Anxiety	53
1. The Definition of Anxiety	53
2. The Cause of Anxiety	54
3. The Effect of Anxiety	59
4. The Aspects for Measuring Anxiety	60
5. Students' Speaking Anxiety	62
G. Review of Relevant Research	64
H. Ratinonale	69
1. The Difference between Coop Jigsaw Team projects	
and Direct Instruction Method	69
2. The Difference between the Students having High	
Speaking Anxiety and those having Low Speaking	
Anxiety	70
3. The Interaction between the Teaching Methods and the	
Students' Speaking Anxiety	70
I. Hypothesis	72
CHAPTER III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	
A. Setting of the Research	74
B. Research Design	75
C. Population, Sample, and Sampling	77
1. Population	77
1	

3. Sampling	79
D. Technique of Collecting Data	78
E. Technique of Analyzing Data	81
F. Statistical Hypothesis	89

#### CHAPTER IV. RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A. Research Implementation	91
B. Data Description	93
C. Data Analysis	106
1. Normality	106
2. Homogenity	109
D. Hypothesis testing	111
1. ANOVA	111
2. Tukey test	116
E. Findings Discussion	118

### **CHAPTER V.** CONCLUSION, IMPLICATION AND SUGGESTION

A. Conclusion	128
B. Implication and Suggestion	129
REFERENCES	134
APPENDICES	139

### LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1	The Aspects of Speaking	24
Table 2.2	The Scoring catagories by Brown	25
Table 2.3	The Scoring Rubric by Haris	27
Table 2.4	The Content Scoring Rubric	28
Table 2.5	The Calculation of Speaking Score	29
Table 2.6	The Example of the Implementation of CJTP	38
Table 2.7	The Steps of CJTP	42
Table 2.8	The Difference of CJTP and DI	53
Table 3.1	Research Activities	74
Table 3.2	Research Design	76
Table 3.3	ANOVA	87
Table 3.4	The Summary of 2x2 ANOVA	88
Table 4.1	The Summary of the Research Implementation	91
Table 4.1	Frequency Distribution A <sub>1</sub>	94
Table 4.2	Frequency Distribution A <sub>2</sub>	96
Table 4.3	Frequency Distribution B <sub>1</sub>	97
Table 4.4	Frequency Distribution B <sub>2</sub>	99
Table 4.5	Frequency Distribution A <sub>1</sub> B <sub>1</sub>	. 100
Table 4.6	Frequency Distribution A <sub>1</sub> B <sub>2</sub>	102
Table 4.7	Frequency Distribution A <sub>2</sub> B <sub>1</sub>	. 103
Table 4.8	Frequency Distribution A <sub>2</sub> B <sub>2</sub>	. 105
Table 4.9	Summary of Normality Test	. 109
	Summary of Homogeneity Test	
Table 4.11	Summary of Mean Scores	112
Table 4.12	Summary of Multifactor Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) 2 x 2.	114
Table 4.13	Summary of Tukey Test	. 117

### LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 4.1	The Histogram and Polygon of the Students' Speaking Score Taught Using CJTP $(A_1)$
Figure 4.2	The Histogram and Polygon of the Students' Speaking Score Taught Using $DI(A_2)$
Figure 4.3	The Histogram and Polygon of the Students' Speaking Score with Low Speaking anxiety (B <sub>1</sub> )
Figure 4.4	The Histogram and Polygon of the Students' Speaking Score with High Speaking anxiety $(B_2)$
Figure 4.5	The Histogram and Polygon of the Students' Speaking Score with Low Speaking Anxiety Taught by Using CJTP (A <sub>1</sub> B <sub>1</sub> ) 101
Figure 4.6	The Histogram and Polygon of the Students' Speaking Score with High Speaking Anxiety Taught by Using CJTP $(A_1B_2)$ 102
Figure 4.7	The Histogram and Polygon of the Students' Speaking Score with Low Speaking Anxiety Taught by Using $DI(A_2B_1)$ 104
Figure 4.8	The Histogram and Polygon of the Students' Speaking Score with High Speaking Anxiety Taught by Using DI (A <sub>2</sub> B <sub>2</sub> ) 105

#### LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix 1.1	Syllabus	141
Appendix 1.2	Lesson Plan of Experimental Class	165
Appendix 1.3	Lesson Plan of Control Class	206
Appendix 2.1	Blueprint of Speaking Test	243
Appendix 2.2	Scoring Rubric of speaking Test	244
Appendik 2.3	Speaking Test	246
Appendix 2.4	Readability Questionnaire of Speaking Test	247
Appendix 2.5	Result of Speaking Test Readability	248
Appendix 3.1	Blueprint Speaking Anxiety Questionnaire	250
Appendix 3.2	Speaking Anxiety Questionnaire	251
Appendix 3.3	Tryout of Speaking Anxiety Questionnaire	254
Appendix 3.4	Validity and Reliability of Speaking Anxiety Questionnaire	257
Appendix 3.5	Speaking Anxiety Questionnaire after Validation	264
Appendix 4.1	Speaking Test Score	268
Appendix 4.2	Speaking Test Score based on Speaking Anxiety Questionnaire .	274
Appendix 5.1	Normality Test	279
Appendix 5.2	Data Homogeneity	289
Appendix 6	ANOVA and Tukey Test	291
Appendix 7	Research Permission Letter	294