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ABSTRACT

This article reveals an experiment study to teach speaking in a senior high school in East Java. It discusses about the effectiveness of Coop Jigsaw Team Projects to teach speaking influenced by students' speaking anxiety. It also shows whether there is interaction or not between teaching method and students' speaking anxiety in student's speaking skill. The population of this research was the tenth grade students. The sample of this research was 40 students of experimental group taught using Coop Jigsaw team projects and 40 students of control group taught using Direct Instruction. The sampling applied was cluster random sampling. 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.
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INTRODUCTION

An effective speaking activity involves active students to participate and create a life communication. The ideal condition of English speaking class involves the students' effectiveness in participating teaching and learning process. Besides that, they should be able to master all aspects of speaking, which consist of pronunciation, grammatical accuracy, vocabulary, fluency, and content relevance. It means that the students should be able to pronounce all utterances clearly, speak grammatically correct, master many vocabularies so that their diction is good, speak fluently, and they should be able to understand everything they say.

Practically, teachers must be aware that students still face many problems in learning speaking. There are a lot of problems faced by Indonesian students in learning English especially in speaking skill. Some problems that are
faced by many students of tenth grade are they often get nervous to speak in front of many people when they are asked to present their work to their friends. It is a little bit easier when they have to present it by their own language, but they will feel hard when they have to speak English. Some students get anxious symptom when they are asked to show their speaking skill. They are afraid of other’s perception when they make mistakes whether it is on purpose or not.

Clark and Clark (1997: 223) states that speaking is a process of uttering words, phrases, and sentences, meaningfully using oral language in order to give information and ideas. It is clear that speaking is not just producing sound but there must be a meaning of that sound production which is going to be delivered by the speakers. The aspects analyzed in oral competence stated by Weir (1998: 147-148) are appropriateness, vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, fluency, and content. To master speaking, students are claimed to have all those aspects. Those aspects are also used to score students' speaking skill so that teachers are able to measure whether the students have already been good enough or not yet. In this study, the researcher adapts analytical scoring by Haris. Haris’ scoring rubric is used in this research because the language is much more understandable, this scoring rubric is also more complete, compels testers to take a variety of factors into account, and contains the analytic score that the performance is observed separately under the language components: pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension in 1-5 scale. The researcher uses content instead of comprehension since she wants to score the students in one-way speaking.

Based on the problem that most students at tenth grade face, they need some classroom activities which enable them to develop their skills to participate in oral interactions. Besides using different methods from time to time, teachers of English also try to find out the most effective method to help the students master English easily and effectively. The teacher cannot only deliver the lesson through oral explanation and writing on the board, but also be as creative as possible in choosing method to help them deliver the material of English more effectively.

The researcher gets the idea firstly from getting inspired by Spencer and Kagan that create classic cooperative learning. Cooperative learning can be one of the alternatives to cope with the students' speaking difficulty. Based on the problems above, the researcher considers using one of cooperative learning method that called Coop Jigsaw Team Projects to solve the
problems. This method divides the students into some teammates. Each teammate will get team topics and each student in it will have an expert topic to be discussed. After discussion, teammates will have a chance to present their last project in front of the class. Based on the steps of Coop Jigsaw Team Projects above, this kind of cooperative learning is very suitable method to be applied to tenth grade students of Senior High School using 2013 curriculum because this method is students-centered and integrated skill.

Another method that is usually used by teacher in teaching speaking is Direct Instruction Method. This method is teacher-centered that is dominated by the teacher to take a part in teaching and learning process. Students do not have many chances to show their speaking skill. According to Arends (2000: 264), Direct Instructional model is a teaching model that is aimed at helping students learn basic skills and knowledge that can be taught in a step-by-step fashion. From the definition above it can be concluded that Direct Instruction takes learners through the steps of learning systematically, helping them see both the purpose and the result of each step. The teacher usually spends some time lecturing, breaks the problems down into some steps, and gives students problems that should be accomplished on their own.

Besides all problem stated above, language anxiety also has very big influence in teaching and learning process of speaking. Horwitz (cited in Talebinejad and Nekouei, 2013: 1) states that anxiety is the subjective feeling of tension, apprehension, nervousness, and worry associated with an arousal of the automatic nervous system. Mesri (2012: 1) states that Foreign language anxiety is widely used to describe the feeling of tension and apprehension, which is specifically associated with foreign language learning contexts, including listening, speaking, reading, and writing. It can be concluded that students' language anxiety in speaking is students' feeling of tension and apprehension, which is specifically associated with speaking foreign language.

Foreign Language anxiety is used because it can represent an emotionally and physically uncomfortable experience for some students in EFL classes. If the students are very anxious in class, they are probably not actively involved in teaching learning process. It is because anxiety poses several potential problems for EFL students so that it can interfere with the acquisition, retention, and production of new language. To reduce students’ speaking anxiety, teachers should be able to create a comfortable atmosphere in teaching and learning process. As stated by Johnson, Johnson,&Holubec (1990); Oxford (1997)
and Slavin (1991) in Duxbury and Ling-Ling Journal (2010), cooperative learning has been suggested as one possible means of reducing anxiety in classrooms.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research was included as an experimental research with quantitative approach since the purpose of this research was investigating some cause-and-effect interactions of a number of variables. It is supported by Fraenkel et. Al., (2009: 261) that experimental research is type of research that directly attempts to influence a particular variable, and when properly applied, it is the best type for testing hypotheses about cause and effect relationship.

In this research, the population was the tenth grade students. The researcher took 2 classes consisting 40 students for each to be experimental group and control group as the sample. To achieve the research finding, the researcher needed data to be analysed. The required data were students’ speaking score to measure the students’ speaking skill and speaking anxiety questionnaire to know the level of students’ speaking anxiety. To obtain the data, it was needed some instruments. They were speaking test to obtain the students’ speaking score and close-questionnaire to obtain the data of students’ speaking anxiety.

In techniques of analyzing data, the researcher used descriptive and inferential analysis. Descriptive analysis was used to know the mean, median, mode, and standard deviation of the students’ scores in speaking test. Inferential analysis was applied to test the hypothesis. Before that, it was necessary to know data’s normality and homogeneity. The researcher, then, tested the hypothesis by using ANOVA and Tukey test. Anova was used to find out the difference between columns and rows. Tukey test was used to identify the significant difference between groups or cells.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

After gathering the research data, the researcher required to test the data’s normality and homogeneity. The data are in normal distribution if $L_o$ is lower than $L_t$ in the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$. Based on table 1, it can be identified that the data are in normal distribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Number of Data</th>
<th>$L_o$</th>
<th>$L_t$</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$A_1$</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$A_2$</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$B_1$</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$B_2$</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$A_1B_1$</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$A_1B_2$</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$A_2B_1$</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$A_2B_2$</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data are considered homogeneous when $\chi^2_o$ ($\chi^2_{\text{data}}$) is lower than $\chi^2_t$ ($\chi^2_{\text{table}}$) at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$. Based on data calculation, it...
can be identified that the data are homogeneous.

Table 2. Summary of Homogeneity Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>1/df</th>
<th>$s^2$</th>
<th>$\log s^2$</th>
<th>$df \log s^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.0526</td>
<td>26.57</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>27.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.0526</td>
<td>21.89</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>25.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.0526</td>
<td>26.73</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>27.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.0526</td>
<td>45.25</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>31.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σ</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0.2105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>111.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>9.04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$X^2/\alpha$</td>
<td>7.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After fulfilling the requirement of normality and homogeneity, the data were analyzed by using Multifactor Analysis of Variance 2x2 (ANOVA). $H_0$ is rejected if $F_o$ is higher than $F_t$. It means there is a significant effect of two independent variables to dependent variable. After knowing that $H_o$ is rejected, the analysis is continued by performing the comparison between cells using Tukey test to see where the significant difference is.

Table 3. Summary of Multifactor Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) 2 x 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variance</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>$F_t (0.05)$</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between columns</td>
<td>204.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>204.8</td>
<td>3.664</td>
<td>$H_o$ rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A1-A2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between rows</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>$H_o$ accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B1-B2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column by row</td>
<td>217.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>217.8</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>$H_o$ rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(interaction)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between group</td>
<td>456.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Group</td>
<td>2288.4</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>30.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2744.8</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the table, it can be concluded that:

1. $F_o$ between columns (6.80) is higher than $F_t(3.664)$ in the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$. It means the difference between columns is significant. $H_o$ is rejected. It can be concluded that Coop Jigsaw team projects method is more effective than Direct Instruction method to teach speaking.

2. $F_o$ between rows (1.12) is lower than $F_t(3.664)$ at the level significance $\alpha = 0.05$. It means the difference between rows is not significant. $H_o$ is accepted. It can be concluded that the difference of speaking skill between the students with low level of speaking anxiety and the students with high level of speaking anxiety is not significant.

3. $F_o$ interaction (7.23) is higher than $F_t(3.664)$ at the level significance $\alpha = 0.05$. It means there is interaction between the two variables: teaching techniques and self-concept. $H_o$ is rejected. Accordance with the result, it can be said that the effect of teaching methods on students’ speaking performance depends on the level of speaking anxiety.

Table 4. Summary of Tukey Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>$q_o$</th>
<th>$q_t$</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$A_1$ and $A_2$</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$B_1$ and $B_2$</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$A_1B_1$ and $A_2B_1$</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$A_1B_2$ and $A_2B_2$</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the analysis of Tukey test, it can be concluded as follows:

1. Because $q_o$ between columns $A_1$-$A_2$ is higher than $q_t$ (2.86) at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$, the
difference between columns is significant. Further, the mean score of $A_1$ (82.30) is higher than the mean score of $A_2$ (79.10). Hence, it can be concluded that Coop Jigsaw Team Projects is more effective to teach speaking than Direct Instruction.

2. Because $q_o$ between rows $B_1$ - $B_2$ (1.50) is lower than $q_i$ (2.86) at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$, the difference between columns is not significant. Hence, it can be concluded that the students having low speaking anxiety have similar speaking performance with those having high speaking anxiety.

3. Because $q_o$ between columns $A_1B_1$ and $A_2B_1$ (5.30) is higher than $q_i$ (32.95) at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$, the difference between teaching speaking using Coop Jigsaw Team Projects and Direct Instruction for students with low speaking anxiety is significant. Further, the mean score of $A_1B_1$ (84.60) is higher than the mean score of $A_2B_1$ (78.10). Hence, it can be inferred that Coop Jigsaw Team Projects is more effective than Direct Instruction to teach speaking for the students with low speaking anxiety.

4. Because $q_o$ between columns for $A_1B_2$ and $A_2B_2$ (0.08) is lower than $q_i$ (2.95) at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$, the difference between teaching speaking using Coop Jigsaw Team Projects and Direct Instruction for students having high level of speaking anxiety is not significant. It can be inferred that the students with high speaking anxiety get similar speaking performance when they are taught using Coop Jigsaw Team Projects or Direct Instruction.

**DISCUSSION**

The research reveals that Coop Jigsaw team projects is more effective than Direct Instruction to teach speaking. Logically, Coop Jigsaw Team Project is an effective method applied in teaching speaking of ESL instead of Direct Instruction since CJTP claims the students to be more active in the class. As known, an ideal condition of speaking class is the students’ effectiveness in participating teaching and learning process. Students should actively participate in classroom activities since speaking is an activity that asks the students to get along in class and talk a lot. As stated by Clark and Clark (1997: 223), speaking is a process of uttering words, phrases, and sentences, meaningfully using oral language in order to give information and ideas. Students are claimed to utter words means that they should talk to share ideas or information. If students want to get successful speaking
Coop Jigsaw Team Projects is the combination of Co-op Co-op and Jigsaw elements. This method is included in cooperative approach that divides the students into some teammates. Slavin (1990: 3) states that cooperative approach shares the idea that students work together to learn and responsible for their teammates’ learning as well as their own. Therefore, it persuades all the students to work together to solve the problems given. It also encourages them to be able to understand and master the task. This method gives a chance for them that need time to think individually before going to discuss it in a group.

Students have many characteristics in learning English, especially speaking. Many factors will influence their ability, for example; students’ anxiety, students’ self-esteem, students’ basic knowledge, etc. CJTP has a chronological steps allowing students to think individually, share it to the group and present it to the larger one that ease the students having difference characteristics to learn speaking much better. As stated by Kagan and Kagan (2009: 17.14), CJTP has the advantage of producing expression and allowing comprehensive coverage of a topic while allowing creative expression and allowing application-level thinking. Hence, all members have the same chance to express their creative ideas and share it to other members.

On the contrary, Direct Instruction method is done under the teacher’s strict direction and the students must follow a definite structure with specific steps to guide them toward achieving learning outcomes. As stated by Carnine in Miller (2001: 3), Direct Instruction is a method of skill-oriented and teacher-directed. It emphasizes the use of small group, face to face instruction by teachers and aides using carefully articulated lessons in which cognitive skills are broken down into small units, sequenced deliberately, and taught explicitly. This method emphasizes in the teaching direction on classroom activities. Students totally take a concern on teacher’s explanation. In this case, teacher has an important role in the implementation of Direct Instruction method. She takes control of the class condition. It is also supported by Harmer (2001: 94) that there is nothing wrong with teachers getting involved, of course, provided they do not start to dominate. It means that it does not matter if teacher has control in the class activities as long as students still able to get chance to show their oral ability.

Teaching learning procedures in Direct Instruction are started by providing objectives of the lesson. Then, teacher presents step by step information or material to the class.
Next, teacher gives tasks for guiding practice to the students. At last, teacher checks the students' understanding of the lesson and give feedback. The teacher's domination in the teaching and learning process makes the students passive so that they cannot practice ESL for often. So, it makes the ideal condition of speaking class is hard to be achieved since the students do not actively talk and share their ideas in the class.

In relation with the discussion above, it can be concluded that there are some differences between Coop Jigsaw team projects and Direct Instruction method. In the implementation of CJTP, students are claimed to be more active than the teacher. They are asked to practice more speaking than when Direct Instruction is applied in the class. Students are given chance to think individually, then share it to their group and present it to the whole students. It trains the students who have low confidence and high level of anxiety to present it to the small group before going to the larger one. The role of the teacher in the implementation of CJTP is only as a learning facilitator.

On the other hand, the activities stated before do not happen in the implementation of Direct Instruction. In this method, teachers have bigger role than the students. They tend to more dominated in controlling the activities in the class. Since teachers take more control in the class, students do not have many chances to practice or show their ability.

So, from the discussion and the result of this research, it can be concluded that Coop Jigsaw Team Projects is more effective than Direct Instruction in teaching speaking for tenth grade students.

The second result of this study shows that there is no significant difference in speaking between the students having low level of speaking anxiety and those having high level of speaking anxiety. In a learning process, the students with low level of anxiety tend to be able to come up with a high confidence in speaking rather than the students with high level of anxiety. As a result, students having low speaking anxiety will express his ideas and speak more confident in front of others. Students who have low speaking anxiety seem to be more active in class because they do not have any problem in producing new language. They are not afraid of making mistakes. They are willing to take a risk in every word they say. However, students with high speaking anxiety tend to be more silent. They are afraid of producing wrong new language. They avoid getting comment from their friends or teacher that will make them down. However, comment from other friends will establish their speaking skill.
After conducting this research, it is found that the students having high level of speaking anxiety have almost similar result with those who have low level of speaking anxiety on speaking performance. The logical reason behind this result is that students’ speaking anxiety is uncertain aspect that is able to influence students’ performance whether will give a better performance or not depending on any conditions. Williams (2008: 1) claims that although there are some kind of anxiety which give bad contribution to students learning, there can be a good kind of anxiety that is facilitating anxiety which can give positive effect on students learning. It means that students having low language anxiety will not always have better speaking performance than students having high level of speaking anxiety depending on how they manage their speaking anxiety.

The researcher found there were some factors causing speaking anxiety in some researches. It is also supported by Liu (2007: 128) that there were two main factors that cause speaking anxiety. The first is learners' characteristics such as low English proficiency, lack of preparation, lack of practice, fear of making mistakes and being laughed at, and personality. The second factor is classroom procedures including teaching method.

Since speaking anxiety is uncertain aspect that is able to influence students’ performance, the students should be able to manage their anxiety so that they are not getting burdened with it. It is linked with the first factor that causes anxiety that is students’ characteristics. It can influence their speaking performance. Horwitz (2001: 128) states that anxiety can lead the students to make error even for the bright students. It means that students with high level of English proficiency do not always have good English performance if they have a high level of anxiety and they can not control it. As stated by Griffin and Tyrrell (2007:5) that the students will reach optimal performance if they can control their anxiety into positive feeling instead of being controlled by it.

The example of how to manage students' anxiety into positive feeling is when they are lack of preparation. The study conducted by Marwan (2007: 48) revealed that lack of preparation was the primary causes of students' anxiety. The purpose of the preparation is to make the quality of the subsequent speaking reach a higher level than it would without the preparation (Nation &Newton, 2009: 155). Therefore, preparation is seem to be important when going to give a presentation orally especially for the anxious students. The preparation itself is different from one student to another. Some students study hard, train themselves to perform their speaking in front of mirror or their
close friends, and many others. A good preparation will lead to a good speaking performance.

Related to the discussion above, it reveals that speaking anxiety is uncertain in any conditions. All of the students can manage their Speaking anxiety to improve their speaking ability. Therefore, teachers have a great role in helping them. In conclusion, not all the students having low level of speaking anxiety have better speaking skills. From the result, it can be stated that the difference in speaking between the students having low level of speaking anxiety and those having high level of speaking anxiety for the tenth grade students.

The third result of this study reveals that there is interaction between teaching methods and speaking anxiety in teaching speaking. Appropriate teaching methods can give a significant effect on the students' speaking performance. One of appropriate teaching methods is Coop Jigsaw Team projects. This method is cooperative method that can increase students' confidence to speak in front of many people. It is supported by Barkley et al. (2005: 156) that this teaching method trains the students to work in small groups developing knowledge about given topic and formulating effective ways of teaching it to others. This is able to increase students' speaking performance. Besides teaching methods, there are many things that have to be taken into consideration. One of those things is students' speaking anxiety.

Speaking anxiety can influence students' speaking performance. Students with low level of anxiety will be very suitable with the implementation of CJTP in the classroom by considering their characteristics that are confident and more active. As stated by Horwitz, cited in Tallon, (2011), if the students are very anxious in class, they are probably not actively involved in teaching learning process. Foreign language anxiety has been found to have potential negative effects on academic achievement, cognitive processes, the social context, and the reaction for the language learner. It means students with low level of anxiety tend to be more active and often get involved in the class. They will practice speaking with no doubt. It indicates that the students with low speaking anxiety are more appropriate to be taught by using Coop Jigsaw Team Projects.

Students with high level of anxiety tend to be less confident and stay silent in the class rather than those having low anxiety. They are afraid of making mistakes, getting feedback from the teacher or their friends, and also scared of procuring negative evaluation. All those fears guide them into passive performance. As stated by Zeidners (1998: 293), people with high levels of
trait anxiety are often quite easily stressed and anxious. Students in this case will talk less and give the control to the teacher. These characteristics is suitable with the implementation of Direct Instruction in the teaching and learning process since DI is teacher-centered method that does not claim the students to be more active in the class since teacher takes control of the whole class activities. However, Williams (2008: 1) claims that although there are some kind of anxiety which give bad contribution to students learning, there can be a good kind of anxiety, that is facilitating anxiety which can give positive effect on students learning. Thus, the teachers’ real job would be to help students keep adequate anxiety, neither too high nor too low, because a proper level of anxiety plays a positive role and can motivate students to maintain their efforts in learning.

Logically, students with low level of anxiety will have better speaking performance than students having high speaking anxiety. However, it is not totally right. When students are able to control their anxiety, their speaking performance will not be influenced. To manage students' speaking anxiety, the implementation of teaching method will be very helpful. Based on the characteristics of CJTP and DI, both methods will guide the students having high level of speaking anxiety to get better performance. Therefore, both student-centered and teacher-centered methods give the same effect to the students with high level of speaking anxiety. Those methods can increase students speaking performance. It is also supported by findings of this research that the result of Tukey Test of students with high level of speaking anxiety who were taught by using Coop Jigsaw Team Projects and Direct Instruction is not significant that means they have similar speaking performance.

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATION

As the research result and the discussion elaborated above, the findings are follows: (1) Coop Jigsaw Team Projects is more effective than Direct Instruction to teach speaking at the tenth grade students; (2) There is no significant difference in speaking skill between the students having low level of speaking anxiety and those who have high level of speaking anxiety of the tenth grade students; (3) There is an interaction between teaching methods and students' speaking anxiety in teaching speaking at the tenth grade students.

Dealing with the research findings, Coop Jigsaw Team Projects can give effect to students’ speaking skills. The result of the research has proven that the students who are taught using Coop Jigsaw Team Projects have better
speaking skills than those who are taught using Direct Instruction.

The activities of Coop Jigsaw team Projects push the students to be more active and cooperative in learning speaking since CJTP is a cooperative teaching approach that claims the students to be more active in speaking and sharing their ideas. The students are given time to work with the topic given individually before they come to the group (small group). CJTP pushes the students to work together with their friends in their team. The students get good opportunity to gain and explore their ideas in their team. All students in a team have the same opportunity to share and gain knowledge and to practice their speaking before come in front of the class (larger group).
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