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Abstract – This research is conducted from the difficulties of students’ speaking skill in monologue text. The research is written to identify whether Group Investigation Method (GI) is more effective than Direct Method (DM) to teach speaking, to identify whether students having low communication apprehension have better speaking skill than those having high communication apprehension and to identify whether there is an interaction between teaching methods and communication apprehension in teaching speaking. The research methodology was the experimental research. The data collection used questionnaire and speaking test. The sampling of the data used cluster random sampling. The population of this research was eighth grade students of Junior High School. The data analysis shows the following findings: (1) GI is more effective than DM to teach speaking; (2) the students with low level of communication apprehension have better speaking performance than those with high level of communication apprehension; (3) there is interaction between teaching methods and the students’ level of communication apprehension for teaching speaking. It means that the effectiveness of the teaching methods depends on the degree of the students’ communication apprehension.
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INTRODUCTION

Speaking skill is a productive skill. When someone speaks, he or she can produce the oral expression to utter words, phrases and sentences to send his/ her information or ideas. 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. The purpose of speaking is supposed to be a means of communication in which it is unlimited in daily use. Last but not least, Chaney in Kayi (2006) views speaking as the process of building and sharing meaning through the use of verbal and non-verbal symbol, in a variety context.

With regards to speaking, it is one of the four language skills that must be learnt by the students in school. Speaking helps the students to communicate in the target language. They can share their experience, tell the short story, express their idea etc. Speaking skill is not only stopped in junior high school but also it will be used until the next grade and in a long life. That is why the mastery of
language especially speaking becomes the crucial thing to consider related to the main mission of education in Indonesia which is aimed to make the students have enough knowledge and life skills for their future (KTSP, 2007: 2).

As a productive skill, speaking has been a challenge for the students to perform. Unfortunately, most students assume it as a difficult skill to learn. Developing the learners’ communicative proficiency, conversation practice is probably the most important variable needed by people for communication. Based on the statement and based on the writer observation, students found difficulty in speaking monolog like giving announcement, retelling story, telling the process of something, describing things or places than dialog. They can not be fluent to practise it. Some reasons were caused it such as students’ reluctance, lack of motivation, uninteresting teaching method, etc. While the speaker should master several elements which are important such as: pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. Therefore the writer focused the research on speaking short functional text and monologue.

Teaching learning process is said to be successful when there is students’ involvement in the classroom activity. The new learning paradigm should provide wide space not only for teacher but also for learners. It is not easy to make the students speak. It deals with many factors to influence the students’ speaking skill. In general, the factors include internal and external factors. Internal factors are student’s mastery of linguistic features, student’s willingness to speak, students’ level of communication apprehension to express, students’ motivation, students’ self-esteem, etc. Meanwhile, the external factors are students’ condition, students’ social background and social income, facilities supporting the learning process, and teaching strategy. Teaching strategy can be used to influence the students’ speaking skill. Due to the importance of speaking, teacher has to find a suitable and effective method to influence the students’ speaking skill. In conducting this research, the writer implemented is Group Investigation Method which is compared with Direct Method.

Besides, Wrench, Peck Richmond and Gorhan (2009: 55) state that many students don’t learn when they are fearful, anxious, apprehensive or scared to communicate with the other. It can be defined that one of the problems in learning speaking is apprehensive aspect. Communication Apprehension

---
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can decrease the use of Group Investigation Method. Students who have high communication apprehension will have low skill in speaking. They may desire to communicate with their peer or teachers, but are impeded by their fear or anxiety about communication. Therefore, the students who have high communication apprehension will have difficulty in speaking, they will find difficulty to utter their words and feeling that will not make their speaking skill better. So, they will get better achievement if they are taught by direct method. On the other side, students who have low communication apprehension will have high skill in speaking. They will be brave to utter their words and express their feeling. Finally, they will have better speaking skill. Based on this condition, the students will be suitable taught using group Investigation.

By virtue of the above background of study, the writer formulates the problems as follows: (1) Is Group Investigation more effective than Direct Method for teaching speaking? (2) Do students having low communication apprehension have better speaking skill than those having high communication apprehension? (3) Is there any interaction between teaching methods and students' communication apprehension in teaching speaking?

By virtue of the above formulation of the problems, this research is primarily aimed at deciphering: (1) To identify whether or not Group Investigation is more effective than Direct Method in teaching speaking; (2) To identify whether students having low communication apprehension have better speaking skill than those having high communication apprehension; (3) To identify whether there is an interaction between teaching methods and communication apprehension in teaching speaking.

According to Hornby (1995: 1140) speaking as say of words, to know and be able to use a language; expressing one-self in words; making speech. Speaking is part of reciprocal exchange in which both reception and production a part (Widowson, 1978: 59-60). Later he states that the skill of speaking involves both receptive and productive participation. Speaking is productive rather than receptive skill because it is as a way in which the language system is manifested through the use of the organs of speech. Speaking is called as productive and receptive skill because it is used in communicative activities both listener as reception part and speaker as production part. And Tarigan (2008: 16)
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says that speaking is the ability to pronounce articulations’ of sounds or words to express thought, ideas and feels. Bailey (2005:2) also defines that speaking is as a way of processing information.

From the above experts' perspectives of speaking, it can at best be concluded that speaking is a part of language skills which is processing information ability by pronouncing of words and the function is to express and communicate the ideas between listener and speaker.

Still in line of speaking, Wollbert in Tarigan (1981: 18) states that the speaker concern four matters to explain their mind or opinion: first, speaker is a volition meaning and the meaning what they want is others' have. Second, the speaker is language user, construct their mind and soul to be words. Third, the speaker is something want to be observed, want to be listened, and delivered their mind and words by sounds. The last, the speaker is something that must be showed the figures, be seen and be read by eyes. The first point means the speaker has a purpose. He/ she want to know whether the others have an equal understanding on what the speaker said. The second means the speaker is manufacturer of words through contructing of mind which is used to share information. The third line, the speaker wants to be observed and to be listened on what he/ she said. Here, the listener should give an attention in order to observe what the speaker delivered in sounds. It is produced by words and mind.

Based on the definition above, it can be defined that the purpose of speaking is to communicate where the speaker must be seen in a volition, as a language user to construct their mind and words, as the object of observation and the figure as something act.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>Fluency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>Comprehension</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By converting experts' perspective aspects into the table, it can be drawn that there are five indicators of speaking. They are fluency, accuracy (vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation), content and comprehension. According to syakur (1987: 5), here are the description of the indicators' speaking: (1) Fluency: The ease and speed of the flow of speed; (2) Pronunciation: When teachers teach English, they need to be sure that their students can be understood when they speak. Students need to be able to say what they want to say; (3) Grammar: It is very needed by the students when the knowledge of grammar is essentially competent the language use. For example: they need to know what kind verbs that used by
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after the third person in simple present form (‘he swims’; ‘she runs’); (4) Vocabulary: Language students need to learn the lexis of the language. They need to learn what words mean and how they are used; (5) Comprehension: Requiring a subject to respond to speech as well as to initiate oral communication; (6) Content: Content means the quality of the language production. The spoken language should be easy to be understood by the listeners. Besides, it should consist of acceptable idea as the topic discussed. The content of the production cannot be separated from the language cultures and the language rules. The language expression used should be suitable with the condition of the conversation. Content is the spoken language element which determines the understanding among speakers so that they can communicate well.

Based upon the above experts' perspectives of speaking definition, speaking purposes and speaking indicators, it can be summed up that speaking is a part of language skills which is processing information by pronouncing words and the function is to express and communicate the ideas between listener and speaker. There are four indicators involved in speaking skill. They are fluency, accuracy (grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation), content, and comprehension.

In other case, concept of Group Investigation According to Slavin (1995: 112) defines that group investigation is appropriate for integrated study project that deal with the acquisition, analysis and synthesis of information in order to solve a multi-faceted problem. While according to Barkley, Patricia Cross & Howell Major (2005: 199) Group investigation is the student teams plan, conduct, and report on in-depth research project. Sharan and sharan (1990: 17) states that group investigation as a teaching method that the students take an active part in planning what they will study and how. Furthermore, according to Zingaro (2008: 01) states that group investigation is students form interest groups within which to plan and implement an investigation and synthesis the findings into a group presentation for the class. So, group investigation is a method which deals with the students’ teams plan, acquisition, analysis and synthesis of information to give opportunities to the students to get the knowledge what they will study and how continuing by group presentation for the class. By integrating these several steps, the students feel interesting to follow the speaking class. They are more attractive because they have many opportunities to speak and explain in front of their friends in a group. Beside that, the
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teacher’s role in GI is only as a facilitator among the students. GI may appear to be time consuming but it can make the class presentation more productive.

Here are some steps to reach for implementing of GI. According to Slavin (1995: 113) state that the steps for implementing of Group Investigation are the following: (1) Identifying the topic and organizing pupils in groups; (2) Planning the learning task; (3) Carrying out the investigation; (4) Preparing a Final Report; (5) Presenting the Final Report; (6) Evaluation.

On the other hand, Direct Method is also better-known as a teacher centered method. The teacher’s role is very important. Teacher invites the students to be more active. Here, the teacher have a role as the expert whose guide the students directly. As stated by Alan (2003: 11), Direct Instruction Method or teacher centered instruction generally put in “teacher-centered-instruction” the teacher role is that of a knowledge expert whose major job is to pass knowledge directly to students. Still in line, Direct Instruction model is teaching facts, rules, and action sequences are most efficiently achieved through a process (Borich, D. Gary 1996). Meanwhile Joyce, Weil, & Calhoun, 2000, in Magliaro et al (2005: 1) stated that direct instruction is an instructional model that focuses on the interaction between teacher and students. So, It can be concluded that direct method is a learning model which is applied from the teacher as the component to obtain effective learning in sequences and directly.

Arrends (1997: 66) summarized the DM steps into 5 phrases, namely: (1) Phrase 1, Provide objective and establish set teachers goes over objective for the lesson, gives background information, and explain why the lesson is important gets the students ready to learn; (2) Phrase 2, Demonstrate knowledge or skill. Teacher demonstrates the skill correctly or presents step by step information; (3) Phrase 3, Provide guide practice. Teacher structures initial practice; (4) Phrase 4, Check understanding and provide feedback. Teachers check to see students understanding and to provide feedback; (5) Phrase 5, Provide extended practice and transfer, teachers check condition for extended practice with attention to transfer to more complex and real life situation.

By seeing the degree of Communication Apprehension of the students, we can implement the effective method. Richmond and McCroskey (1998) in Wrench, Peck Richmond and Gorham (2009: 56) defines that Communication Apprehension is the fear or anxiety associated with either real or
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anticipated communication with another person or persons. It means that if we apply in a classroom, there are some students which have communication apprehensive may desire to communicate with their peer or teachers in the class, but they are always impeded by their fear or anxiety. A person who already has a fear tends to avoid everything in their around including to talk to the others. If someone does not want to talk to the others, there will also be no communication. Therefore, the writer chooses communication apprehension as a variable to know the students’ speaking skill. With a good speaking, people can communicate well. To be successful learners in learning speaking, students are required to be brave. Communication apprehension involves many problems solving in learning anxiety, be brave students, and measuring the students' fear to speak. Here, several aspects proposed by some expert. Then, the writer has an conclusion on a list to make easy on assessing of communication apprehension.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introvert</td>
<td>Introvert</td>
<td>Introvert</td>
<td>Introvert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self confidence</td>
<td>Self control/ self confidence</td>
<td>Self confidence Tolerance</td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>Adventurousness</td>
<td>Adventurousness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>Maturity</td>
<td>Maturity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self esteem</td>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Shyness        | Introvert                                | Anxiety                                    |                 |

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The method used in conducting this research was an experimental research. It attempts to investigate the influence of one or more variables to other variables. As stated by (Gall, Gall, and Borg, 2003: 365), experiment is the most powerful quantitative research method for establishing cause and effect relationships between two or more variables.

In parallel with this research, related to the effectiveness of teaching methods used as the independent variables and speaking skill as the dependent variables. Still in line, this research design used was factorial design. Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2007: 281) state that factorial designs also have to take account of the interaction of the independent variables. In this research, the independent variables divided into two. They were teaching method as active variables and student’s communication

1 (Student of English Education Department Graduate School of Teacher Training and Education Faculty)
2 (Lecturer of English Education Department Graduate School of Teacher Training and Education Faculty UNS)
apprehension as attributive variable. The teaching method used were Group Investigation as the experimental group and Direct Method as the control group.

This study was conducted at the eighth grade students which are intentionally divided into seven classes. Each class consists of 30 students, so that means there are 210 students for the total. The researcher decided to take only 2 classes from the population as the sample of this study. They are experimental group, and control group. To determine which one is experimental and control group, the researcher uses lottery to draw the class. Then, in dividing each of the classes into the group of high and low communication apprehension, the writer classified 14 students having high CA and 14 students having low CA for each class by using questionnaire.

The sampling technique used in conducting this research was cluster random sampling technique. Cluster random sampling is ideal when it is impossible or impractical to compile a test of the elements composing the population (Cresswell 2008: 156). The researcher made seven lotteries that represented the class A-G. All members of selected groups have similar chance. After that, the researcher took two lotteries randomly. Then the researcher got two classes, class A and class G. Then the researcher made a lottery again to determine the experimental group and control group.

Besides, in collecting the data, the writer used instruments i.e. questionnaires and speaking test. Questionnaire has an important role to know the students’ level of communication apprehension and to classify students into two groups, students who have low communication apprehension and those students who have high communication apprehension. Questionnaire has an important role to know the students’ level of communication apprehension and to classify students into two groups, students who have low communication apprehension and those students who have high communication apprehension. Whereas speaking test was done in order to know the students’ speaking skill. The questions of the test were arranged based on the indicators at the construct, formulated based on the operational definition, and those must involve all indicators of speaking skills including fluency, accuracy (vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation), content and comprehension.

The method used in analysing the data of this study was descriptive and inferential analysis. Descriptive analysis was used to know the mean, median, mode, and standard deviation of the scores of the speaking test,
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whereas Inferential analysis used was multifactor analysis of variance $2 \times 2$. After that was continued to know the degree of effectiveness using Tukey test.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Normality Test
From the data of the research can be concluded that the data obtained are in normal distribution. The sample is normal if $L_o$ ($L$ obtained) is lower than $L_t$ ($L$ table) at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$. $L$ is liliefors.

Homogeneity Test

Table 2. Summary of Homogeneity Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$1/df$</th>
<th>$\gamma^2$</th>
<th>$\log \gamma^2$</th>
<th>$(df)/\log \gamma^2$</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$\chi_t^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>16.63</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>7.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>17.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>42.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>16.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 5.56$

The data are homogenous if $x^2_o$ is lower than $x^2_t$ (0.05) or ($x^2_o < x^2_t$). Based on the calculation above, it can be seen that $x^2_o$ (3.81) is lower than $x^2_t$ (7.815). Thus, it can be concluded that the data are homogenous.

Table 3. The Mean Scores of Multifactor Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students' Level of Communication Apprehension</th>
<th>Teaching Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GI ($A_1$)</td>
<td>DM ($A_2$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low ($B_1$)</td>
<td>Mean = 83.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean = 71.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($B_1$)</td>
<td>($B_1$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High ($B_2$)</td>
<td>Mean = 71.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean = 76.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($B_2$)</td>
<td>($B_2$)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$c_1 = 77.68$

$c_2 = 73.96$

Table 4. The Summary of Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variance</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>$F_o$</th>
<th>$F_t(0.05)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between columns</td>
<td>193.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>193.14</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between rows</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column by rows</td>
<td>1045.79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1045.79</td>
<td>36.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1364.93</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>1481.29</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2846.21</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the data above, it can be concluded that: (a) Because $F_o$ between columns (6.78021) is higher than $F_t$ (4.03) at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ or (6.78021 > 4.03), $H_o$ is rejected and the difference between columns is significant. There is a significant difference between students who are taught using GI and those who are taught using Direct method in their speaking skill. The mean score of the students who are taught using GI (77.68) is higher than those who are taught using Direct method (73.96). Therefore, it can be concluded that GI is more effective than Direct method to teach speaking; (b) Because $F_o$ between rows (4.42318) is higher than $F_t$ (4.03) at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ or (4.42318 > 4.03), $H_o$ is rejected and the difference between rows is significant. There is a significant difference between students with low level Communication Apprehension and those with high level Communication Apprehension in their speaking skill. The mean score of the students with low level Communication Apprehension
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(77.3) is higher than those with high level Communication Apprehension (74.32). Therefore, it can be concluded that the students with low level Communication Apprehension have better speaking skill than those with high level Communication Apprehension; (c) Because $F_o$ columns by rows (36.7119) is higher than $F_t$ (4.03) at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ or (36.7119 > 4.03), $H_0$ is rejected and there is an interaction between teaching methods and the students’ level of Communication Apprehension in teaching speaking. Therefore, it can be concluded that the effect of teaching methods to teach speaking depends on the students’ level of Communication Apprehension.

**DISCUSSION**

Based on the data analysis, here are some findings: (1) Group Investigation is more effective than Direct method to teach speaking. Group Investigation helps the students form cooperative groups according to common interest in a topic which will be studied. All group members prepare a plan how to research their topic and carry out each part of the investigation to share the information and interact each other. Finally, they synthesize and present the finding in the whole class. As stated by Sharan and Sharan, states that in group investigation, students take an active part in planing what they will study and how (1989). From this activity, Group investigation gives opportunity not only to increase their speaking but also it can build the students’ ability in real social situation during the activity in a small group. As stated by Ornstein,

**Table 5. The Summary of Tukey Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Data Sample</th>
<th>$q_o$</th>
<th>$q_t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>$A_1 &gt; A_2$</td>
<td>$A_1-A_2$</td>
<td>3.68245</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>$B_1 &gt; B_2$</td>
<td>$B_1-B_2$</td>
<td>2.97428</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>$A_1B_1 &gt; A_2B_1$</td>
<td>$A_1B_1-A_2B_1$</td>
<td>8.66292</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>$A_1B_2 &gt; A_2B_2$</td>
<td>$A_1B_2-A_2B_2$</td>
<td>3.45515</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the table above, it can be concluded that if $q_o$ is higher than $q_t$ at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$, applying the data is significant.

Based on the result of Tukey test, Group Investigation is more effective for the students with low level of communication apprehension than direct method, and direct method is more effective for students with high level of Communication apprehension than Group Investigation. Therefore, there is an interaction between teaching methods and the students’ level of communication apprehension in teaching speaking. It means that the effect of teaching methods on speaking skill depends on the students’ level of communication apprehension.
dividing students into small groups seems to provide an opportunity for students to become more actively engaged in learning and for teacher to monitor students’ progress better. It can also enhance students’ cooperation and social skill (2000: 311). On the other side, teaching speaking using Direct method is different with teaching speaking using Group Investigation since Direct method is not a group work. The general goal of the Direct method is to provide learners with a practically useful knowledge of language. Direct Method includes lecturing, didactic questioning, explicit teaching, practicing and drilling, and demonstrating. Person, Hinson, and Brown (2001) say the teacher will be engaged in many planning decisions. It is highly structured and teacher directed. The teacher control occurs when the teacher selects and directs the learning tasks. In this case, the students tend to be passive and dependent. As the result, teaching speaking using Group Investigation method is more effective than Direct method; (2) Students with low communication apprehension have better speaking skill than those who have high communication apprehension. Basically, communication apprehension is a factor that may affect students’ ability to do something. In this case, students’ communication apprehension gives a great influence to their ability to express their feeling orally. Ideally, if students have low level of communication apprehension, they: are active to express their feeling orally, are brave to speak with their arround, like to share something, have high self confidence, are smart to make a decision, are not arrogant, etc. It is easy for them to understand the message for some expression in oral communication. They can decrease their anxiety in their arround. As stated by Pick Richmon and Gorham (2009: 55), the student who have low level of communication apprehension: like to talk; tends to have low general anxiety; tolerates ambiguous situations; has a high degree of self control; is adventurous; has a high self esteem; is emotionally mature; is assertive. According to communication apprehension theory, the meaning of speaking not only comes from expression itself but also how the speaker speak to each other, Bourhis et al. (2006) state that fear is generally considered ‘unreasoned’ in the sense that fear is something that can be conquered or reduced as a result of appropriate intervention and is not beyond control. So, it is easy for the students with low level of communication apprehension to speak each other or to communicate with another person or persons with their
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low anxiety. On the contrary, the student who have high level of communication apprehension they meet some difficult to speak, feel worried when they have to join with their group, have low self confidence, are not be able to make a decision, are arrogant, difficult to join with their friends or their group, etc. As stated by Wrench, Pick Richmon and Gorham (2009), the student who is highly communicatively apprehensive: scared to talk (tends to suffer from general anxiety); has low tolerance for ambiguity; lacks self control; is innovative; has a low tolerance for disagreement; is not adventurous; lacks emotional maturity; and is introvert.

McCroskey (1998) states that the high communication apprehensive’s peer groups often see her/ him as less approachable, less friendly, less talkative, less outgoing, less pleasant and less intelligent than the low communication apprehensive students. So, it is clear that student who have high communication apprehension become passive learners since they are not able to express their feeling orally each other. Therefore, it can conclude that the students with low level of communication apprehension have better speaking skill than the students with high level of communication apprehension; (3) There is the interaction between teaching methods and level of communication apprehension. Teaching speaking is not easy for second language learners as Indonesian students. One of cause is the level of students’ apprehensive in communication. Students who have low communication apprehension more active than students who have high communication apprehension. As stated by Wrench, Pickman, and Gorham, students do not do well in the classroom environment, when they are fearful, anxious, apprehensive or scare (2009: 55). Many students do not learn when they are fearful, anxiety, or apprehensive. The teacher must be smart to confront this students by selecting the appropriate teaching method. Teaching method which is used by the teacher in the class gives a big influence for the success of teaching and learning process. Meanwhile communication apprehension are important factor which influence the students to comprehend their speaking skill.

The use of Group Investigation method encourages students to speak more. It helps the students to communicate actively. Group Investigation is supported with discussing in a small group. It makes the students more comfort to communicate with their interest group than they speak alone in front of the class. As stated by Zingaro (2008: 01)
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Group investigation is students form interest groups within which to plan and implement an investigation and synthesize the finding into a group presentation for the class. Group Investigation activities give opportunity the students to have speaking activity in small group actively and independently. As stated by Ornstein, dividing into small group seems to provide an opportunity for students to become actively engaged in learning and for teacher to monitor students’ progress better. It can also enhance students’ cooperation and social skill (2000:311).

In small group, Group Investigation is suitable the students who have low communication apprehension in analyzing and synthesizing the topic. They have characteristics of active students who always like to talk and brave in every opportunity they have to try something new. Students with low level of communication apprehension feel more comfortable in learning speaking with group investigation method since this method encourages them to develop their skill in group freely. They feel free to discuss with their friends and change their opinion. So, they can prepare the report of their investigation and present it in the class orally. Therefore, group investigation method is more effective for teaching students with high level of communication apprehension.

On the other hand, direct method leads the students become passive learners since still use the teacher as the connector aspect. It means that the teacher is the first point in teaching and learning process. Without the teacher role, students can not learn in speaking class especially. The teacher always helps the students to express their speaking by teacher structure such as imitating of word. Teacher is the centre of teaching and learning process. Santrock (2008 in Hunt, 2009: 137) states that direct instructional method is a structured, teacher-centered approach for teaching characterized by teacher direction and control, and high teacher expectation for students’ progress. The teacher share word by word or sentence by sentence. Direct method is suitable for the student who have high level of communication apprehension. Students with high level of communication apprehension are not active and scare to talk. They do not want to appear foolish when they speak. As a result, they tend to keep silent during the lesson. They only want to speak by imitating and forcing from the teacher. As stated by Richmon and Gorham (2009: 56), communication apprehension

---
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students tend to be low verbalizers and often only speak when forced to do so. Realizing this fact, direct method is more effective than Group investigation method to teach speaking for the students who have high communication apprehension.

Therefore, there is an interaction between methods used and the level of communication apprehension of the students in teaching speaking. Group Investigation is more effective than direct method to teach speaking to the students with low level of communication apprehension. That means Group Investigation is suitable for students with low level of communication apprehension. Meanwhile, direct method is more effective than Group Investigation to teach speaking to the students with high level of communication apprehension. That means direct method is suitable for students with high level of communication apprehension.

CONCLUSION, IMPLICATION AND SUGGESTION

Based on the research finding described in data analysis, some conclusions are as follows: (1) Group Investigation is more effective than Direct Method to teach speaking; (2) The students with low level of communication apprehension have better speaking skill than those with high level of communication apprehension; (3) There is an interaction between teaching methods and the students' level of communication apprehension.

Group Investigation is proved to be more effective than direct method in teaching speaking. To make Group Investigation working properly, it needs to be applied properly in the teaching and learning process. The teacher can see it in the teaching steps of Group Investigation. Here are steps for implementing Group Investigation Method: (1) identifying the topic, students choose specific subtopics within a general problem. Then, students organize into several groups based on interest and heterogeneous; (2) Planning the learning task, students and teacher plan specific learning procedures, task, and goal consistent with subtopics of the problem selected in step 1; (3) Implementation, students carry out their plan formulated in step 2. Learning should involve a wide variety of activities and skills such as investigation, analysing, discussion, and synthesis the source. It should lead students to look for the different kinds of source both outside and inside the school. The teacher closely follows the progress of each group and offers assistance when needed; (4) Preparing final report, the students plan how their report can be
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summarized in some interesting form for possible display or presentation in the whole class after step 3; (5) Presenting the final report, the students or group give an interesting presentation to the audience. In order they can give feedback orally. Group presentation are coordinate by the leader; (6) Evaluation, in this step the students and the teacher evaluate each group’s contribution to the work of the class as a whole.

However, the result of the method applied is also affected by the students’ characteristics. Not all of the students feel comfortable with particular method. As proved by the research conducted by researcher, Group Investigation method is more suitable for the students with low level of communication apprehension. Meanwhile, direct method is more suitable for the students with high level of communication apprehension. Therefore, it is important for the teacher to examine the students’ characteristic, especially their level of communication apprehension.

For the last, related to this research, the researcher wants to give suggestion for the teachers, students, and other researchers as follows: (1) For teachers, Group Investigation is proved as an effective method and strongly recommended for the teachers to teach speaking. The teachers have to consider about the students’ level of communication apprehension since it affects the students achievement on speaking. As proved through this research, Group Investigation is suitable for students with low level of communication apprehension. Meanwhile, direct method is suitable for students with high level of communication apprehension; (2) For students, The students are expected to be more active in teaching and learning process in order to develop their speaking skill. The students need to adjust themselves to the method used by the teacher; (3) For future researchers, The future researcher may use the result of this research as a starting point to conduct another research with students in different condition or skill. The future researcher may also use the result of this research to develop this teaching method and make revision of the weaknesses found on this research.
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