KEEFEKTIFAN *CLT*, *TBLT* DAN *CLA* DALAM PEMBELAJARAN KETERAMPILAN BERBICARA DI UNIVERSITAS COKROAMINOTO PALOPO

Musliadi dan Widyastuti Purbani
Applied Linguistics, State University of Yogyakarta
Musliadi.uncp@yahoo.com, widyastuti_purbani@yahoo.com

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui mana yang yang lebih efektif antara: (1) *Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)* dan *Cooperative Learning Approach(CLA)*, (2) *Task-Based Language Teaching(TBLT)* dan *Cooperative Learning Approach*, dan (3) *Communicative Language Teaching* dan *Task-Based Language Teaching* dan (4) yang paling efektif antara *Communicative Language Teaching, Task-Based Language Teaching* dan *Cooperative Learning Approach* dalam pembelajaran keterampilan berbicara mahasiswa Universitas Cokroaminoto Palopo. Jenis penelitian ini adalah *quasi experiment* dengan *nonequivalent control group design*. Populasi penelitian ini adalah seluruh mahasiswa semester 5 Universitas Cokroaminoto Palopo, tahun ajaran 2013/2014. Sample dipilih menggunakan teknik *simplecluster random sampling*. Data dianalisis menggunakan *one-way ANOVA* dan dilanjutkan dengan *UjiScheffe*. Hasil Penelitian menunjukkan bahwa (1) *Communicative Language Teaching* lebih efektif daripada *Cooperative Learning Approach* dalam pembelajaran keterampilan berbicara, dengan nilai *mean difference* = 10.08920, (2) *Task-Based Language Teaching* lebih efektif daripada *Cooperative Learning Approach* dalam pembelajaran keterampilan berbicara, dengan nilai *mean difference* = 19.42360, dan (3) *Task-Based Language Teaching* lebih efektif daripada *Communicative Language Teaching* dalam pembelajaran keterampilan berbicara, dengan nilai *mean difference* = 9.33440 dan (4) *Task-Based Language Teachin*g paling efektif diantara ketiga pendekatan yang diteliti.

Kata Kunci: Communicative Language Teaching, Task-Based Language Teaching, Cooperative Learning Approach

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF CLT, *TBLT* AND *CLA* IN THE TEACHING OF SPEAKING SKILLS IN THE UNIVERSITY OF COKROAMINOTO PALOPO

ABSTRAK

This research aims to find out which approach is more effective between (1) Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and Cooperative Learning Approach (CLA), (2) Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) and Cooperative Learning Approach, and (3) Communicative Language Teaching and Task-Based Language Teaching, and (4) to uncover the most effective approach among communicative Language Teaching, Task-Based Language Teaching dan Cooperative Learning Approach in the teaching of speaking skills of the students at University of Cokroaminoto Palopo. This research is quasi experiment with nonequivalent control group design. The population of this research is the students of semester V at University of Cokroaminoto Palopo, at the academic year 2013/2014. The samples were chosen using simplecluster random sampling technique. The data were analyzed using one-way ANOVA and Scheffe Test. The results show that (1) Communicative Language Teaching is more effective than Cooperative Learning Approach in the teaching of speaking skills, with mean difference = 10.08920, (2) Task-Based Language Teaching is more effective than Cooperative Learning Approach in the teaching of speaking skills, with mean difference = 19.42360, and (3) Task-Based Language Teaching is more effective than Communicative Language Teachingin the teaching of

speaking skills, with mean difference = 9.33440 and (4) Task-Based Language Teaching is the most effective approach among the three observed approaches.

INTRODUCTION

In today's global world, a good professionalism, personality, and talent are required for someone to be successful in life. Speaking fluently is one of the skills needed to get a good job and to perform social interaction globally. It is clear that mastering English will influence people's professionalism, as McKay in Hornberger and McKay (2010: 89) clarifies that the English uses in present days will influence their professionals in the field. The ability to speak English fluently opens up wider opportunities to achieve success in life. Sometimes people build judgments about others based on their speaking ability. In addition, students of English who are going to apply scholarship and to complete their graduate in universities are required to be fluent in speaking.

Different people learn English for different purposes, for example to get quality education and to get good opportunities in building up their career. In communication, speaking is the main tool or we can say that we communicate in order to achieve a particular end, for example expressing ideas, expressing wish or desire to do something, solving a particular problem and maintaining social relationship. Therefore, we can say that speaking as a skill is playing a significant role in our lives.

In learning English, there are some skills that must be mastered by the learners. Brown (2001: 232) classifies the skills in English namely listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Furthermore, he categorizes listening and reading as receptive skills otherwise speaking and writing as productive skills. In this research the writer just focuses on speaking in which this skill is one of the instruments to measure whether or not the learners succeed to learn English. It is also based on the general goal of studying a foreign or second language that is able to communicate in a target language. Speaking as a productive skill is an important aspect in language learning. By speaking, we can convey information and ideas, express opinion and feeling, share experiences, and maintain social relationship by communicating with others.

Teaching speaking is quite difficult to teach. Therefore, a teacher as a guide in learning process is demanded to be more creative to build up the students' motivation and improve their ability in speaking activities. Besides, the teacher must be able to identify the students' weaknesses and difficulties in learning speaking. Some of the problems are problem in vocabulary, grammar, and students' motivation itself.

In terms of teaching English, particularly in teaching speaking, teacher of English must understand the teaching theory, as Richards and Renandya (2002: 6) show that a teaching theory is viewed as something that is constructed by individual teacher. From this perspective, teaching is viewed as teachers' attempts in integrating theory and practice. The selection of theory in teaching to integrate the teaching model will be an appropriate action done by the teachers to improve their teaching in the classroom. Besides, teachers have to enrich their teaching model in order to create their own new understanding of teaching, which have been expanded and revised to deepen their experience and knowledge in teaching.

Based on the preliminary observation done by the writer to English Education Program of Cokroaminoto University of Palopo, the writer found that (1) most lecturers are difficult to design the learning material used in teaching; (2) the lecturers are not creative in applying method in teaching, particularly in teaching speaking; (3) most lecturers lack of knowledge about teaching approaches applied in teaching and learning in the classroom, especially in speaking class; and (5) most lecturers use Cooperative Learning Approach in teaching, particularly in teaching speaking.

In addition, based on the interview done by the writer to the English students of Cokroaminoto University of Palopo, from 30 students taken from 6 classes, 90 % of them stated that they were not interested in following the speaking class. The writer also found that from the data taken from the teaching method written by the lectures in the lesson plan collected in the head of English study program, all lecturers at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo use Cooperative Learning Approach in teaching speaking. For example, one lecturer made the lesson plan, and other lecturers copied the lesson plan. The result is that they were not familiar with other teaching approaches, while there are a lot of language teaching approaches or methods have been demonstrated during the post-method era (Brown, in Richards and Renandya, 2002: 10), like Communicative Language Teaching and Task-Based Language Teaching. This condition shows that the lecturers are not variative in designing the appropriate teaching model of speaking.

The result of the observation done by the writer shows that the use of Cooperative Learning Approach causes monotonous teaching process in the class. The fact is that the use of monotonous teaching influences the students' achievement in learning speaking. Based on the result of the students' speaking achievement in speaking 3 at the fifth semester, Academy Year 2011/2012, the mean score got by the students after following the speaking learning process is still low (65.20), while the maximum score is 100. This shows that the use of monotonous teaching model affects the students' achievement in learning.

One of the ways that is accomplished by the writer to help the students learn speaking is using Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). The concept of CLT is how language is used by involving students in meaning-focused communicative tasks, and using plentiful exposure to language, then enlarging opportunities to use it (Harmer, 2007: 69). This approach aims at encouraging the students to communicate something.

The other way that is offered by the writer to teach the students to speak is applying Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) formulated in to teaching and learning process in the classroom. Task-Based Language Teaching (sometimes referred to as Task-Based Instruction) makes the performance of meaningful task central to the learning process. It is based on a belief that if students are focused on the completion of task, they are likely to learn the language as they are if they are focusing on language forms. Instead of a language structure or function to be learnt, students are presented with a task they have to perform or a problem they have to solve (Harmer, 2007: 71).

Another approach used to investigate students' speaking skill is Cooperative Learning Approach (CLA). Cooperative learning is the process of learning using small group in order to work together to maximize their own and each other's learning (Jolliffe, 2007: .3). In cooperative learning contexts, students do not learn in what may be called a compositional vacuum, but they are members of a class and a small group. According to Tuan (2011: 521), Cooperative Learning conspicuously is not simply putting students together in groups and giving them tasks to do, but an environment in which teachers have to guarantee that the subsequent four elements transpire. In addition, tasks are the building of a language course. Students will perform the tasks and focus on the language form as they do the task, or as a result of having done them. The tasks also provide the students with the language to do them before they set out to perform the tasks.

In order to stress the importance of the learning approaches, (CLT, TBLT and CLA), the writer has seen the application of the learning approaches that has been widely introduced in some Asian countries. Littlewood(2007, p.243) in his revised article presented in an international conference of the Korean Association for Teachers of English, held in Seoul, Korea, in June 2006 stresses that to improve the communicative competence of people in East Asia, educators and government as well as national policies and syllabi have been moving increasingly towards Communicative Language Teaching and Task-Based Language Teaching. Butler (2011: 36) synthesizes that Communicative Language Teaching and Task-Based Language teaching have inûuenced

English language teaching worldwide, and Asia is no exception to this trend. He also argues that to provide an alternative to synthetic approaches (traditional approach), various governments in Asia-Pacific Region established CLT and TBLT as major components of their English language curricula and instruction programs.

The other research done by Siburian (2012), following on the Implementation of Task-Based Learning in Increasing the SpeakingAbility of Eleventh Grade Students of SMAN 1 Bangkinang Riau shows that The implementation of Task-Based Learning can improve the students' speaking. It is found that the students with the treatment could perform a better speaking on all post-tests. A research was done by Efrizal (2012: 127), which is entitled Improving Students' Speaking through Communicative Language Teaching Method at Mts Ja-alhaq, Sentot Ali Basa Islamic Boarding School of Bengkulu, Indonesia. This study finds that Communicative Language Teaching can improve the students' speaking.

The formulations of the problem in this study are (1) which is more effective between Communicative Language Teaching and Cooperative Learning Approach in teaching speaking at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo?, (2) which is more effective between Task-Based Language Teaching and Cooperative Learning Approach in teaching speaking at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo?, (3) which is more effective between Communicative Language Teaching and Task-Based Language Teaching in teaching speaking at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo?, and (4) which is the most effective among Communicative Language Teaching, Task-Based Language Teaching and Cooperative Learning Approach in teaching speaking at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo?

In line with the formulations of the problem, the objectives of the study are primarily intended to find out (1) which is more effective between Communicative Language Teaching and Cooperative Learning Approach in teaching speaking at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo, (2) which is more effective between Task-Based Language Teaching and Cooperative Learning Approach in teaching speaking at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo, (3) which is more effective between Communicative Language Teaching and Task-Based Language Teaching in teaching speaking at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo, and (4) which is the most effective among Communicative Language Teaching, Task-Based Language Teaching and Cooperative Learning Approach in teaching speaking at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo.

This study is expected to provide theoretical and practical significances. Theoretically, the finding of the study is intended to give some helps for the teachers or lecturers of English in teaching speaking at the University, so that their students' speaking is improved and to become contribution to highlight the better strategies in teaching of English, particularly in teaching speaking.

Practically, the significances of the study are (1) the teachers or lecturers of English can use the result of the study to improve their new teaching strategy in teaching speaking, (2) the students can use the result of the study as an effective way in improving their speaking and (3) it is an input or a feedback for the university, especially the rector of the university to encourage his/her lecturers in teaching, particularly in teaching speaking.

METHOD

This study is *quasi-experimental research*, which specifically goes to *non-equivalent control group design* consisting of experimental class and control class (Cohen, Manion, and Morrison, 2005: 214).

This study was conducted at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo, South Sulawesi, Palopo City. This study was held on November 2013 and finished on December 2013, exactly following the academic year 2013/2014 at the fifth semester students of Cokrominoto University of Palopo.

The population of the study is the fifth semester students of English department of Cokroaminoto University of Palopo, academic year 2013 and 2014. The number of the population is 265 students divided into six classes (A, B, C, D, E, and F). The sample of the study was selected using *Simple Cluster Random Sampling*. The sample of the study was taken tree classes from the six classes, which

classified into two experimental classes and one control class. Each of the classes consists of 25 students.

This experimental research applies pre-experiment, experiment, and post-experiment. In pre-experimental phase, the writer prepared the pre-test. The result of the pre-test was analyzed to find out the equal competence between experimental classes and control class based on the result of the pre-test. This test was analyzed using *one-way ANOVA*. In experimental phase, the lecturer applied CLT and TBLT in experimental classes and CLA in control class. In the post-experimental phase, the writer prepared the pre-test. The results of the post-test were compared with the results of the pre-test and then the writer analyzed the data using *one-way ANOVA* followed by *scheffe test*.

The instrument used to collect the data is the speaking scoring system which is formulated into *rubric scoring method*. The score resulted through the instrument is used for data analysis. The scoring criteria of speaking are stated by Heaton (1988: 100) that for the oral communication, the criteria are accuracy, fluency, and comprehensibility. The scoring criteria are formulated in to the rating scale of the *rubric scoring method*. Technique used to collect the data is through non-test by performing speaking tasks. The speaking tasks are purely conducted to know the students' speaking ability in spoken language. The task required the students to speak based on the titles, questions or instructions given. The students should be able to speak based on the title, questions or instructions.

Technique of Data Analysis

Technique of data analysis used in this study is *one-way ofanalysis of variance* (one-way ANOVA) followed by *cheffe test*. Before analyzing the data using the analysis technique, the data must be tested using the test of analysis requirements that are *normality* and *homogeneity of variance* test (Siregar, 2013: 269).

The testing criteria of *one-way ANOVA* is that the null hypothesis (H_0) is acceptable if the value of p (probability) obtained is higher than alpha 5% (0,05). On the other hand, the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected if the value of p (probability) is lower than alpha 5% (0,05). To find out the rank of effectiveness among Communicative Language Teaching, Task-Based Language Teaching and Cooperative Learning Approach, the writer continued using *scheffe test*.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Description of the Data

The data gathered in this study covered the score of pre-test and post-test of students' speaking skill at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo. There are three groups used in this study; two of them are experimental classes, and another group is control class. The scores gathered from experimental classes, either pre-test or post-test, are the students' speaking scores that have been given learning approaches in the treatment.

Descriptive Analysis of the Students' Speaking Skill in the Pre-test

Experimental Class 1

Based on the analysis of the result of the pre-test of the students' speaking skill in experimental class 1 using SPSS 17.0 for windows, it is described that the highest score reaches 61.11 and the lowest score reaches 18.89. Meanwhile, the mean score of the student's speaking skill in the pre-test of experimental class 1 is 37.07. The distribution of frequency scores of the Students' speaking skill in experimental class 1 is presented in the following table.

Table 1. The Distribution of Frequency Scores of the Students' Speaking Skill in Experimental Class 1: Pre-test

Scores	Frequency	Percentage (%)
17.00-26.00	3	12%
26.01-35,01	6	24%
35.02-44.02	10	40%
44.03-53.03	5	20%
53.04-62.04	1	4%
N	25	

Regarding to the table 1, the number of the students reached 17.00-26.00 is 3 (12%), the students reached 26.01-35,01 is 6 (24%), the students reached 35.02-44.02 is 10 (40%), the students reached 44.03-53.03 is 5 (20%) and the student reached 53.04-62.04 is 1 (4%).

Experimental Class 2

Based on the analysis of the result of the pre-test of the students' speaking skill in experimental class 2 using SPSS 17.0 for windows, it is described that the highest score reaches 61.11 and the lowest score reaches 18.89. Meanwhile, the mean score of the student's speaking skill in the pre-test of experimental class 2 is 37.47. The distribution of frequency scores of the Students' speaking skill in experimental class 2 is presented in the following table.

Table 2. The Distribution of Frequency Scores of the Students' Speaking Skill in Experimental Class 2: Pre-test

Scores	Frequency	Percentage (%)
17.00-26.00	5	16%
26.01-35,01	2	48%
35.02-44.02	12	28%
44.03-53.03	4	4%
53.04-62.04	2	4%
N	25	

Regarding to the table 2, the number of the students reached 17.00-26.00 is 5 (20%), the students reached 26.01-35.01 is 2 (8%), the students reached 35.02-44.02 is 12 (48%), the students reached 44.03-53.03 is 4 (16%) and the students reached 53.04-62.04 is 2 (8%).

Control Class

Based on the analysis of the result of the pre-test of the students' speaking skill in control class using SPSS 17.0 for windows, it is described that the highest score reaches 50.00 and the lowest score reaches 18.89. Meanwhile, the mean score of the student's speaking skill in the pre-test of control class is 36.31. The distribution of frequency scores of the Students' speaking skill in control class is presented in the following table.

Table 3. The Distribution of Frequency Scores of the Students' Speaking Skill in Control Class: Pre-Test

Scores	Frequency	Percentage (%)
17.89-24.89	5	20%
24.90-31.90	2	8%
31.91-38.91	8	32%
38.92-45.92	4	16%
45.93-52.93	6	24%
N	25	

Based on the table 3, the number of the students reached 17.89-24.89 is 5 (20%), the students reached 24.90-31.90 is 2 (8%), the students reached 31.91-38.91 is8 (32%), the students reached 38.92-45.92 is 4 (16%) and the students reached 45.93-52.93 is 6 (24%).

Descriptive Analysis of the Students' Speaking Skill in the Post-test
Experimental Class 1

Based on the analysis of the result of the post-test of the students' speaking skill at experimental class 1 using SPSS 17.0 for windows, it is described that the highest score reaches 77.78 and the lowest score reaches 25.56. Meanwhile, the mean score of the student's speaking skill in the post-test of experimental class 1 is 44.58. The distribution of frequency scores of the Students' speaking skill in experimental class 1 is presented in the following table.

Table 4. The Distribution of Frequency Scores of the Students' Speaking Skill in Experimental Class 1: Post-Test

Scores	Frequency	Percentage (%)
24.56-35.56	4	16%
35.57-46.57	12	48%
46.58-57.58	7	28%
57.59-68.59	1	4%
68.60-79.60	1	4%
N	25	

Based on the table 4, the number of the students reached 24.56-35.56 is 4 (16%), the students reached 35.57-46.57 is 12 (48%), the

students reached 46.58-57.58 is 7 (28%), the students reached 57.59-68.59 is 1 (4%) and the students reached 68.60-79.60 is 1 (4%).

Experimental Class 2

Based on the analysis of the result of the post-test of the students' speaking skill in experimental class 2 using SPSS 17.0 for windows, it is described that the highest score reaches 88.89 and the lowest score reaches 25.56. Meanwhile, the mean score of the student's speaking skill in the post-test of experimental class 2 is 53.9. The distribution of frequency scores of the Students' speaking skill in experimental class 2 is presented in the following table.

Table 5. The Distribution of Frequency Scores of the Students' Speaking Skill in Experimental Class 2: Post-Test

Scores	Frequency	Percentage (%)
25.00-38.00	4	16%
38.01-51.01	6	24%
51.02-64.02	8	32%
64.03-77.03	5	20%
77.04-90.04	2	8%
N	25	

Regarding to the Table 5, the number of the students reached 25.00-38.00 is 4 (16%), the students reached 38.01-51.01 is 6 (24%), the students reached 51.02-64.02 is 8 (32%), the students reached 64.03-77.03 is 5 (20%) and the student reached 77.04-90.04 is 2 (8%).

Control Class

Based on the analysis of the result of the post-test of the students' speaking skill in control class using SPSS 17.0 for windows, it is described that the highest score reaches 54.44 and the lowest score reaches 18.89. Meanwhile, the mean score of the student's speaking skill in the post-test of control class is 34.49. The distribution of frequency scores of the Students' speaking skill in control class is presented in the following table.

Table 6. The Distribution of Frequency Scores of the Students' Speaking Skill in Control Class: Post-Test

Scores	Frequency	Percentage (%)
17.00-25.00	7	28%
25.01-33.01	2	8%
33.02-41.02	8	32%
41.03-49.03	6	24%
49.04-57.04	2	8%
N	25	

Regarding to the table 6, the number of the students reached 17.00-25.00 is 7 (28%), the students reached 25.01-33.01 is 2 (8%), the students reached 33.02-41.02 is 8 (32%), the students reached 41.03-49.03 is 6 (24%) and the students reached 49.04-57.04 is 2 (8%).

Before analysing the data using ANOVA followed by *scheffe test*, the data is firstly analyzed by the tests of analysis requirements that are normality test and homogeneity of variance test.

The result of the normality test in the post-test shows that on the experimental class 1, the value of p is higher than $\alpha = 0.05$ (0.185 > 0.05), which shows that the data of the post-test of the sudents' speaking skill in experimental class 1 is on the normal distribution. On the experimental class 2, the value of p is higher than $\alpha = 0.05$ (0.195 > 0.05), which shows that the data of the post-test of sudents' speaking skill in experimental class 2 is on the normal distribution. On the control class, the value of p is higher than $\alpha = 0.05$ (0.2 > 0.05), it means that the data of the post-test of sudents' speaking skill in control class is on the normal distribution. Based on the test of analysis requarement, it is concluded that the data of the post-test of experimental class 1, experimental class 2 and control class are on the normal distribution, where p was higher than $\alpha = 0.05$ (p > 0.05).

The result of the homogeneity of variance test of the students' speaking skill in the post-test shows that the value of p (probability) on the levene test is higher than $\alpha = 0.05$ (0.138>0.05), which shows that there is no difference in the value of variance of all the variables.

To prove the hypotheses, the first test held is the hypothesis testing using *one-way ANOVA* and followed by *scheffe test*. One-way ANOVA is used to find out whether or not there is a significant difference among the use of Communicative Language Teaching, Task-Based Language Teaching and Cooperative Learning Approach in teaching speaking skill at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo. The constructed hypothesis required *one-way ANOVA* is as follows.

H_0: There is no significant difference among the use of CLT, TBLT and CLA in teaching speaking at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo.

H_a: There is a significant difference among the use of CLT, TBLT and CLA in teaching speaking at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo.

The result of *one-way ANOVA* shows that the value of p (probability) obtained is lower than α = 0.05 (0.000<0.05), which shows that the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is acceptable. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference among the use of Communicative Language Teaching, Task-Based Language Teaching and Cooperative Learning Approach in teaching speaking at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo. Furthermore, to find out which is the most effective of the three learning approaches, it is continued by *scheffe test*.

Hypothesis Testing 1

H_0: Communicative Language Teaching is not more effective than Cooperative Learning Approach in teaching speaking at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo.

H_a: Communicative Language Teaching is more effective than Cooperative Learning Approach in teaching speaking at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo.

The summary of the result of *scheffe test* is presented in the following table.

Table 7. The Summary of the Result of *Scheff Test*

I) Groups	J) Groups	Mean Difference (I-J)	std. Error	sig.	95% Confidence Interval lower Bound	upper Bound
exp. 1	exp. 2	-9.33440*	3.53349	.036	-18.1666	-.5022
	control	10.08920*	3.53349	.021	1.2570	18.9214
exp. 2	exp. 1	9.33440*	3.53349	.036	.5022	18.1666
	control	19.42360*	3.53349	.000	10.5914	28.2558
control	exp. 1	-10.08920*	3.53349	.021	-18.9214	-1.2570
	exp. 2	-19.42360*	3.53349	.000	-28.2558	-10.5914

The result of *scheffe test* about the effectiveness between the use of CLT and CLA in teaching speaking at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo presents that the probability(0.021) is lower than α = 0.05 (0.021<0.05), which shows that the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is acceptable (H_a). Based on the result, it is stated that there is a significant difference between the use of CLT in experimental class 1 and the use of CLA in control class in teaching speaking at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo.

The value of *mean difference* of experimental class 1 to the control class on the *scheffe test* is positive (10.08920), which shows that the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is acceptable. Therefore, it can be concluded that Communicative Language Teaching is more effective than Cooperative Learning Approach in teaching speaking at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo.

The finding of the study is consistent with the objective of Communicative Language Teaching in developing students' speaking skill. Communicative language teaching sets as its goal the teaching of communicative competence, not the grammar competence (Richard, 2006, p.3). Communicative competence includes the aspects of language knowledge: (1) knowing how to use language for a range of different purposes and functions, (2) knowing how to vary our use of language according to the setting and the participants (e.g., knowing when to use formal and informal speech or when to use language appropriately for written as opposed to spoken communication) and (3) knowing how to maintain communication despite having limitations in one's language knowledge (e.g.,

through using different kinds of communication strategies). CLT provides ways to increase the students' motivation in learning a language. It capitalizes on the interests and needs of the learners, particularly in communicating.

Hypothesis Testing 2

H_0: Task-Based Language Teaching is not more effective than Cooperative Learning Approach in teaching speaking at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo.

H_a: Task-Based Language Teaching is more effective than Cooperative Learning Approach in teaching speaking at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo.

The summary of the result of *scheffetest* is presented in the following table.

Table 8. The Summary of the Result of *Scheff Test*

I) Groups	J) Groups	Mean Difference (I-J)	std. Error	sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					lower Bound	upper Bound
exp. 1	exp. 2	-9.33440*	3.53349	.036	-18.1666	-.5022
	control	10.08920*	3.53349	.021	1.2570	18.9214
exp. 2	exp. 1	9.33440*	3.53349	.036	.5022	18.1666
	control	19.42360*	3.53349	.000	10.5914	28.2558
control	exp. 1	-10.08920*	3.53349	.021	-18.9214	-1.2570
	exp. 2	-19.42360*	3.53349	.000	-28.2558	-10.5914

The result of *Scheffe test* about the effectiveness between the use of TBLT and and TBLT in teaching speaking at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo presents that the probability (0.000) is lower than α = 0.05 (0.000<0.05), which shows that the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is acceptable (H_a). Based on the result, it is stated that there is a significant difference between the use of TBLT in experimental class 2 and the use of CLA in control class in teaching speaking at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo.

The value of *mean difference* of experimental class 2 to the control class on the *scheffe test* is positive (19.42360), which shows that the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is acceptable. Therefore, it can be concluded that Task-Based Language Teaching is more effective than Cooperative Learning Approach in teaching speaking at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo.

The result found in this study is consistent with the purpose of Task-Based Language teaching in reaching the language learning goal. In Task-Based Language Teaching, the tasks perform basic unit of learning principles that are goals, educational activities and assessment (Van den Branden, 2006: 12). These three levels aim at: (a) finding out what functional things the learners need to use the language (target task), (b) acquiring the language to perform these target tasks, by being motivated to perform these tasks and supported while doing so and (c) assessing the learners' speaking competence to which they are able to perform the target tasks.

The application of TBLT in the classroom learning activities underpins the learners to explore their linguistic resources in the completion of the tasks. Besides, it emphasize on learning through interaction in the target language.

Hypothesis Testing 3

H_0: Communicative Language Teaching is not more effective than Task-Based Language Teaching in teaching speaking at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo.

H_a: Communicative Language Teaching is more effective than Task-Based Language Teaching in teaching speaking at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo.

The summary of the result of *scheffetest* is presented in the following table.

Table 9. The Summary of the Result of *Scheff Test*

I) Groups	J) Groups	Mean Difference (I-J)	std. Error	sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					lower Bound	upper Bound
exp. 1	exp. 2	-9.33440*	3.53349	.036	-18.1666	-.5022
	control	10.08920*	3.53349	.021	1.2570	18.9214
exp. 2	exp. 1	9.33440*	3.53349	.036	.5022	18.1666
	control	19.42360*	3.53349	.000	10.5914	28.2558
control	exp. 1	-10.08920*	3.53349	.021	-18.9214	-1.2570
	exp. 2	-19.42360*	3.53349	.000	-28.2558	-10.5914

The result of *Scheffe test* about the effectiveness between the use of CLT and TBLT in teaching speaking at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo presents that the probability (0.036) is lower than α = 0.05 (0.036<0.05), which shows that the null hypothesis (H_0) rejected and

the alternative hypothesis was acceptable (H_a). Based on the result, it is stated that there is a significant difference between the use of CLT in experimental class 1 and the use of TBLT in experimental class 2 in teaching speaking at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo.

The value of *mean difference* of experimental class 1 to the experimental class 2 on the *scheffe test* is negative (-9.33440), which shows that the null hypothesis (H_0) is accepted and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) isrejected. Therefore, it was concluded thatCommunicative Language Teaching is not more effective than Task-Based Language Teaching in teaching speaking at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo.

Based on the finding, the hypothesis assumes that CLT is more effective than TBLT is rejected. As a matter of fact, the characteristics of CLT involved in the learning activities of CLT in the classroom do not contribute much compared to the characteristics of TBLT. After observing the learning activities in experimental class 1, the writer observed that the students are difficult to speak directly due to the lack of vocabulary. Most activities in CLT require students to speak directly with the focus on meaning, while students needa lot ofvocabulariesandideastotalk. It madestudentsless confidencein speaking.

CLT needs supportive vocabulary for functional language use but it gives littleguidance about how to handle vocabulary. It requires the students to speak based on the functional use of language for meaningful purposes, as Brown (2007: 241) stated that the characteristics of CLT are; (a) classroom goals are focused on all of the components of Communicative Competence and not restricted to grammatical or linguistic competence, (b) language techniques are designed to involved learners in the pragmatic, functional use of language for meaningful purposes. It is an approach focusing on language meaning not language form and (c) fluency and accuracy are seen as complementary principles underlying communicative techniques. Fluency may have been more importance than accuracy in order to keep learners meaningfully engaged in language use.

a) In the communicative classroom, students ultimately have to use the language productively and receptively, in unrehearsed contexts.

Relating to the Brown's opinion, fluency is more importance than accuracy in order to keep learners meaningfully engaged in language use. However, the criteria of assessing speaking used in this study are accuracy, fluency and comprehensibility. The fact is that during learning process in experimental class 1, many students still need supportive vocabulary for functional language use.

Based on the finding, CLT is also effective in improving students' fluency, accuracy and comprehensibility in speaking, but it is not much more than TBLT. The characteristics of TBLT are more completely involved the communicative competence of language than that of CLT. On the other hand, the theories strengthen the finding that the use of TBLT is more effective than CLT in teaching speaking skill at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo.

Hypothesis Testing 4

H_0: Communicative Language Teaching is not the most effective compared to Task-Based Language Teaching and Cooperative Learning Approach in teaching speaking at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo.

H_a: Communicative Language Teaching is the most effective compared to Task-Based Language Teaching and Cooperative Learning Approach in teaching speaking at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo.

Based on the data in hypothesis 1, 2, and 3, TBLT is the most effective compared to CLT and CLA, which shows that H_0 is acceptable and H_a is rejected. Therefore, it can be concluded that Communicative Language Teaching is not the most effective compared to Task-Based Language Teaching and Cooperative Learning Approach in teaching speaking at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo.

CONCLUSIONS

Referring to the data analysis and discussion of the study, there is a significant difference among Communicative Language Teaching, Task-Based Language Teaching and Cooperative Learning Approach in teaching

speaking at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo. It is proved by the result of *one-way ANOVA* which shows that the value of sig. (p) is lower than $\alpha = 0.05$ ($0.000 < 0.05$). Based on the result of the *scheffe test*, it can be concluded that:

The first, Communicative Language Teaching is more effective than Cooperative Learning Approach in teaching speaking at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo. It is proved by the value of *mean difference* of experimental class 1 to the control class on the *scheffe test* is positive (10.08920).

The second, Task-Based Language Teaching is more effective than Cooperative Learning Approach in teaching speaking at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo. It is proved by the value of *mean difference* of experimental class 2 to the control class on the *scheffe test* is positive (19.42360).

The fourth, Task-Based Language Teaching is more effective than Communicative Language Teaching in teaching speaking at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo. It is proved by the value of *mean difference* of experimental class 1 to the experimental class 2 on the *scheffe test* is negative (9.33440).

The fifth, Task-Based Language Teaching is the most effective compared to Communicative Language Teaching and Cooperative Learning Approach in teaching speaking at Cokroaminoto University of Palopo. It is based on the result of the hypothesis 1, 2 and 3.

After conducting the research, the writer would like to offer several recommendations for the English teachers or lecturers and other researchers. The recommendations are:

The first, for the English teachers or lecturers, particularly the English lecturers of Cokroaminoto University of Palopo, it is recommended to apply TBLT in teaching speaking, as the result of this study proves that TBLT is the most effective compared to CLT and CLA.

The second, for other researches, it is recommended to follow up the study that involves aspects such us students' motivation, learning style, learning environment, and students' background for the completion of this study.

REFERENCES

Brown, H. D. 2001. *Teaching by Principle: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*: Second edition. New York: Pearson Education, Inc.

Brown, H. D. 2007. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. New York: Pearson Education.

Butler, Y. G. 2011. The Implementation of Communicative Language Teaching and Task-Based Language Teaching in the Asia-Pacific Region. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics,* 31, 36-57.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. 2005. *Research Methods in Education*: 5th edition. New York: Taylor & Francis e-Library.

Efrizal, D. 2012. Improving Students' Speaking Through Communicative Language Teaching Method Atmts Ja-Alhaq, Sentot Ali Basa Islamic Boarding School of Bengkulu, Indonesia. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*. Vol.2, No. 20

Harmer, J. 2007. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*: Fourth edition. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.

Heaton, J.B. 1988. *Writing English Language Test*. New York: Longman Group UK Limited.

Hornberger, N.H. & McKey, S.L. 2010. *Sociolinguistics and Language Education*. Bristol: Short Run Press Ltd.

Jolliffe, W. 2007. *Cooperative Learning in the Classroom*: *Putting it into Practice*. London: Paul Chapman Publising.

Littlewood, W. 2007. Communicative and Task-Based Language Teaching in East Asian

Classrooms. *Language Teaching, 40, 243-249.*

Richards, J. & Renandya, W.A. 2002. *Methodology in Language Teaching*: *an Anthropology of Current Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Siburian, I. E. S. 2012.*The Implementation of Task-Based Learning in Increasing the Speaking Ability of Eleventh Grade Students Of SMA 1 Bangkinang* (versi elektronik). Skripsi. Universitas Riau.

Siregar, S. 2013. *Statistik Parametrik Untuk Penelitian Kuantitatif*. Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara.

Tuan, L. T. 2011. Integrating Cooperative Learning into Organizational Behavior Lessons. *Mediterranean Journalof SocialSciences*, Vol. 2, No. 3.

Van den Branden, K. 2006. *Task-Based Language Education: From Theory to Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.