

# THE EFFECTIVENESS OF CONTEXTUAL TEACHING AND LEARNING METHOD IN TEACHING SPEAKING

Murti Bandung

Fakultas Ilmu Budaya, Universitas Indonesia  
murtibandung91@gmail.com

## Abstract

The background of the study in this research is based on the researcher's experience when doing teaching practice, in which method used by the teacher in teaching and learning process was often assumed as the factor that cause the students speaking problem. So, the researcher used another method in this case the method of contextual teaching and learning can develop the students' ability in English speaking skill. The design of this research is an experimental study. The kind of the data collected is quantitative data. The data were analyzed statistically by using homogeneity test and t-test. Data analysis was from the beginning and the ending of experimental and control class that is taken from test where as pre and post test score. In addition, homogeneity test and t-test used to prove the hypothesis that has been planned before. There are difference score between students taught using CTL method and conventional method. It is shown that the average of experimental class is higher than control class  $78.24 > 73.23$ . Besides that, the test of hypothesis using t-test shown the result is higher than the number of the t-table. The result of t-test is 33.4 and the number of t-table on  $\alpha = 5\%$  is 1.98 ( $33.4 > 1.98$ ). The hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) is accepted.

**Keywords:** speaking, contextual, CTL method.

## Introduction

Teaching English in Indonesia emphasizes on the students' skill to master the four language skills namely listening, speaking, reading and writing. The four skills should be reinforced equally. The integration of the four skills is the only possible approach within a communicative, interactive framework. (Brown, 2000: 234). So, in learning English there are four skill that we need to master especially for speaking skill, because it is one of communication tools used to communicate each other. Also as a skill, speaking is more frequently used by people rather than the three other language skills such as reading, writing, listening. However, most students of senior high school still get difficulties in speaking English to communicate each other.

The difficulties got by students in speaking skill is mostly caused by the teachers in senior high school that usually use traditional methods in teaching and learning process. This method is not effective to students because the students are bored, and they need much time to be able in master speaking in doing conversation or communication. Based on the researcher's experience when doing teaching practice at SMA Negeri 1 Kota Ternate, the teacher just give the material like "expression of angry" before the teacher explain and ask the students to do conversation related to the material, after that the teacher give one or two examples and at last the teacher give exercises to be submitted in the next meeting. That is why, although the students start learning English from elementary school to senior high school, they still could not

speaking English well.

Based on the fact, the researcher can state that the method used by the teachers handicap the students success. Also, the method used by the teacher in teaching and learning process is often assumed as the factor that cause the students speaking problem. So, the researcher will use another method that can develop the students' skill in English speaking skill.

In addition, there are many methods of teaching that may be selected for teaching speaking skill. One of them is assumed to be appropriate in developing students' speaking skill is Contextual Teaching and Learning Method (CTL). CTL one of method in teaching and learning that enables students to see the meaning of the context in their daily lives such as context of their personal, social, and culture. To achieve the expectation above, there are eight components need to implement like making meaningful connection, doing significant work, self-regulated learning, collaborating, critical and creative thinking, naturing the individual, reaching high standard, and using authentic assessments.(Johnson, 2002 : 25)

So, by using CTL, it can help students to relate the subject matter content to the real situation. In other word, this method is regarded as the effective method in teaching speaking.

In teaching learning theory, this method is based on constructivism ideology. "Students construct their own knowledge by exploring their ideas based on prior knowledge and experience, applying these ideas to a new situation, and integrating the new knowledge gained with preexisting" (Wijarwadi: 2008). Based on Wijarwadi (2008), "constructivism calls for active participation in problem solving and critical thinking regarding an authentic learning activity that students find relevant and engaging intellectual constructs."

In order to strenghten the assumption above, in this thesis the researcher would like to use Contextual Teaching and Learning in teaching speaking in order to know the effectiveness in developing students speaking ability.

### ***Identification of the Problem***

Based on the researcher's experience when doing teaching practice, the researcher finds some problems as follow:

1. Most students of SMA Negeri 1 are still get difficulties in speaking English.
2. The teachers in senior high school still use traditional methods in teaching and learnig process.

### ***Scope of the Problem***

In this paper, the writer limits the subject matters to discuss the effectiveness of teaching speaking in using Contextual Teaching and Learning Method at the second grade students of SMA Negeri 1 kota Ternate and using analitical score based on components of speaking such as pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension.

### ***Statement of the Problem***

In this study, the researcher state a problem: "Is Contextual Teaching and Learning effective in teaching speaking for the second grade students of SMA Negeri 1 Kota Ternate?"

### ***Objective of the Study***

The objective of the study is:

To know the effectiveness of Contextual Teaching and Learning Method in teaching speaking at the second grade students of SMA Negeri 1 Kota Ternate.

### ***Significant of the Study***

1. For the teacher
  - a. Teacher can use the result of this study as a reference when they want to improve their skill in teaching speaking.
  - b. Teacher will get new innovative method in enhancing their teaching method. Their method will definitely affects the teaching process quality. In short, the teachers' method will help their students in achieving the best result.
2. For the school
 

The result of this study can be used to improve English teaching in teaching speaking.
3. For the researcher
 

The researcher can use this method to improve her teaching skill in teaching speaking.

### **Findings**

This study used experimental design of the effectiveness of teaching speaking in using Contextual Teaching and Learning Method on January.

The implementation of this study was divided into two classes, namely the experiment class (XI-IPA 4), the control class (XI-IPA 8). Before this research was conducted, the materials and lesson plan were determined to the process of learning. Learning in the experiment class was conducted by using contextual teaching and learning method, while the control class using the conventional method.

So, after prepared materials and lesson plan the teacher did teaching and doing test which is pre, treatment, and post test to collect the data in both classes, where as experimental class got treatment and control class did not get a treatment. To collect the data, the writer used analytical score to explain the rating score of speaking components based on Harris (1969: 81-82) there are five components of speaking skill, analytical scoring can be seen on the following figure:

Table 1. Analytical scoring of English skills based on Harris (1969: 81-82)

NO	COMPONENTS OF SPEAKING	RATING SCORE	COMMENTS
1	Pronunciation	5	Has few traces of foreign language
		4	Always intelligible, though one is conscious of a definite accent
		3	Pronunciation problem necessities concentrated listening and occasionally lead to misunderstanding
		2	Very hard to understand because of pronunciation problem, most frequently be asked to repeat
		1	Pronunciation problem to serve as to make speech virtually unintelligible
2	Grammar	5	Make few (if any) noticeable

			errors of grammar and word order
		4	Occasionally makes grammatical and or word orders errors that do not, however obscure meaning
		3	Make frequent errors of grammar and word order, which occasionally obscure meaning
		2	grammar and word order errors make comprehension difficult, must often rephrases sentence and or rest rich himself to basic pattern
		1	Errors in grammar and word order, so, severe as to make speech virtually unintelligible
		5	Use of vocabulary and idioms is virtually that of native speaker
		4	Sometimes uses inappropriate terms and must rephrases ideas because of lexical and equities
		3	Frequently uses the wrong words conversation somewhat limited because of inadequate vocabulary
3	Vocabulary	2	Misuse of words and very limited vocabulary makes comprehension quite difficult
		1	Vocabulary limitation so extreme as to make conversation virtually impossible
		5	Speech as fluent and efforts less as that of native speaker
		4	Speed of speech seems to be slightly affected by language problem
		3	Speed and fluency are rather strongly affected by language problem
4	Fluency	2	Usually hesitant, often forced into silence by language limitation
		1	Speech is so halting and fragmentary as to make conversation virtually impossible
		5	Appears to understand everything without difficulty
5	Comprehension	4	Understand nearly everything at normal speed although occasionally repetition may be

	necessary
3	Understand most of what is said at slower than normal speed without repetition
2	Has great difficulty following what is said can comprehend only .social conversation. Spoken slowly and with frequent repetition
1	Cannot be said to understand even simple conversational English

Done by collected the data in both classes, the researcher analyzed it. The first step, data analysis was from the beginning of control and experimental class was taken from pretest score. The homogeneity test used to know the similarity of variant. The second step, data analysis was from the ending of control class and experimental class. It was used to prove the hypothesis test that had been planned.

#### ***Data Analysis of Pre Test of Experimental and Control Class***

The data analysis shown the result of pre-test that was done both experimental and control group. This analysis answered the research question “Is Contextual Teaching and Learning method effective in teaching speaking for the second grade students of SMA Negeri 1 Kota Ternate?”. Before the researcher tested the hypothesis that had been planned, the researcher analyzed and tested dealt with homogeneity test, and t-test (the different test of two variants) in pre and post-test.

The control class(class XI-IPA 8) was given a pre-test on January 16th, 2014 and experimental class(class XI-APA 4) was given a pre-test on January 17<sup>th</sup>, 2014. They were asked to make a dialog based on expression that they have learned.

Table 2. 1table of Pre-test Score of the Experimental Group

N O	RESPON DENTS	SPEAKING COMPONENTS					TO TA L SC OR E	Classifi cation SCORE
		C	G	V	P	F		
1	R-1	4	3	4	3	3	17	70
2	R-2	4	3	4	3	3	17	70
3	R-3	4	4	4	4	4	20	80
4	R-4	4	4	4	4	4	20	80
5	R-5	4	4	4	4	4	20	80
6	R-6	3	4	4	3	3	17	70
7	R-7	4	4	4	4	4	20	80
8	R-8	4	4	4	3	4	19	70
9	R-9	4	3	4	3	3	17	70
10	R-10	4	3	4	3	3	17	70
11	R-11	4	4	4	4	5	21	80

1	R-12	4	4	4	4	5	21	80
2								
1	R-13	4	3	3	4	4	18	70
3								
1	R-14	4	3	3	4	4	18	70
4								
1	R-15	4	3	4	4	4	19	70
5								
1	R-16	4	3	4	4	4	19	70
6								
1	R-17	4	5	5	5	4	23	80
7								
1	R-18	4	5	5	5	4	23	80
8								
1	R-19	4	3	3	4	4	18	70
9								
2	R-20	4	3	3	4	4	18	70
0								
2	R-21	4	4	4	3	4	19	70
1								
2	R-22	4	4	4	3	4	19	70
2								
2	R-23	5	5	5	4	4	23	80
3								
2	R-24	5	5	4	4	4	22	80
4								
2	R-25	5	4	4	5	4	22	80
5								
2	R-26	5	4	4	5	4	22	80
6								
2	R-27	4	3	4	4	4	19	70
7								
2	R-28	4	3	4	4	4	19	70
8								
2	R-29	5	4	5	5	5	24	80
9								
3	R-30	5	4	5	5	5	24	80
0								
3	R-31	4	4	4	4	4	20	80
1								
3	R-32	4	4	4	4	4	20	80
2								
3	R-33	5	4	4	3	5	21	80
3								
3	R-34	4	4	4	4	5	21	80
4								
SUM		1	1	1	1	1	677	2560
		4	2	3	3	3		
		2	8	7	3	7		
AVERAGE		4.	3.	4.	3.	4.	19.9	75.29

1	7	0	9	0	1
8	6	3	1	3	

Table 2. 2. table of Pre-test Score of the Control Group

N O	RESPONDE NTS	SPEAKING COMPONENTS					TOTAL SCORE	Clas sific ation SCO RE
		C	G	V	P	F		
1	R-1	5	4	4	4	4	21	80
2	R-2	4	4	4	4	4	20	80
3	R-3	4	3	3	4	4	18	70
4	R-4	4	3	3	4	4	18	70
5	R-5	4	3	3	3	4	17	70
6	R-6	4	3	3	3	4	17	70
7	R-7	3	3	3	3	3	15	70
8	R-8	3	3	3	3	3	15	70
9	R-9	4	3	3	3	3	16	70
10	R-10	4	3	3	3	3	16	70
11	R-11	4	4	4	4	4	20	80
12	R-12	4	3	3	3	3	16	70
13	R-13	4	3	4	3	3	17	70
14	R-14	4	3	4	3	3	17	70
15	R-15	3	3	3	3	3	15	70
16	R-16	3	3	3	3	3	15	70
17	R-17	3	3	3	3	3	15	70
18	R-18	3	3	3	3	3	15	70
19	R-19	3	3	3	3	3	15	70
20	R-20	3	3	3	3	3	15	70
21	R-21	5	4	4	4	4	21	80
22	R-22	5	4	4	4	4	21	80
23	R-23	4	3	4	4	4	19	70
24	R-24	4	3	4	4	4	19	70
25	R-25	4	4	4	4	4	20	80
26	R-26	4	4	4	4	4	20	80
27	R-27	3	3	3	4	4	17	70
28	R-28	3	3	3	4	4	17	70
29	R-29	3	3	3	3	3	15	70
30	R-30	4	4	4	4	4	20	80
31	R-31	4	4	4	4	4	20	80
32	R-32	4	3	4	3	4	18	70
33	R-33	4	4	4	4	4	20	80
34	R-34	4	3	4	4	4	19	70
SUM		1	1	1	1	1	599	2480
		2	1	1	1	2		
		8	2	8	9	2		
AVERAGE		3	3	3	3	3	17.62	72.9

---

.	.	.	.	.	4
7	2	4	5	5	
6	9	7	0	9	

---

*The Homogeneity Test*

The homogeneity test was done to see whether sample in the research come from population that had the same variant or not. In this study, the homogeneity test was measured by comparing the obtained score (*F score*) with *F table*. Both, if obtained score (*F score*) was lower than the *F table* or equal, it could be said that the Ho was accepted. It meant that the variance was homogeneous. The analysis of the homogeneity test could be seen in table 2. 3.

Table. 2. 3 The Homogeneity Test (Pre-test)

Variant Sources	Experimental Class	Control Class
Sum	2560	2480
N	34	34
$\bar{x}$	75.29	72.94
Variants (s2)	25,668	21,390
Standard deviation (s)	7,19	7,12

By knowing the result of mean and the variance, the researcher was able to test the similarity of the two variants in the pre-test between experimental and control group.

The computation of the test of homogeneity Cited from Sugiono:  
as follows:

$$F = \frac{\text{Biggest variance}}{\text{Smallest variance}}$$

$$= \frac{25,668}{21,390}$$

$$= 1.2$$

By the number of percent using 5% with dk numerator (nb - 1) = 34 - 1 = 33 and dk denominator (nk - 1) = 34 - 1 = 33, it was found  $F_{table (0,025)(33;33)} = 1.82$ . and shown  $F_{score} \leq F_{table}$ , so it could be concluded that both classes where experimental and control class had no differences. The result showed both groups had similar variants (homogenous).

*The Difference test of Two Variants in experiment and control group*

After counting the standard of deviation and variance, it could be concluded that both are no differences in the test of two variances in pre-test score. So, to differentiate whether the students' results of speaking skill in experimental and control class were significant, the researcher used t-test to analyze the hypothesis that had been planned before. The researcher used formula:

$$t = \frac{\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2}{s \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}}}$$

Where:



$$s = \frac{\sqrt{(n_1 - 1)s_1^2 + (n_2 - 1)s_2^2}}{n_1 + n_2 - 2}$$

Based on table 2.3, first the researcher had to find out S by using the formula above:

$$s = \frac{\sqrt{(34 - 1)25,668 + (34 - 1)21,390}}{34 + 34 - 2}$$

$$s = \frac{\sqrt{847.004 + 705.07}}{66}$$

$$s = \frac{39.3964}{66}$$

$$s = 0.6$$

After found the number of S, the next step was to measure t-test:

$$t = \frac{75.29 - 72.94}{0.6 \sqrt{\frac{1}{34} + \frac{1}{34}}}$$

$$t = \frac{2.35}{0.15}$$

$$t = 15.67$$

In addition, after getting the result of t-test, then it would be consulted to the critical score of  $t_{table}$  to seen whether the difference is significant or not. For a = 5% with df  $34 + 34 - 2 = 66$ , it was found  $t_{table(0.025)(66)} = 1.98$ , because of  $t_{score} > t_{table}$ , then could be concluded that there was significant difference between both classes. It means that both experimental and control class had not similar condition before the researcher giving the treatments.

**The Analysis Data of Post Test of Experimental and Control Class**

The experimental class was given post test on January 28<sup>th</sup>, 2014 and so did in control group. Post-test was conducted after the treatment giving by the researcher was done. CTL was used as method in teaching speaking to students in experimental group. While control class student are not. Post-test was aimed to measure students' ability after they got treatments.

Table 2.4 Table of the Pos-test Score of the Experimental Class

N	RESPONDENTS	SPEAKING COMPONENTS					TOTAL SCORE	Classification SCORE
		C	G	V	P	F		
1	R-1	5	4	5	5	5	24	80
2	R-2	5	4	5	5	5	24	80
3	R-3	5	4	5	5	5	24	80
4	R-4	4	4	4	4	4	20	80
5	R-5	4	4	4	4	4	20	80
6	R-6	4	4	4	3	3	18	70
7	R-7	4	4	4	3	3	18	70
8	R-8	4	4	5	5	5	23	80
9	R-9	4	4	4	5	5	22	80
1	R-10	4	4	4	4	4	20	80

0								
1	R-11	5	4	5	4	4	22	80
1								
1	R-12	5	5	5	5	5	25	90
2								
1	R-13	4	4	4	4	4	20	80
3								
1	R-14	4	4	4	4	4	20	80
4								
1	R-15	4	4	5	5	5	23	80
5								
1	R-16	4	4	5	5	5	23	80
6								
1	R-17	4	3	4	4	4	19	70
7								
1	R-18	4	3	4	4	4	19	70
8								
1	R-19	4	4	4	4	4	20	80
9								
2	R-20	4	4	4	4	4	20	80
0								
2	R-21	4	4	4	4	4	20	80
1								
2	R-22	4	4	4	4	4	20	80
2								
2	R-23	4	4	4	4	4	20	80
3								
2	R-24	4	3	4	4	4	19	70
4								
2	R-25	4	4	4	3	3	18	70
5								
2	R-26	4	4	4	4	4	20	80
6								
2	R-27	5	5	5	4	4	23	80
7								
2	R-28	4	3	4	4	4	19	70
8								
2	R-29	4	4	5	4	4	21	80
9								
3	R-30	4	4	5	4	4	21	80
0								
3	R-31	4	4	5	4	4	21	80
1								
3	R-32	4	4	5	4	4	21	80
2								
3	R-33	4	4	5	4	4	21	80
3								
3	R-34	4	4	5	4	4	21	80
4								
SUM		1	1	1	1	1	709	2660

	4	3	5	4	4		
	2	4	1	1	1		
AVERAGE	4.	3.	4.	4.	4.	20.8	78.24
	1	9	4	1	1	5	
	8	4	4	5	5		

Table 2.5 Table of the Pos-test Score of the Control Class

N O	RESPON DENTS	SPEAKING COMPONENTS					TOT AL SCO RE	Classifi cation SCORE
		C	G	V	P	F		
1	R-1	5	5	5	5	5	25	90
2	R-2	4	3	4	3	3	17	70
3	R-3	5	4	4	4	4	21	80
4	R-4	4	3	3	3	3	16	70
5	R-5	3	3	3	3	3	15	70
6	R-6	4	4	4	3	4	19	70
7	R-7	3	3	3	3	3	15	70
8	R-8	4	4	4	4	4	20	80
9	R-9	5	4	4	4	5	22	80
10	R-10	5	4	4	4	5	22	80
11	R-11	3	3	3	3	3	15	70
12	R-12	3	3	4	3	3	16	70
13	R-13	4	4	4	4	4	20	80
14	R-14	3	3	4	3	3	16	70
15	R-15	3	3	3	3	3	15	70
16	R-16	4	3	4	4	4	19	70
17	R-17	3	3	3	3	3	15	70
18	R-18	3	3	3	3	3	15	70
19	R-19	3	3	3	3	3	15	70
20	R-20	4	4	4	4	4	20	80
21	R-21	3	3	4	4	4	18	70
22	R-22	4	4	4	4	4	20	80
23	R-23	4	3	4	3	4	18	70
24	R-24	4	4	4	4	4	20	80

4								
2	R-25	3	3	3	3	3	15	70
5								
2	R-26	4	4	4	3	3	18	70
6								
2	R-27	4	4	4	3	3	18	70
7								
2	R-28	4	3	4	4	4	19	70
8								
2	R-29	4	3	4	4	4	19	70
9								
3	R-30	4	3	4	4	4	19	70
0								
3	R-31	4	3	4	3	3	17	70
1								
3	R-32	4	4	5	4	4	21	80
2								
3	R-33	4	4	5	4	4	21	80
3								
3	R-34	4	4	5	4	4	21	80
4								
	SUM	1	1	1	1	1	559	2270
		2	1	3	2	2		
		9	8	1	0	4		
	AVERAGE	3.	3.	3.	3.	3.	18.0	73.23
		7	4	8	5	6		
		9	7	5	3	5	3	

### *The Homogeneity test*

The researcher bent the mean and variant of the students' score either in both class. By knowing the mean and variance, the researcher was able to test the similarity of the two variance in the post-test between experimental and control group.

Table. 2. 6 The Homogeneity test (Post-test)

Variant Sources	Experimental Class	Control Class
Sum	2660	2270
N	34	34
$\bar{x}$	78.24	73,23
Variants (s <sup>2</sup> )	21,034	30,392
Standard deviation (s)	7,19	7,12

The computation of the test of homogeneity Cited from Sugiono as follows:

$$F = \frac{\text{Biggest variance}}{\text{Smallest variance}}$$

$$= \frac{30,392}{21,034}$$

$$= 1.5$$

By the number of percent using 5% with df numerator  $(nb - 1) = 34 - 1 = 33$  and df denominator  $(nk - 1) = 34 - 1 = 33$ , it was found  $F_{table} (0.025)(33:33) = 1.89$ , and shown  $F_{score} \leq F_{table}$ , then it could be concluded that both class had no differences. The result showed both groups had similar variance (homogenous).

*The Difference Test of Two Variants in post-test between experiment and control group*

After counting the standard deviation and variance, it could be state that both classes are difference in the test of two variances in post-test score. Therefore, to differentiate whether the students' results of speaking skill in both class after getting treatments were significant or not, the researcher used t-test to test the hypothesis to see the difference between the experimental and control class, the researcher used formula:

$$t = \frac{\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2}{s \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}}}$$

Where:

$$s = \frac{\sqrt{(n_1 - 1)s_1^2 + (n_2 - 1)s_2^2}}{n_1 + n_2 - 2}$$

Based on table 2.6, first the researcher had to find out S by using the formula above:

$$s = \frac{\sqrt{(34 - 1)21,034 + (34 - 1)30,392}}{34 + 34 - 2}$$

$$s = \frac{\sqrt{694.122 + 1002.936}}{66}$$

$$s = \frac{41.195}{66}$$

$$s = 0.62$$

After found the number of S, the next step was to measure t-test:

$$t = \frac{78.24 - 73.23}{0.62 \sqrt{\frac{1}{34} + \frac{1}{34}}}$$

$$t = \frac{5.01}{0.15}$$

$$t = 33.4$$

After getting t-test result, then it would be consulted to the critical score of  $t_{table}$  to see whether the difference is significant or not. For  $\alpha = 5\%$  with df  $34 + 34 - 2 = 66$ , it was found  $t_{table(0.025)(66)} = 1.98$ , because of  $t_{score} > t_{table}$ , then it could be concluded that there was significance of difference between both groups. It means that experimental class was better than control class after the researcher giving the treatments.

Since the obtained t-test score was low than the critical score on the table, the difference was statistically significance. Therefore, based on the computation there was a significance difference between teaching speaking using CTL and teaching without CTL to the second grade students of SMA Negeri 1 kota Ternate. Teaching speaking using CTL method seemed to be quite effective than teaching speaking without using CTL. It can be seen from the result of the test where the students taught by using CTL method got higher scores than the students taught by using conventional method.

## Discussions

The data were collected by the students' achievement scores of the test of speaking skill. They were pre and post test scores from both group. The average score for experimental class was 75.29 (pre-test) and 78.24 (post-test). The average score for control class was 72.94 (pre-test) and 73.23 (post-test). The following was the simple tables of pre and post-test students' average score and students' average score of each speaking components.

Table 2. 7 The Average Scores of Student Result in Pre and Post-test

No	Class	The Average Percentage of Pre-test	The Average Percentage of Post-test
1	Experimental	75.29	78.24
2	Control	72.94	73.23

Table 2. 8 The Average Scores of Student Result in Pre and Post-Test

No	Components of Speaking	Class	The Average Score of Pre-test	The Average Score of Post-test
1	Comprehension	Experimental	4.18	4.18
		Control	3.76	3.79
2	Grammar	Experimental	3.76	3.94
		Control	3.29	3.47
3	Vocabulary	Experimental	4.03	4.44
		Control	3.47	3.85
4	Pronunciation	Experimental	3.91	4.15
		Control	3.50	3.53
5	Fluency	Experimental	4.03	4.15
		Control	3.59	3.65

### *Students' Condition in Control Group*

In this research, source of data that become as control class was class XI-IPA 8. Where is control group, there was not a new treatment in a teaching and learning process. They were given conventional treatment. The researcher had used a book as media which could not increase students' speaking skills. Students could not enjoy in speaking and explore their ideas because they had to answer and write what they had read from the book. That was proven by control group's score in the post-test (73.23) which was lower than the experimental class (78.24).

### *Students' Condition in Experimental Group*

#### *The Analysis Students' Speaking Before Getting a Treatment (Pre-test)*

In the first test, students' ability speaking was low. Pre-test was conducted before the treatment. By the result of pre-test, it was seen that students faced a little bit

difficulties in speaking skill. The sentences were made by them influenced by Indonesian language. Students' ability was in low level when they had arranged sentences to be a good paragraph by considering main idea. It means that the idea was not clearly stated and the sentences were not well-organized to support the main idea. Students' word choice (fluency) and also pronunciation were also far from being perfect. Not only the sequence of sentences which were made by students was not complete but also there were a little bit difficulties in grammar and vocabulary. To reduce the number of students' mistakes in their speaking, the researcher collected students' dialogues paper, gave correction, and gave a feedback to them. From the correction of their mistakes, students' were supposed to learn more and improve their ability in speaking.

#### *The Analysis Students' Speaking After Getting a Treatment (Post-test)*

The result of post-test that obtained by the students in both classes increased. The average score obtained by the experimental class was (78.24) and control class(73.23) Although there was slight difference between those scores, still it can be said that the experimental class achieved higher score than the control group.

Based on the data analysis of students' ability, it was found that students' ability after getting treatment was improved. The finding showed that students' ability was in good level. Although, there were still some mistakes that students had made like grammar. Then, the researcher could be concluded that treatment by using CTL method in teaching speaking was quite effective. It was proven with students' average score in experimental class was higher than control class. By considering the students' final score after getting treatment, the teaching of speaking skill using CTL method was better than conventional method.

Based on the analysis data that was done, the researcher was found that the  $t_{score}$  (33.4) was higher than  $t_{table}$  by using 5% alpha of significance (1.98). Since  $t_{score} > t_{table}$ , it was proved that there is a significant difference between the improvement of students achievement that was given treatment by using CTL method and the improvement of students achievement that was given a conventional treatment.

### **Conclusions**

Based on the finding and discussion, the researcher can be concluded that teaching speaking through Contextual Teaching Learning in SAM Negeri 1 kota Ternate is quite successful. The result of data was collected proved by the obtained score of t-test. The t-test showed that t-score 33.4 was higher than t-table 1.98. It means the Alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) that has been planned was accepted. Since the t-score was higher than the t-table, there was difference in the achievement between students in class XI-IPA 4 who were taught speaking using CTL method and students in class XI-IPA 8 who were taught speaking using conventional method.

The average score of control group's before treatment (72.94) and the average score of control class treatment was (73.23). Whereas, the experimental group's average before treatment was (75.29) and the experimental group's average score treatment was (78.24). It means that the experimental class (class XI-IPA4) is better than the control class (XI-IPA 8).

However, the researcher could not deny that the different score between two classes is not too much. It can be seen on the table of the students speaking scores that the students who learned speaking through Contextual Teaching Learning and Conventional Method have difference scores, but the speaking improvement in the experimental class has proven that Contextual Teaching Method can be a good method

in developing speaking ability.

## References

- Arikunto, Suharsimi. 2006. *Prosedur Penelitian : Suatu Pendekatan Praktek*. Jakarta
- Baker, E.D., Hope, L., and Karandjeff. K. 2009. *Contextualized Teaching & Learning: A Faculty Primer A Review of Literature and Faculty Practices with Implications for California Community College Practitioners*. Retrieved on November 15, 2012 from <http://www.cccbsi.org/Websites/basicskills/Images/CTL.pdf>
- Brown and Yule, 1999. *Teaching the spoken Language*, New York: Cambridge University Press
- David P.Harris, 1969. *Testing English as A Second Language*, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company
- Dease, A. 2012. Contextual Teaching and Learning Theory. Available online on. Retrieved on November 1st 2012
- Donn, Byrne, 1998. *Teaching Oral English*, New York: Longman
- Febby. 2011. Definition of Contextual Teaching and Learning (CTL). Available online on. Retrieved on November 1st 2012
- Harmer, Jeremy. 2002. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. New England, longman
- Hornby, 1987. *Oxford Advance Learner.s Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, Sixth Edition.
- J. Michael O'Malley and Lorraine Valdez Pierce. 1996. *Authentic Assessment for English Language Learners*, London: Longman
- Jack C.Richard, *Developing Classroom Speaking Activities; From Theory to Practice*, ([Http://www.professorjackrichard.com/developing-classroom-speakingactivities.pdf](http://www.professorjackrichard.com/developing-classroom-speakingactivities.pdf), p.2,) It was retrieved on November 1 2007
- Johnson, B., Elaine. 2002. *Contextual Teaching and Learning: What It Is and Why It.s Here to Stay*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press
- Journals:
- Marianne Celce-Murcia. 2001. *Teaching English As A Second or Foreign Language* Boston: Heinly and Heinle, a Division of Thomson Learning,Inc.
- Noah Webster. 1980. *Webster.s New Twentieth Century Dictionary, 2nd Edition*, New York:William Collins Publishers
- Nunan, David. 1992. *Research Methods in Language Learning*, New York: Cambridge University Press
- Nunan, David. 2003. *Practical English Language Teaching*, New York, the Mc Graw Hill Companies
- Nurhadi, et.al., 2004. *Pembelajaran Kontekstual (Contextual Teaching and Learning/CLT) dan Penerapannya Dalam KBK*. Malang: Penerbit Universitas Negeri Malang
- Richard and Reanadya. 2002. *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of*



Current Practice, New York: Cambridge University Press

Rineka Cipta, 2006)

Tarigan, G. Henry, 1981. *Berbicara Sebagai Suatu Ketrampilan Berbahasa*, Bandung: Angkasa

Wijarwadi, W. 2008. The Effectiveness of Contextual Teaching and Learning in Teaching Speaking: An Experimental Study at the First Grade Students of SMAN 1 Ciputat Academic Year 2007/2008. Paper Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University Jakarta. Available online on [db4.wikispaces.com/file/view/rc18THEEFFECTIVENESSOFCONTEXTUALTEACHINGANDLEARNINGINTEACHINGSPEAKING.pdf](http://db4.wikispaces.com/file/view/rc18THEEFFECTIVENESSOFCONTEXTUALTEACHINGANDLEARNINGINTEACHINGSPEAKING.pdf). Retrieved on November 1st 2012