

THE DIFFERENCE OF STUDENT READING ACHIEVEMENT BEFORE AND AFTER USING CONTEXTUAL TEACHING AND LEARNING AT SMA PRIMAGANDA BULUREJO DIWEK JOMBANG

Khudriyah¹

A. Background

Mastery English in this globalization era is a must. The government of Indonesia has decided that English become a compulsory subject from the elementary school up to the university which is taught as a foreign language.² The aim of learning English in Indonesia is to enable students to master the four English skills, i.e. listening, speaking, reading and writing.³ All of the skills are important and each of them must be emphasised for development.

Reading is one of language skill to be mastered. There are many steps to master it, such as word perception, comprehension, reaction and interaction. Reading is the single most important skill necessary for a happy, by reading for fun the readers will get happiness and by reading important information they will be successful in life. Reading skill is considered important for students to be learned. By learning reading the students will get information not only for their own knowledge in the class but also it will be their valuable experiences for their life.

According to Patel, reading is most useful and important skill for people. This skill is more important than speaking and writing. Reading is a source of joys. Good reading is that which keeps students regular in which provide him both pleasure and profit.⁴ Reading is also a window to the world, people who read will be consequently success through life. By reading they will get valuable information. The more people read the more they will be rich in knowledge. Besides, by reading a lot, the students will master three other English language skills.

Becoming reading as habit will make someone becomes rich of information and knowledge. Reading habits not only help the students to get knowledge and wisdom from

¹Penulis adalah dosen STIT Urwatul Wutsqo Bulurejo Jombang.

²N. Huda, *Language Learning and Teaching* (Malang : Penerbit IKIP Malang, 1999), 98.

³Depdiknas, *Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional Republik Indonesia Nomor 22 Tahun 2006* (Jakarta : Direktorat Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah, 2006), 287.

⁴M. Jain dan Patel F.M, *English Language Teaching* (tk. : Sunrise Publishers and Distributors, 2008), 90.

the cultural of heritage, but are also very helpful in passing for leisure period.⁵ Rivers states that reading is an important activity because it is not only a source of information and a pleasurable activity, but also a means of consolidating one's knowledge of a language.⁶ Reading can also become the first step of developing proficiency to other skills of language such as listening, speaking and writing. Many proof shows that people can speak and write because of reading, since they have a lot of activities in reading. It means that reading belongs to a tool to opens windows to the world, unlock doors to opportunities and expand our minds to new ideas.

However, teaching reading is considered difficult for many teachers. The following are the result of the research were found, they are in general, students learning to read English as a foreign language find it a difficult process and as a result they do not enjoy it.⁷ The other result is the students were not interested in reading because of their background knowledge, inability to understand the content of the text and complicated organizational structure of the text.⁸ The next is Firmanto on his study told that reading was considered a boring and stressful activity because of some factors such as unsuitable texts (e.g., due to the text length or unfamiliar vocabularies), teacher's scarcity in employing pre-reading activities (e.g., explaining some difficult words or activating the student's prior knowledge) and monotonous post-reading activities (e.g., answering questions based on the texts and retelling the text).⁹ Another research found that most students were not interested in reading because they get difficulties to identify the meaning a lot of words and they are not motivated by the reading materials. Most of them are passive and unresponsive.¹⁰

The problem was also found in SMA Primaganda Bulurejo Diwek Jombang, the students were not intersted in reading because they didn't know meaning, many students said that text is too long and the vocabulary was unfamiliar. The students were also less motivated in learning reading. The cause is a learning process at SMA Primaganda still uses a teacher-centered. Teachers transfer their knowledge to their students actively, mean-

⁵Ibid, 9.

⁶W.M. River, *Teaching Foreign Language Skill* (Chicago : The University of Chicago Press, 1991), 103.

⁷RR. Day dan J. Bamford, "Teaching Reluctant Readers," jurnal *English Teaching Forum*, No. 35 (4), 2000, 28-35.

⁸S. Kweldju, "English Department Student's Interest and Strategies in Reading their Content Area Textbooks," *TEFLIN Journal*, No. 8 (1), 1996, 104-117.

⁹Firmanto, "Students Behavior of Reading Comprehension: Expectations and Follow up," Paper presented at LIA International Conference, (Jakarta, 2005).

¹⁰J.K. Klingner, S. Vaughn dan A. Broadman, *Teaching Reading Comprehension to Students with Learning Difficulties* (London : The Guilford Press, 2007), 175.

while, their students, are given various kinds of knowledge and the teachers only use bottom up model as process of teaching, in which the students in understanding the text decoding letter-by-letter. It spends much time and makes the students feel bored. Meanwhile the students of reading class who focus more word accuracy rather than comprehension monitoring less able comprehenders and generally have weak metacognition skills.¹¹ The students with poor comprehension generally are poor at making inferences and integrating text information.

Reading is as a message-getting, problem-solving activity which increases in power and flexibility the more it is practiced.¹² Reading is a thinking process, is part of everything that happens to you as a person and comprehending a text is intimately related to your life.¹³ This definition reinforces Rosenblatt's theory that reading comprehension requires the reader to interact with the text. Reading is about understanding written text. It is complex activity that involves both perception and thought. Reading is an active skill. It constantly involves guessing, predicting, checking and asking one self question. This should be taken into consideration when devising reading comprehension. It means that students need good preparation in understanding written text.

Based of the explanation above, teachers should discover creative strategies to enhance students' interests to reading. Providing students with explicit instruction in comprehension strategies can be an effective way to help them overcome difficulties in understanding text.¹⁴ The more explicit the comprehension strategy and self-regulatory instruction, the higher the likelihood that the learner will make significant gains in comprehension.¹⁵

There are three main "models" being proposed to explain the nature of foreign learning to read, (1) bottom-up processing model, which focuses on developing the basic skill of matching sounds with letters, syllables and words written on a page, (2) top-down processing model, which focuses on the background knowledge that a reader uses to

¹¹K. Cain dan J.V. Oakhill, Inference Ability and its Relation to Comprehension Failure in Young Children (Reading and Writing, 11, 1999), 489-503.

¹²MM. Clay, *Becoming Literate* (Auckland, New Zealand : Heinemann, 1991), 89.

¹³I. Fountas dan G.S. Pinnell, *Guiding Readers and Writers, Grades 3-6* (Portsmouth : Heinemann, 1999), 56.

¹⁴L. Graham dan A. Bellert, "Difficulties in Reading Comprehension for Students with Learning Difficulties," in Wong B. (ed.), *Learning About Learning Disabilities* (San Diego : Elsevier Academic, 2004), 256.

¹⁵G. Manset-Williamson dan J.M. Nelson, "Balanced, Strategic Reading Instruction for Upper Elementary and Middle School Students with Reading Disabilities," *Jurnal Learning Disability Quarterly*, No. 28, 2005, 60.

comprehend a text, (3) the third model called "interactive" model which incorporates both top-down and bottom-up processing models and regards text processing as a non-linear, constantly developing phenomenon where both the former explanations constantly react and influence one another.¹⁶

The following are strategies of teaching reading such as Plan and Monitor, controlling one's mental activities, determine importance, identifying essential ideas and information, ask questions, interrogating texts for a variety of purposes, such as checking one's understanding, querying the author about his or her writing and discerning relationships among ideas and information within a text, make inferences, linking parts of texts that authors did not link explicitly, make connections, using what is known to enrich authors' meanings, synthesize, putting together ideas from multiple sources, the students are taught how to draw conclusions, form generalizations and make comparisons across texts. Visualize, forming sensory and emotional images of textual contents, especially visual images.¹⁷

All of the strategies are included in contextual teaching and learning (CTL), CTL is good choice to facilitate students in learning reading. Besides, CTL includes the three models of reading. Especially interactive model and the important aspect of the interactive model is emphasizing schemata in which the reader's pre-existing framework about the world and about the text to be read. A reader fits what is found in a passage into this framework. If new textual information does not fit into the reader's schemata, the reader misunderstands the new information, ignores it, or revises the schemata to match the facts within the passage. CTL called contextual approach because the concept of learning that help teacher's content associate between the lesson and the real world situation with the students and encourage students to make the relationship between knowledge held by the implementations in their lives as members of the community.

CTL is a system that stimulates the brain to weave patterns that express meaning. Contextual teaching and learning is a brain compatible system of instruction that generates meaning by linking academic content with the context of a student's daily life. Taking advantage of the fact that the environment stimulates the brain's neurons to form pathways, the system focuses on context, on relationship.¹⁸ CTL has been differently defined by

¹⁶W. Grabe dan F. Stoller, *Teaching and Researching Reading* (Harlow : Longman, 2002), 190.

¹⁷R. Gersten et. all, "Teaching Reading Comprehension Strategies to Students with Learning Disabilities," *A Review of Educational Research*, 2001, 279.

¹⁸Elaine B. Jhonson, *Contextual Teaching and Learning* (Bandung : LC, 2002), 16.

many experts. Some experts define contextual teaching and learning as a concept that helps teachers and students relate the meaning and real world situations with the subject matter in the right way.¹⁹ In other words, CTL motivates the learners to take charge of their own learning and to relate between knowledge and its application to the various contexts of their lives.

CTL is a proven concept that incorporates much of the most recent research in cognitive science. CTL is promoted as the alternative for the new learning strategy. CTL emphasizes the learning process through constructing not memorizing and teaching is interpreted as an activity of inquiring process not only transferring knowledge to the students. In CTL, students are expected to develop their own understanding from their past experience or knowledge. It is important because our brain or human mind functioned as the instrument for interpreting knowledge so that it will have a unique sense.

The following statements is reason why CTL is good as overcoming problem inreading class, they are CTL makes meaningful connections, in this case the students can organize themselves as learners, who learn actively in improving their interest individually, they can work individually or in a group and they can do learning by doing. CTL is doing significant work, the student can make relationship among schools and the various existing contexts in the real world as business maker, CTL is also self-regulated means the students do the significant work, they have purpose, connection with others and connection with decision making and the last is concrete results or products. Besides, in model of CTL is collaborating which students are able to work together. CTL is also critical and creative thinking students are able to apply higher level thinking critically and effectively.

Another reason is CTL is nurturing the individual students carry on themselves, understand, give attention, posses high wishes, motivate and empower themselves. It also helps students to reach high standards and using authentic assessments, in this matter, the students use academic knowledge in the real world context to the meaningful purposes.²⁰ Besides, by using as model learning will be more productive and able to foster the strengthen of the concept since in constructivismelearners are led to find their own knowledge and they are expected to learn through experience instead of memorizing. Moreover, one of the teachers' roles in CTL classroom is motivating students to learn. The motivation can be in the form of appraisal or reward. The heart of CTL is the connection

¹⁹Ibid, 14.

²⁰Ibid, 26-28.

that leads to meaning. When a young people connect the content of an academic subject with their own experiences, they discover meaning and meaning gives them a reason for learning.

The previous reserch about CTL has done by Kitri Katon Peni research and the title is the effectiveness of CTL to teach reading comrehension viewed from student's intellegence experimental study in SMP Negeri surakarta 2009/2010.²¹ The result of the research were CTL was more effective than grammar transasional method, the students have high intellegence, there was an interraction between teaching method and students' intellegence in teaching reading. S. Zakiyah, Improving Students' Reading Comprehension of Descriptive Text Through CTL at second grade Bakti Mulia 400 Junior High School Jakarta. The result is the students can achieve the criteria of success and the students were actively involved in the teaching and learning process²² used quantitative method of Paired Sample t-test.

B. Method

This research was experimental in the form of one group pretest and posttest design. In this case the researcher treated differently to the same sample. The population and the sample of this research was the first grade of SMA Primaganda students in academic year of 2012/2013 who were 31. The study was conducted in second semester.

In this study the researcher conducted pretest related with based competenced the students had gotten before giving treatment in the form of contextual teaching and learning method. The pretest is intended to know the students reading achievement, after the treatment conducted the researcher gave them a posttest related to competenced based. The purpose of the study was to compare whether or not the difference of students reading achievement before and after the implementation of contextualteaching and learning, this study is also intended to determine the closeness relationship and influence of one to the other variables. The following table is description of the research design.

Table 1
One Group Pretest and Post-test Design

Group	Pretest	Treatment	Post Test
-------	---------	-----------	-----------

²¹Kitri Katon Peni, The Effectiveness of Contextual Teaching and Learning to Teach Reading Comrehension Viewed from Student's Intellegence Experimental Study in SMP Negeri Surakarta 2009/2010.

²²S. Zakiyah, Improving Students' Reading Comprehension of Descriptive Text Through CTL at Second Grade Bakti Mulia 400 Junior High School Jakarta, 2011.

Experiment (E)	O1	X	O2
----------------	----	---	----

Notes :

- E means the experimental group, the group that was given treatment
- O1 means pretest given before the implementation of CTL
- X means the implementation of CTL
- O2 means posttest given after the implementation of CTL

The data was gained by some instruments such as test, interview and observation. The test was in the form of multiple choice. To know whether or not the instrument had validity and reliability was tested at tutoring agencies in Nglaban by ten students. The result was 7 questions were not valid since the rating scale found was under 0,602 meanwhile the rating scale table with df 9 is 0,6021. That is why only 18 questions were used as instrument as the rating scale was more than 0,687.

In analysing the data, the researcher used statistical calculation of paired sample *t-test* to find out the differences score of students reading achievement before and after treating by CTL method. The formula is described as follow :

$$t = \frac{\bar{X} - \mu}{\frac{S}{\sqrt{n}}}$$

Notes :

- t refers to score of t found
- \bar{X} refers to mean before and after treatment
- μ refers to hypothesized value
- S refers to standard deviation
- n refers to sample members²³

The treatment is influenced when t value > t_{table} or H₀ is rejected, however, H₀ is accepted when t value < t_{table} means the treatment doesn't effect the student reading achievement and there is no difference of students reading achievement before or after implementing CTL.

To support the data needed, the researcher interviewed one of the teachers and some students. Besides, the researcher noted all activities when the teaching and learning using CTL conducted.

C. Result

²³Sugiyono, *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif* (Bandung : Alfabeta, 2011), 84.

The following is the description of the data analysis result about the students score before and after the implementation of CTL.

Table 2
The students' reading score of pretest and posttest

No	Name	Pretest	Post-test	Increase
1	AA	60	85	25
2	AG	55	80	25
3	AK	65	90	25
4	AL	55	80	30
5	AW	50	80	30
6	DK	60	90	20
7	DS	60	80	15
8	EE	65	80	25
9	EES	55	80	25
10	EG	60	85	20
11	HR	75	95	25
12	JF	60	85	15
13	JP	65	80	40
14	KD	35	75	20
15	LK	60	80	15
16	MA	60	75	20
17	MAS	65	85	25
18	MK	55	80	30
19	MM	40	70	35
20	NA	50	85	35
21	NAF	45	80	30
22	NL	60	90	30
23	PR	50	80	25
24	RW	55	80	30
25	SN	60	90	25
26	SP	55	80	20
27	SW	60	80	25
28	TAW	50	75	15
29	UC	65	80	30
30	YS	50	80	35
31	ZM	55	80	35
	Σ	1745	2535	
	Mean	56,29032	81,77419	

The table shows that all students score are increased at least 15 and the most is 40. The mean score of pretest is 56,290 and the posttest is 81,774.

Table 3
The Result of Normality Test
Tests of Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
Before	.189	31	.006	.942	31	.096
After	.310	31	.010	.870	31	.009

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

The result of normality test explains that the the result of Shapiro Wilk and Lilliefors test before and after treatment was 0,06 and 0,10, means that both of them are greater than 0,05 or (0,06 and 0,10 > 0,05) and the *p* value before treatment was 0,96 and after treatment was 0,09. It means that both of them are greater than 0,05.

Table 4
The Result of Hypothesis

Paired Samples Statistics

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1 Before CTL	56.2903	31	8.26315	1.48410
After CTL	81.7742	31	5.25173	.94324

Paired Samples Correlations

	N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1 Before CTL and After CTL	31	.637	.000

Paired Samples Test

	Paired Differences					T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Pair 1 Before CTL - After CTL E1	- 2.54839	 6.37114	 1.14429	 -27.82082	 -23.14692	 -22.270	 30	 .000

The analysis result using SPSS.16 described that the mean of the group before implementing CTL was 56,2903, and after the treatment was done the mean was 81,7742. The standard deviation of both were 8,26 for pretest and 5,25 after treatment. The *t* value was - 22.270 and significance 2 tailed was 0,000. The correlation gained from the analysis was 0,637.

The data gained from interview to students explains that most of them like and motivated to learn since they had never found the method before, in addition the teacher explained most of the students were interested and motivated in the teaching and learning process. The result of observation of CTL process showed that most of the students noted and tried to answer the questions relate to the material given by the teacher. The learning community was occurred in inquiry step. All the members of the group were motivated and actively involved in the learning process, they work together in a group, they tried to look for sources related to the material, analyzed, concluded and presented to the class.

In the presentation phase the students demonstrated what they had worked, most of the students questioned and commented on the other groups work. The students looked actively involved and retained their opinion. The students involment mostly looked at assessment phase. All the groups showed the result of discussion on the class wall and each member assessed other groups work freely, they corrected, comented and gave score. It means that the class have been changed from the passive to be active. The teaching and learning process lasted with reflecting step, in this case the teacher and students enhanced the answers and concluded the result of learning outcomes.

D. Discussion

The data of pretest and posttest showed that the data is normally distributed, since based on the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test the significance 2-tailed is greater than 0,05. That was 0,06 before treatment and 0,10 after giving treatment and the p value before treatment was 0,96 and after treatment was 0,09. It means that both of them are greater than 0,05 (2-tailed sig). So the data can be used for the research.

The mean score is also increasing of 25.4839 from pretest to posttest. However it does not mean that there is differnce between pretest and posttest since the data must be tested using paired sample t test. The result of analysis paired sample t test using SPSS.16 shows that there is distinction in reading achievement before and after the implementaion of CTL method. It can be seen from paired sample t-test obtained t table with degree of freedom (df) 30 is 1,697, then the reception area of Ho between -1,697 to 1,697, Ho is accepted and Ha means rejected. In this study, the t value - 22.270, then the value of the reception area outside Ho, Ho is rejected and Ha is accepted. It can be concluded that there is a difference in reading achievement before and after the implementation of CTL.

The significance value shows 0.000, it is lower than 0,05 ($0.000 < (0.05)$) means that H_0 is accepted and H_a rejected based on the hypothesis has been stated. It can be concluded that the difference of students reading achievement before and after the implementation of CTL as method in teaching is significant. The significant difference learning outcomes does not constitute as coincidence factor, but it is because of the influence of the application CTL with all the advantages that has been described researcher on the discussion before.

To know how much the difference between pretest and post-test results, the researcher using the coefficient of determination test by squaring the test results corelation $(0,637)^2 \times 100\% = 40,57\%$. It can be said that the the degree of difference is 40,57%. The data obtained from interview explains that most of the students are intersted and motivated to have reading ability since the method is interesting and acceptable them. The result of observation shows that most of students were actively involved in the teaching and learning process.

E. Conclusion

The research finding and discussing above states that there is significantly different of students reading achievement who are taught using CTL than who are not taught using it, with degree of difference is 40,57%. Based on the result of analysis t_{value} is 22,270 and t_{table} with degree of freedom of 30 and degree of significance 0,05 is 1,697 means that t_{value} is higher than t_{table} in which H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted. It can be concluded that CTL method is effective to teach reading at SMA Primaganda Jombang. Consequently, this study result supports the theories and the research study considering of the teaching of reading.*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Cain, K. dan J.V. Oakhill, Inference Ability and its Relation to Comprehension Failure in Young Children (Reading and Writing, 11, 1999).
- Clay, MM. *Becoming Literate*. Auckland, New Zealand : Heinemann, 1991.
- Day, RR. dan J. Bamford, "Teaching Reluctant Readers," jurnal *English Teaching Forum*, No. 35 (4), 2000.
- Depdiknas. *Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional Republik Indonesia Nomor 22 Tahun 2006*. Jakarta : Direktorat Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah, 2006.

- Firmanto. "Students Behavior of Reading Comprehension: Expectations and Follow up," Paper presented at LIA International Conference, (Jakarta, 2005).
- Fountas, I. dan G.S. Pinnell. *Guiding Readers and Writers, Grades 3-6*. Portsmouth : Heinemann, 1999.
- Gersten, R. et. all. "Teaching Reading Comprehension Strategies to Students with Learning Disabilities," A Review of Educational Research, 2001.
- Grabe, W. dan F. Stoller, *Teaching and Researching Reading*. Harlow : Longman, 2002.
- Graham, L. dan A. Bellert. "Difficulties in Reading Comprehension for Students with Learning Difficulties," in Wong B. (ed.). *Learning About Learning Disabilities*. San Diego : Elsevier Academic, 2004.
- Huda, N. *Language Learning and Teaching*. Malang : Penerbit IKIP Malang, 1999.
- Jain M. dan Patel F.M. *English Language Teaching*. tk. : Sunrise Publishers and Distributors, 2008.
- Jhonson, Elaine B. *Contextual Teaching and Learning*. Bandung : LC, 2002.
- Klingner, JK., S. Vaughn dan A. Broadman. *Teaching Reading Comprehension to Students with Learning Difficulties*. London : The Guilford Press, 2007.
- Kweldju, S. "English Department Student`s Interest and Strategies in Reading their Content Area Textbooks," *TEFLIN Journal*, No. 8 (1), 1996.
- Manset-Williamson, G. dan J.M. Nelson. "Balanced, Strategic Reading Instruction for Upper Elementary and Middle School Students with Reading Disabilities," *Jurnal Learning Disability Quarterly*, No. 28, 2005.
- Peni, Kitri Katon. "The Effectiveness of Contextual Teaching and Learning to Teach Reading Comrehension Viewed from Student`s Intellegence Experimental Study in SMP Negeri Surakarta 2009/2010".
- River, WM. *Teaching Foreign Language Skill*. Chicago : The University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- Sugiyono. *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif*. Bandung : Alfabeta, 2011.
- Zakiah, S. "Improving Students' Reading Comprehension of Descriptive Text Through CTL at Second Grade Bakti Mulia 400 Junior High School Jakarta," 2011.