

THE APPLICATION OF CONTEXTUAL TEACHING AND LEARNING IN TEACHING ELLIPTICAL SENTENCES TO THE GRADE NINE STUDENTS OF SMP NEGERI 17 PALU

Putri Rahmawati Ningtyas

Sekolah Tinggi Keguruan Dan Ilmu Pendidikan (STKIP) Dampal Selatan
Jalan Drs. Husain Laewang No. 03 Soni Dampal Selatan Kabupaten Tolitoli
e-mail: putrilanter@gmail.com

Abstract:

The Application of Contextual Teaching and Learning in Teaching Elliptical sentences to the Grade Nine Students of SMP Negeri 17 Palu. The objective of this research was to prove that the application of contextual teaching and learning (CTL) can improve the ability of the grade nine students in constructing elliptical sentences. The sample of the research was taken by using cluster random sampling technique. Class IX B was the experimental class while IX C was the control class. The instruments used to collect the data were observation and tests. The results of observation were analyzed by using descriptive analysis. The results of tests were analyzed by applying statistic analysis. Applying 0.05 level of significance and 56 (29+29-2) degree of freedom (df), the writer found that t-test value (6.136) was greater than t-table value (2.007). It means that the application of contextual teaching and learning is effective to improve students' ability in constructing elliptical sentences.

Abstrak:

Penerapan Pembelajaran Kontekstual dan Pembelajaran dalam mengajar kalimat Elips untuk Siswa Kelas Sembilan SMP Negeri 17 Palu. Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk membuktikan bahwa penerapan pengajaran kontekstual dan pembelajaran (CTL) dapat meningkatkan kemampuan siswa kelas sembilan dalam membangun kalimat elips. Sampel penelitian diambil dengan menggunakan teknik cluster random sampling. Kelas IX B adalah kelas eksperimen sedangkan IX C adalah kelas kontrol. Instrumen yang digunakan untuk mengumpulkan data adalah observasi dan tes. Hasil pengamatan dianalisis dengan menggunakan analisis deskriptif. Hasil tes dianalisis dengan menerapkan analisis statistik. Menerapkan tingkat signifikansi 0,05 dan derajat kebebasan (df) 56 (29 + 29-2), penulis menemukan bahwa nilai uji-t (6,136) lebih besar daripada nilai t-tabel (2,007). Ini berarti bahwa penerapan pengajaran dan pembelajaran kontekstual efektif untuk meningkatkan kemampuan siswa dalam membangun kalimat elips.

Keyword: Application, Contextual Teaching and Learning, Teaching, Elliptical sentences

INTRODUCTION

English is popular and important because it is widely used in the world. It is also a medium of getting useful information of the world and useful tool to introduce science and technology. Consequently, in Indonesia English is taught either formally from elementary school up to university level and informally in courses.

When someone is producing a language, skills and components must be integrated to convey and to get message across. It is important for students to master both skills and components of English. The students, whose basic knowledge of English is low, will not be able to use it correctly.

Most of students get difficulties in comprehending and mastering the part of the language especially in structure. Structure is taught integrally in the school. In constructing

grammatically correct sentence, vocabulary and pronunciation are needed. According to Nunan (1991:153), grammar exists to enable us to 'mean' and without grammar, it is impossible to communicate beyond a very rudimentary level. Concerning to the statement, the writer assumes that structure is an aspect of language which should be possessed by students to go to a level of advance in communication. That is why, studying about grammar/structure is important because it rules of forming words and making sentences. Then, John & Yates (1982 : 467) explain:

When you are talking or writing about something that interest you, your ideas are likely to be, not separate and independent, but related to each other. The most important characteristic of mature sentence is they indicate the kinds of relationship that exist between ideas, not only in words but in the structure of the sentence as well.

In this case, students must know and understand the grammar because it is indispensable in organizing sentence into comprehensible English. Besides, grammar can provide the students to be strong on producing and accepting the language formally.

Students of secondary school are taught some English structures. One of English structures that learned by the grade nine students is Elliptical sentences. The elliptical sentence is sentence that contains of two different subjects but have the same verbs. It aims to avoid repetition. For instance:

1. She speaks English, and I do too.
2. They like the song, and so do we.
3. Andrew is not here, and Nita is not either.
4. I don not like papaya, and neither does my sister.

In constructing elliptical sentences, most of students misuse and misplace the use of “so”, “too”, “either”, and “neither” for they have no information in their mind about the difference among them. Students make error by writing They do not like playing badminton, and we do too or Anita eats a plate of fried rice, and I do so. They should construct They do not like playing badminton, and neither do we or Anita eats a plate of fried rice, and so do I instead of the first ones. The use of “so” and “too” is different from “either” and “neither” in forming elliptical construct. Since students are unable to think clearly the pattern of elliptical sentence in the form of the positive and the negative, they cannot construct the sentence of elliptical accurately.

The way of teaching and presenting of material should be improved so that both teacher and students can get maximum achievement after teaching and learning process. Application of techniques and media can facilitate the students in the process of learning and encourage students’ motivation. In this case, teachers have to be able to choose the appropriate technique or media in teaching English structure to create a good class atmosphere. In this research, the researcher is interested in the application of Contextual Teaching and Learning (CTL) in teaching elliptical sentence due to CTL can motivate students in the process of learning that relates the knowledge to the students’ real situations such as personal, social, and cultural circumstances. Then, the students find it easy to apply the knowledge by reflecting their real world. In conducting the teaching and learning process, the researcher explained the material about elliptical sentences. Then, she continued by giving some examples of

elliptical sentences that relate to the topic. The researcher provided the examples of students’ real situations. Then, students tried to make the sentences by taking things that have close relationship to them. By relating the subject matter and things surround them, they have ideas to construct the elliptical sentences.

The researcher conducted her research in SMP Negeri 17 Palu for two reasons. First, a research of teaching English structure, especially teaching elliptical sentence by application of picture has not been conducted yet in the school. Second is most of students, especially the ninth grader, stand up with great difficulty in constructing elliptical sentence in the form of positive and negative. The writer found out the information after conducting PPL Terpadu in SMP Negeri 17 Palu. She taught elliptical sentence to the students of junior high school because based on the curriculum they will study about it when they are in the grade nine.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research was a true experimental research. It had two groups as the samples. One of the groups was the experimental group and another was the control group. The researcher taught the same materials to the two groups by applying different technique. It purposed to know whether the treatment that was given to the experimental group had an influence to students’ achievement. The experimental group (R1) got a treatment through Contextual Teaching and Learning (X), whereas the control group (R2) did not. Both groups were given pretest and posttest. The design of this research taken from Best (1981:70) as follows:

Pre-test-Treatment-Post-test

Experimental

Group	01	X	02
Control Group	03		04

Where:

01 03 : Pre-test

X : Treatment

02 04 : Post-test

This research needs a population to be analyzed by the researcher because it gave some useful information. John (2005:146) states, “A population is a group of individuals who have the same characteristics”. Population of this research will be the total number of the year nine students in the four parallel classes (IX A, IX B, IX C, IX D, and IX E) of SMP Negeri 17 Palu. Each class consists of 29 up to 30 students. The amount of

population is 147 students. The distribution of students in every class can be seen below:

Class IX A consists of 30 students

Class IX B consists of 29 students

Class IX C consists of 29 students

Class IX D consists of 29 students

Class IX E consists of 30 students

Within this target population, the researcher selected a sample for study. John (2005:146) states, "A sample is a subgroup of the target population that the researcher plans to study for generalizing about the target population". She applied cluster random sampling technique to find out the sample of this research that taken from the population. Cluster random sampling technique enables each class to have chance to be selected for being the sample. To determine the sample, the researcher used lottery. There were some procedures. First of all, she prepared four pieces of paper. After that, she marked the papers with the name of the classes and then put them into a box. The writer shook the box till the two papers came out of the box. Then, she decided the experimental group and the control group.

A research needs variable. Kerlingert in Arikunto (2002:97) states "All experiments have one fundamental idea behind them: to test the effect of one or more independent variables on a dependent variable. It is possible to have more than one dependent variable in experiment". It is clear that an experimental research has two variables. They are called dependent and independent variable. Then, Best (1981: 59) states as follows:

Variables are the conditions or characteristic that the experimenter manipulates, control or observe. The independent variables are the condition or characteristics the experimenter manipulates in his/ her attempt to ascertain their relationship to observe phenomena, while the dependent variables are the conditions or characteristic that appears, disappear or change as the experimenter introduces, remove or change independent variables.

The dependent variable of this research was the result of teaching elliptical sentence to the grade nine students of SMP Negeri 17 Palu. Then, the application of Contextual Teaching and Learning was the independent variable.

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

The data were analyzed by using two kinds of analysis. Descriptive analysis presented the result of observation. The main data from pre-test and posttest were analyzed statistically.

The Result of Observation

The researcher observed both the experimental and control group. Her reason for holding on the observation was to get some information dealing with the presentation of the lesson or the materials. She focused her observation on the English classroom activities. The results of the observation are presented in the following ways:

1. The teacher firstly made a check on the student's attendance
2. The teacher made warming up activities before beginning the lesson by asking some questions. This activity was done to get the students' attention in the process of learning.
3. The student's responses were quite passive toward the teacher oral questions. Only a few students could answer the questions.
4. In presenting the material, the teacher didn't use English all the time. She wrote down the material on the board, and then explained it. The material used based on a textbook.
5. In doing the task, the teacher asked the students to do the tasks individually.
6. There were no any media used during the teaching learning process.
7. At the end of teaching and learning process, the teacher gave the students homework.

The Result of Tests

The Result of Pre-test

The pre-test was done before giving the treatment to the students. It was planned to know student's achievement in experimental and control group before the application of contextual teaching and learning

Table 1
The Result Of Pre-test Of Experimental Group

No	Initial Name of the Students	Raw Score			Total	Standard Score
		Translation	Completion	Sentence Construction		
1	Agu	8	8	12	28	4.3
2	And	3	3	9	15	2.3
3	Cla	10	6	14	30	4.6
4	Des	10	3	3	16	2.4
5	Dwi	0	3	11	14	2.1
6	Eka	0	5	10	15	2.3
7	Ern	10	7	10	27	4.1
8	Feb	7	4	9	20	3.0
9	Hel	6	4	10	20	3.0
10	Ind	9	8	11	28	4.3
11	Irm	9	7	12	28	4.3
12	Lar	11	5	14	30	4.6
13	M.Fad	10	12	14	36	5.5
14	M.Fai	9	7	9	25	3.8
15	M.Igr	9	7	15	31	4.7
16	M.Rez	11	0	15	26	4
17	Nov	9	1	12	22	3.3
18	NurF	10	4	7	21	3.2
19	NurH	5	7	10	22	3.3
20	NurN	6	2	13	21	3.2
21	Nrl	6	4	0	10	1.5

22	Rev	0	4	11	15	2.3
23	Rif	9	4	17	30	4.6
24	Riz	7	6	14	27	4.1
25	Sis	9	6	17	32	4.9
26	Sri	7	1	9	17	2.6
27	Sul	7	7	11	25	3.8
28	Tas	7	5	10	22	3.3
29	Win	9	6	7	22	3.3
Total					675	102.7

The data on table 4.1 displays the mean scores of students in experimental group. The researcher computed the scores by using formula that proposed by Arikunto as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 M_x &= \frac{\sum X}{N} \\
 &= \frac{102.7}{29} \\
 &= 3.54
 \end{aligned}$$

Table 2
The Result Of Pre-test Of Control Group

No	Initial Name of the Students	Raw Score				Standard Score
		Translation	Completion	Sentence Construction	Total	
1	Agu	8	4	8	20	3.0
2	And	3	4	8	15	2.3
3	Ana	7	13	10	30	4.6
4	Ady	10	9	13	32	4.9
5	Dia	6	7	13	26	4
6	Dod	0	4	11	15	2.3
7	Eli	8	7	12	27	4.1
8	Fen	9	3	13	25	3.8
9	Fit	8	10	14	32	4.9
10	Her	0	7	13	20	3.0
11	Iin	5	9	11	25	3.8
12	Kur	0	6	16	22	3.3
13	M. Aj	0	6	11	17	2.6
14	M. Akb	9	12	12	33	5.0
15	M. Riz	4	8	14	26	4
16	M. Sab	7	9	10	26	4
17	M. Sek	8	0	12	20	3.0
18	M. Rai	6	10	12	28	4.3
19	Nur A	10	5	10	25	3.8
20	Nur F	7	3	12	22	3.3
21	Ref	5	11	9	25	3.8
22	Riz	2	3	8	13	2
23	Rin	5	9	9	23	3.5
24	Vin	7	10	14	31	4.1
25	Wul	7	7	5	22	3.3
26	Yuy	9	1	10	20	3.0
27	Zel	10	10	14	34	5.2
28	Put	12	8	10	30	4.6
29	Riz	7	0	12	19	2.9
Total					703	106.4

The mean score of control group on pre-test was also calculated by using the same formula as in the experimental group as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 M_y &= \frac{\sum Y}{N} = \frac{106.4}{29} \\
 &= 3.66
 \end{aligned}$$

The result of Posttest

The posttest that was given to the experimental and control group had the same form as the pre-test. The posttest was administered in order to know the effect of the treatment toward the students' achievement. The results of the posttest are presented in the following table:

Table 3
The Result Of Post-test Of the Experimental Group

No	Initial Name of the Students	Raw Score				Standard Score
		Translation	Completion	Sentence Construction	Total	
1	Agu	12	15	18	45	6.9
2	And	19	15	17	51	7.8
3	Cla	23	19	20	62	9.5
4	Des	22	19	20	61	9.3
5	Dwi	8	15	17	40	6.1
6	Eka	22	20	17	59	9.0
7	Ern	21	19	18	58	8.9
8	Feb	10	10	18	38	5.8
9	Hel	19	15	18	52	8
10	Ind	21	20	20	61	9.3
11	Irm	21	19	20	60	9.2
12	Lar	21	19	20	60	9.2
13	M. Fad	21	20	20	61	9.3
14	M. Fai	18	17	17	52	8
15	M. Iqr	20	19	18	57	8.7
16	M. Rez	22	18	18	58	8.9
17	Nov	18	16	18	52	8
18	Nur F	13	13	19	45	6.9
19	Nur H	21	20	20	61	9.3
20	Nur N	20	20	20	60	9.2
21	Nrl	13	12	17	42	6.4
22	Rev	20	18	19	57	8.7
23	Rif	22	18	20	60	9.2
24	Riz	22	19	18	59	9.0
25	Sis	19	17	17	53	8.1
26	Sri	17	14	18	49	7.5
27	Sul	13	15	19	47	7.3
28	Tas	20	19	20	59	9.0
29	Win	20	19	19	58	8.9
Total					1577	241.4

The mean score of experimental group on post-test could be calculated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 M_x &= \frac{\sum X}{N} \\
 &= \frac{241.4}{29} \\
 &= 8.32
 \end{aligned}$$

Table 4
The Result Of Posttest Of Control Group

No	Initial Name of the Students	Raw Score				Standard Score
		Translation	Completion	Sentence Construction	Total	
1	Agu	15	11	15	41	6.3
2	And	8	13	14	35	5.3
3	Ana	21	17	19	57	8.7
4	Ady	20	17	20	57	8.7
5	Dia	15	10	18	43	6.6
6	Dod	10	16	15	41	6.3
7	Eli	19	16	18	53	8.1
8	Fen	19	14	16	49	7.5
9	Fit	16	17	19	52	8
10	Her	15	10	18	43	6.6
11	Iin	16	14	16	46	7.0
12	Kur	21	17	18	56	8.6
13	M. Aj	13	12	17	42	6.4
14	M. Akb	18	17	17	52	8
15	M. Riz	16	15	15	46	7.0
16	M. Sab	19	13	17	49	7.5
17	M. Sek	8	16	18	42	6.4
18	M. Rai	21	18	18	57	8.7
19	Nur A	12	14	17	43	6.6
20	Nur F	12	15	18	45	6.9
21	Ref	10	14	12	36	5.5
22	Riz	10	10	17	37	5.6
23	Rin	5	17	18	40	6.1
24	Vin	19	19	18	56	8.6
25	Wul	18	13	14	45	6.9
26	Yuy	12	12	14	38	5.8
27	Zel	22	19	20	61	9.3
28	Put	15	13	19	47	7.3
29	Riz	10	14	14	38	5.8
Total					1347	206.1

Based on the table, the researcher computed the mean score the post-test of control group as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} M_y &= \frac{\sum Y}{N} \\ &= \frac{206.1}{29} \\ &= 7.10 \end{aligned}$$

Table 5
The Students' Core Deviation Of Pre-test and Post-test Of Experimental Group

No	Initial Name of the Students	Student's Standard Score		X	
		Pre-test	Posttest	$X_2 - X_1$	X^2
1	Agu	4.3	6.9	2.6	6.76
2	And	2.3	7.8	5.5	30.25
3	Cla	4.6	9.5	4.9	24.01
4	Des	2.4	9.3	6.9	47.61
5	Dwi	2.1	6.1	4	16
6	Eka	2.3	9.0	6.7	44.89
7	Em	4.1	8.9	4.8	23.04
8	Feb	3.0	5.8	2.8	7.84
9	Hel	3.0	8	5	25
10	Ind	4.3	9.3	5	25
11	Irm	4.3	9.2	4.9	24.01
12	Lar	4.6	9.2	4.6	21.16
13	M. Fad	5.5	9.3	3.8	14.44
14	M. Fai	3.8	8	4.2	17.64
15	M. Igr	4.7	8.7	4	16
16	M. Rez	4	8.9	4.9	24.01
17	Nov	3.3	8	4.7	22.09
18	Nur F	3.2	6.9	3.7	13.69
19	Nur H	3.3	9.3	6	36
20	Nur N	3.2	9.2	6	36
21	Nrl	1.5	6.4	4.9	24.01
22	Rev	2.3	8.7	6.4	40.96
23	Rif	4.6	9.2	4.6	21.16
24	Riz	4.1	9.0	4.9	24.01
25	Sis	4.9	8.1	3.2	10.24
26	Sri	2.6	7.5	4.9	24.01
27	Sul	3.8	7.3	3.5	12.25
28	Tas	3.3	9.0	5.7	32.49
29	Win	3.3	8.9	5.6	31.36
	Total	102.7	241.4	138.7	695.93

Table 6
The Students' Score Deviation Of Pre-test and Post-test Of Control Group

No	Initial Name of the Students	Student's Standard Score		Y	
		Pre-test	Posttest	$Y_2 - Y_1$	Y^2
1	Agu	3.0	6.3	3.3	10.89
2	And	2.3	5.3	3	9
3	Ana	4.6	8.7	4.1	16.81
4	Ady	4.9	8.7	3.8	14.44
5	Dia	4	6.6	2.6	6.76
6	Dod	2.3	6.3	4	16
7	Eli	4.1	8.1	4	16
8	Fen	3.8	7.5	3.7	13.69
9	Fit	4.9	8	3.1	9.61
10	Her	3.0	6.6	3.6	12.96
11	lin	3.8	7.0	3.2	10.24
12	Kur	3.3	8.6	5.3	28.09
13	M. Aj	2.6	6.4	3.8	14.44
14	M. Akb	5.0	8	3	9
15	M. Riz	4	7.0	3	9
16	M. Sab	4	7.5	3.5	12.25
17	M. Sek	3.0	6.4	3.4	11.56
18	M. Rai	4.3	8.7	4.4	19.36
19	Nur A	3.8	6.6	2.8	7.84
20	Nur F	3.3	6.9	3.6	12.96
21	Ref	3.8	5.5	1.7	2.89
22	Riz	2	5.6	3.6	12.96
23	Rin	3.5	6.1	2.6	6.76
24	Vin	4.1	8.6	4.5	20.25
25	Wul	3.3	6.9	3.6	12.96
26	Yuy	3.0	5.8	2.8	7.84
27	Zel	5.2	9.3	4.1	16.81
28	Put	4.6	7.3	2.7	7.29
29	Riz	2.9	5.8	2.9	8.41
	Total	106.4	206.1	99.7	357.07

Based on the table 4.5 and 4.6 above, the researcher then computed the mean score of the deviation of pre-test and post-test of both groups

by using the formula proposed by Arikunto as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} M_x &= \frac{\sum X}{N} \\ &= \frac{138.7}{29} \\ &= 4.78 \\ M_y &= \frac{\sum Y}{N} \\ &= \frac{99.7}{29} \\ &= 3.43 \end{aligned}$$

The mean calculation showed that the mean deviation of experimental group was higher than control one. The mean deviation of experimental group on pre-test and post-test was 4.78, while the mean deviation of control group on pre-test and post-test was 3.43.

Before analyzing the data by using the t-test formula, the researcher calculated the sum-squared deviation around the mean of the control and experimental groups as stated in the following ways:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum x^2 &= \sum x^2 - \frac{(\sum x)^2}{n} \\ &= 695.93 - \frac{(138.7)^2}{29} \\ &= 695.93 - \frac{19237.69}{29} \\ &= 695.93 - 663.36 \\ &= 32.57 \\ \sum y^2 &= \sum y^2 - \frac{(\sum y)^2}{n} \\ &= 357.07 - \frac{(99.7)^2}{29} \\ &= 357.07 - \frac{9940.09}{29} \\ &= 357.07 - 342.76 \\ &= 14.31 \end{aligned}$$

As a result, the sum-squared deviation of experimental group is 32.57 and the sum-squared deviation of control group is 14.31.

After having the sum-squared deviation around the mean of experimental and control group, the researcher continued to find out the significant difference of the two groups by using t-test formula stated by Arikunto as follows:

$$t = \frac{Mx - My}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\sum x^2 + \sum y^2}{Nx + Ny - 2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{Nx} + \frac{1}{Ny}\right)}}$$

$$t = \frac{4.78 - 3.43}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{32.57 + 14.31}{29 + 29 - 2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{29} + \frac{1}{29}\right)}}$$

$$t = \frac{1.35}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{46.88}{56}\right)\left(\frac{2}{29}\right)}}$$

$$t = \frac{1.35}{\sqrt{(0.83)(0.06)}}$$

$$t = \frac{1.35}{\sqrt{(0.049)}}$$

$$t = \frac{1.35}{0.22}$$

$$t = 6.136$$

Discussion

The result of observation showed that the teaching and learning process in the class was followed through using three phases, pre-activity, while activity and post-activity. Before beginning the lesson, the teacher did warming up activity to get students' attention. She run the teaching process by combining English and Indonesian. In presenting material to the students, the teacher did not apply specific technique that could support the success of teaching and learning process. At the end of the class, the teacher gave homework to the students.

The tests were used by the researcher r to measure students' ability. There were two kinds of tests, pre-test and posttest. The first one measured the knowledge of the students before having the treatment. Based on the result of pre-test, it could be seen that the experimental and control group had similar ability. Students in experimental class achieved mean score 3.54 while in control class, the students gained mean score 3.66.

In doing the treatment, the researcher applied CTL in teaching elliptical sentences. She taught elliptical sentences by drawing upon students' real life. As the result, the material was more understandable because the students related the subject matter to the things that have close relationship in their daily life. Furthermore, the students were serious in studying for they could understand the lesson. In doing the tasks, the students were often set in pair work or group. It gave positive effect for they had chance to share ideas and solved the problem together. The tasks were easier to be finished in group work than solo work. To get students' attention, the researcher often used pictures. At the end of teaching process, she always gave evaluation to the students. However, in presenting the material the school English teacher did not apply any special technique. She just gave the example from the textbook. She did not try to use media, such as picture to support the learning process. The teacher asked the students to do the tasks individually so that some of them felt desperate when they could not finish the tasks. As the result, the students lost their focus on the tasks and got low motivation in studying. Furthermore, the students were not serious in accepting the lesson. Some of them just made a noisy and chatted.

After applying this method, there was significant change to the experimental group. Some students achieved good improvement in score. The students of control group also improved in score. But, only a few students got highest score after having the posttest. The researcher didn't use any special technique to teach elliptical sentences in the control class. In conclusion, the result of post-test, it was found that most of the students in experimental class could finish all the tests firmly even though some of them still failed; however they could achieve the better mean score in posttest compared to the control class.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Conclusions

After analyzing the data in previous chapter, the researcher draws conclusions as follows:

1. In presenting the material, the teacher did not use any special technique or media in teaching. It might make the motivation of the students in the low level because the teaching and learning process was monotonous.

2. Contextual Teaching and Learning (CTL) is an effective method in improving the ability of students in constructing elliptical sentences because the students find it easy to apply the knowledge by reflecting their real world.
3. There is a significant difference between the result of the pre-test and posttest in the two groups.

Suggestions

The researcher would like to contribute some suggestions for those who are involved in English learning-teaching process to elicit better result in the process. The suggestions are presented as follows:

1. Teachers should apply contextual teaching and learning (CTL) in teaching English.
2. Teachers should make some variations in teaching English. The first step can be provision of media of teaching to raise students' enthusiasm.
3. Students should initiate to motivate themselves to learn English. They should learn many things around them both at school and environment because an all out effort made by teacher is inadequate to encourage students to learn.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arikunto, S. 2002. *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Jakarta; Edisi Revisi V. Rineka Cipta.
- Arikunto, S. 2006. *Prosedur penelitian suatu pendekatan praktik*. Edisi Revisi IV. Jakarta: Rineka cipta.
- Azar, B. S. 1992. *Fundamentals of English grammar*. Second edition. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, inc.
- Best, J.W. 1981. *Research in Education*. New Jersey: Englewood Cliffs.
- Carthy, A. M & Hariyono, R. 2008. *ABC Plus English Grammar*. Surabaya: Gitamedia Press.
- Cyssco, D. R. 2000. *English Grammar Practice for TOEFL*. Jakarta: Puspa Swara.
- Frank, M. 1972. *Modern English*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- John, W. C. 2005. *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitavi and Qualitative Research*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska.
- Krohn, 1971. *English Sentence Structure*. USA: The University of Michigan.
- Latif, M. A. 2002. *Pembelajaran Bahasa Inggris Berbasis Konteks*. Makalah Guru Bahasa Inggris Fakultas Sastra, Universitas Negeri Malang.
- Martinet, A.V & A.J. Thomson. 1969. *A practical English grammar*. Second edition. Oxford university press.
- Nunan, D. 1991. *Language teaching methodology: A textbook for teacher*. New York: Prentice hall.
- Sutomo. 1985. *Teknik Penilaian Pendidikan (edisi pertama)*. Surabaya.
- Swan, M. 1995. *Practical English Usage*. Second Edition. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Anonymous. *Contextual Teaching and Learning*. Retrieved on June 11, 2009 from <http://www.cew.wisc.edu/teachnet/ctl/>. Accessed on June 11, 2009