Mengembangkan Keterampilan Berbicara Mahasiswa Semester 3 AMIK Tri Dharma Palu melalui Pengajaran dan Pembelajaran Kontekstual

Developing Speaking Skill of Semester Semester 3 Students of AMIK Tri Dharma Palu through Contextual Teaching and Learning

Vemmy Maidita Nur Aisyiah*, Hasan Basri, Sudarkam R. Mertosono, Mawardin M. Said, Aminah Suriaman

Program Studi Magister Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan, Universitas Tadulako, Palu, Sulawesi Tengah, Indonesia

Abstrak	Tujuan penelitian ini ialah untuk membuktikan bahwa penggunaan pengajaran dan pembelajaran kontekstual dapat mengembangkan keterampilan berbicara mahasiswa semester 3 AMIK Tri Dharma Palu. Penelitian ini menggunakan *quasi eksperimental* dengan rancangan *non-equivalent control group*. Populasi berjumlah 95 mahasiswa semester 3 AMIK Tri dharma Palu. Sampel berjumlah 42 mahasiswa dipilih menggunakan teknik *purposive sampling*. Metode tes tertulis digunakan pada saat mengumpulkan data dengan tes sebagai instrumen. Tes diberikan sebanyak dua kali yaitu tes awal dan tes akhir. Data dianalisis secara statistik menggunakan tingkat signifikansi 0,05 dan derajat kebebasan 40. Hasil menunjukkan bahwa setelah melakukan pengajaran dan pembelajaran kontekstual, nilai mahasiswa meningkat. Dengan kata lain, penggunaan pengajaran dan pembelajaran kontekstual efektif untuk mengembangkan keterampilan berbicara mahasiswa semester 3 AMIK Tri Dharma Palu.
Kata Kunci	Keterampilan Berbicara, Pengajaran dan Pembelajaran Kontekstual, Mahasiswa
Abstract	The aim of this research is to prove that applying contextual teaching and learning can develop speaking skills of semester 3 Students of AMIK Tri Dharma Palu. The research applied quasi experimental with non-equivalent control group. The population was 95 students of semester 3 of AMIK Tri Dharma Palu. The samples were 42 students selected employing purposive sampling technique. Paper and-pencil method was used when collecting the data with a test as the instrument. The test was administered twice namely pretest and posttest. The data were analyzed statistically using 0.05 level of significance and 40 degree of freedom. The result show that after receiving intervention through contextual teaching and learning, students' score got improved. In other words, applying contextual teaching and learning is effective in developing students' speaking skill of semester 3 of AMIK Tri Dharma Palu.
Keywords	Speaking Skill, Contextual Teaching and Learning, Students

1. Introduction

Speaking is expressing ideas, feelings, thoughts, and needs orally. As Hornby (1995) stated speaking is making words in an ordinary voice, uttering words, knowing and being able to use a language, expressing one in words and making speech. The act of speaking involves not only the production of sound but also the use of gesture, the

movement of muscle of face, and indeed of the whole body (Widdowson, 1985). All these nonverbal accompaniments of speaking as communication activity are transmitted through the visual medium. Harmer (2001) states that the reasons are they want to say something, they have some communicative purposes, and they select from their language store. Of course, there will be a desire to communicate on the part of the learners and they will also have a communicative purpose. Where the learners involve in a drill or in repetition, they will be motivated the need to reach the objective of communication. The emphasis is on the form of the language. A teacher should create the procedures of teaching in order that objective is reached.

Speaking is particularly useful when you want to get something stated and you need to give instruction or orders. Speaking is used for sharing a personal experience to others (Philips,1982). A large percentage of the world's language learners study English in order to develop proficiency in speaking because is one of the most important skills in language learning besides listening, writing, and reading. Speaking belongs to performance rather than competence since the speaker is required to practice in actual situation (Richards & Renandya, 2002; River,1968).

The real problem found in speaking generally is that students are not able to speak English. The students have been taught English since they were in Junior high school or even elementary school but they are not confident in expressing their ideas satisfactorily. Students are not able to speak in English or use the language to communicate when they want to or when they must, when the teacher asks students several questions, they seem that they understand and they want to respond it. The fact, students take long time to respond the questions, students might worry about making mistakes, being criticized, and feeling shy talking in front of the class.

The objective of teaching speaking is clearly stated in Curriculum 2013. For senior high school and university students are expected to be able to arrange written and oral expression. In order to achieve the objective of teaching speaking, the teacher needs to apply appropriate technique or method that refers to the plan of language teaching, or techniques which is the application or the implementation of a method to solve the problem (Fikri et al., 2014).

In AMIK Tri Dharma Palu, the writer found that most students are difficult to engage in speaking activity. Besides, they lack of vocabulary, low confidence, lost idea, not knowing how to pronounce words well, and sometimes clearly being afraid of making mistakes. Some students who spoke English also used inappropriate grammar. Being able to keep speaking English fluently with a native speaker is viewed as the main goal of the students, which underlines as the importance of speaking skill in students' point of view. Therefore, she decided to concentrate on communicative competence in speaking which is helpful for students to develop their speaking skill by using Contextual Teaching and Learning (CTL). Johnson (2002) defines, CTL is an educational process that aims to help students see meaning in the academic material they are studying by connecting academic subjects with the context of their daily lives, that is, with context of their personal, social, and cultural circumstance. The researcher believes that the use of CTL is one of an

alternative way to solve problems of the students in the speaking class because it is connected to their daily life and their lesson in campus.

Berns and Erickson (2001) define CTL as conception of teaching and learning that helps teachers relate subject matter or content to real world situations and motivates students to make connections between knowledge and its applications to their lives. It focuses on the context of what we teach from the students' point of view. Muslich (2007) defines the foundation of CTL is constructivism, which emphasizes that learning is not only memorizing, but also reconstructing or constructing new knowledge and new competence through facts or proportion which they experience in their life. Blanchard (2001) identifies some characteristics of contextual instructions, they are relies on spatial memory, typically integrated multiple subjects, value of information is based on individual need, relates information with prior knowledge, and authentic assessment. Meanwhile Bern and Erickson (2001) state the characteristics of contextual learning as interdiscilinary learning, problem based learning, external context of learning. This theory views learning as where the students construct their own understanding based on prior knowledge and experience and apply them in a new situation. Constructivism calls for active participation from the students. It means that they will be able to maximize their knowledge if they learn through the real life context materials.

Several studies have been conducted and reported by many language researchers which have been purposed to develop learners' speaking skills by using the CTL. First, Astuti et al. (2015), based on the data, the researcher concluded that the implementation of CTL can improve the students' speaking achievement and teaching learning process. Therefore, CTL is recommended to be used by teachers to improve their student's speaking ability. The second research is from Ambarwati (2016), the result indicates that CTL can improve students' speaking ability in handling telephone calls. The other research is from Siregar et al. (2020). The results of this research were the students needed the English-speaking material which contains the material relating to their filed expertise and supported by innovative and creative learning process and the English-speaking material developed through CTL is a set of English-speaking material which consisted of 6 units.

After reading the three previous studies, there are similarities and differences found from both researches and the writers. All the researches used CTL and the results had effect on the students' speaking skills and it was appropriate to the material given. The difference is in design and the objects of the research, the previous researches used classroom action research and educational research and development while this research uses quasi experimental design. The objectives of this research is to prove that applying contextual teaching and learning can develop speaking skills of semester 3 students of AMIK Tri Dharma Palu.

2. Methods

The design of this research was quasi experimental non-equivalent control class, because there were two classes compared; they were experimental class and control one. Both classes were given the pretest and posttest, but only experimental class was given the treatment through the CTL. The control class was taught by using conventional teaching by their own English lecturer with the same materials arranged by the writer.

The population of this research was semester 3 students of AMIK Tri Dharma Palu which consists of two departments. Each department has two classes. First, Computer Engineering Department A and B, each class consists of 21 and 21 students. Second, the students consist of 26 and 27 in Computer System Department A and B. So, the population is 95. In selecting the data accurately, the writer chose the sample purposively because the students who became the sample have some problems in speaking. Therefore, it was conducted in Computer Engineering Department A as an experimental group and class B as the control group. In this research, the writer used test. The test consisted of pre-test and post-test. It focused on measuring the students' ability in speaking after treatment done. It can be known whether the CTL has effect or not.

Pretest is given to experimental and control classes in order to know the students' speaking skills concerned with their fluency and accuracy. In conducting the test, there were given some topics to be asked and answered. In this activity, the students are expected to be active in speaking activities. After giving the pretest to the experimental class, the treatment was done for six meetings in relation to their subject of English. The treatment was done in the campus and the writer gave the treatment directly based on te meeting result from the campus that started from the odd semester in 2020, the students could study in the campus by paying attention to the health protocol such as wearing the mask, washing their hands before entering the class, checking the body's temperature, and sitting apart. Before studying at campus in this pandemic Covid-19 situation, the students and their parents signed the agreement that the students want to study in the campus.

In this research, the test was given twice, before and after the treatment. The tests that she used were oral tests. Collecting data was started from October 14th, 2020 until November 6th, 2020. The writer gave the treatment to experimental class on October 16th, 2020 until November 6th, 2020.Whereas, the control class was taught by their English lecturer and the writer, on the same days but different time. In conclusion, the researcher taught experimental classes for eight meetings including pre-test and post-test. The meetings were scheduled twice a week for every class. For testing the students' speaking skill, the scale of scoring system covered fluency and accuracy. The scoring system can be seen in the Table 1.

Table 1. Scale of Scoring System

Rating	Accuracy	Fluency
5	Pronunciation is slightly influenced by the mother tongue. A few minor grammatical and lexical error but most utterances are correct.	Has to make an effort at times to search for words. Nevertheless, smooth delivery on the whole and a few unnatural pauses.
4	Pronunciation is still moderately influenced by the mother tongue but not serious phonological errors. A few grammatical and lexical errors but only one or two major errors causing confusion.	Although he has to make and effort and search for words, they are not too many unnatural pauses. Fairly smooth delivery mostly. Occasionally fragmentary but succeeds in conveying the general meaning. Fair range of expression.
3	Pronunciation is influenced by the mother tongue but only a few phonological errors. Several grammatical and lexical errors, some of which cause confusion.	Has to make an effort for much of the time. Often as to search for desired meaning. Rather meaning delivery and fragmentary range of expression often limited.
2	Pronunciation seriously influenced by the mother tongue with tenors causing a breakdown in communication. Many 'basic' grammatical and lexical errors.	Long pauses while be searches for the desired meaning. Frequently fragmentary and halting delivery. Almost gives up making the effort at times. Limited range of expression.
1	Serious pronunciation errors as well as many 'basic' grammatical and lexical errors. No evidence of heaving mastered any of the language skill and areas practiced in the course.	Full of long and unnatural pauses. Very halting and fragmentary delivery. At times gives making the effort. Very limited range of expression.

(Adapted From Heaton 1988)

Having presented about a rating scale of scoring system as written by Heaton above, the writer also determined the achievement standard that the students obtain individually to get the results of mean score. The grading system can be seen in the Table 2.

Table 2. Grading System Used at Amik Tri Dharma Palu

Rating	Score	Category	Predicate	Qualification
5	90-100	Excellent	A	Successful
4	80-89	Very Good	B+	Successful
3	70-79	Good	B	Successful
2	60-69	Fair	C	Fair
1	50-59	Poor	D	Failed
1	< 50	Very Poor	E	Failed

(Adopted From the score category of Amik TD Palu)

The high score in each aspect is 5 for two components of speaking (fluency and accuracy). There were 3 numbers of tests. So, the maximum score was 30. After doing all the treatment, the results of test were evaluated. The result of students' score in pre-test and post-test are analyzed statistically.

3. Results and Discussion

Results

Students from experimental and control classes were tested before implementing the treatment. This test was the pre-test. The purpose of this test was to measure students' prior knowledge in speaking. The result of the pre-test is presented in Table 3.

Table 3. The Students' Score of Pre-test of Experimental Class

No.	Initial	Fluency	Accuracy	Obtained Score	Maximum Score	Standard Score	Category	Qualification
1	AA	11	9	20	30	66	Fair	Failed
2	AD	5	4	9	30	30	Very Poor	Failed
3	ARS	6	6	12	30	40	Very Poor	Failed
4	BI	12	11	23	30	76	Good	Successful
5	BW	7	5	12	30	40	Very Poor	Failed
6	DM	6	6	12	30	40	Very Poor	Failed
7	DS	3	3	6	30	20	Very Poor	Failed
8	ES	10	12	22	30	73	Good	Successful
9	FA	4	6	10	30	33	Very Poor	Failed
10	FF	9	8	17	30	56	Poor	Failed
11	HS	7	7	14	30	46	Very Poor	Failed
12	IZ	4	3	7	30	23	Very Poor	Failed
13	JN	8	7	15	30	50	Poor	Failed
14	LS	3	3	6	30	20	Very Poor	Failed
15	MA	5	4	9	30	30	Very Poor	Failed
16	MJ	5	3	8	30	26	Very Poor	Failed
17	RF	14	11	25	30	83	Very Good	Failed
18	SHM	2	1	3	30	10	Very Poor	Failed
19	SK	3	2	5	30	16	Very Poor	Failed
20	TU	7	6	13	30	43	Very Poor	Failed
21	YN	6	5	11	30	36	Very Poor	Failed
Mean		6.52	5.81	12.33	30	40.81		

Based on the Table 3, the highest score of the pre-test is 83 and the lowest score is 10. Based on the grading system of English subject in that campus, there are only three students who are qualified successful in the pre-test because the score is more than 70. It means that there are 18 students who fail in the test. There is no student categorized excellent, 1 student is categorized very good, 2 students are good, 1 student is fair, 2 students are poor, and the rest 15 are very poor.

Table 4. The Students' Score of Pre-test of Control Class

No.	Initial	Fluency	Accuracy	Obtained Score	Maximum Score	Standard Score	Category	Qualification
1	AB	6	5	11	30	36	Very Poor	Failed
2	AN	6	7	13	30	43	Very Poor	Failed
3	BS	10	8	18	30	60	Fair	Failed
4	BZ	7	8	15	30	50	Poor	Successful
5	CSB	9	9	18	30	60	Fair	Failed
6	DA	6	6	12	30	40	Very Poor	Failed
7	DI	7	6	13	30	43	Very Poor	Failed
8	GP	11	9	20	30	66	Fair	Failed
9	GS	9	7	16	30	53	Poor	Failed
10	KL	8	10	18	30	60	Fair	Failed
11	LM	5	6	11	30	36	Very Poor	Failed
12	MH	7	6	13	30	43	Very Poor	Failed
13	NA	6	5	11	30	36	Very Poor	Failed
14	NS	7	7	14	30	46	Very Poor	Failed
15	OK	8	6	14	30	46	Very Poor	Failed
16	PG	8	7	15	30	50	Poor	Failed
17	RR	7	7	14	30	46	Very Poor	Failed
18	SH	6	6	12	30	40	Very Poor	Failed
19	US	7	6	13	30	43	Very Poor	Failed
20	WR	12	8	20	30	66	Fair	Failed
21	ZM	13	12	25	30	83	Very Good	Successful
Mean		7.86	7.19	15.05	30	49.81		

Regarding the Table 4, the highest score of the pre-test is 83 and the lowest score is 36. The result of pre-test of the control class shows that there was a student who qualified successful in the pre-test because the score is more than 70. Meaning that there were 20 students who are fail. There is no students categorized excellent, 1 student is categorized very good, 5 students are categorized fair, 3 students are poor, and the rest 12 are very poor. After getting the pre-test score of control class, the researcher calculated the mean score of the pre-test by applying the formula which was proposed before.

After computing the result of both groups, the researcher found the difference of mean score between experimental and control group. Where score of experimental group was 40.81 and score of control group was 49.81. So, the different was only about 9 scores, it means that, the level of knowledge of both groups was almost equal before given the treatment.

After doing the treatment to the experimental group, the researcher gave post-test to the experimental and the control group in order to find out the effect of the treatment toward the students' progress. It was given both in experimental and control group by using the equivalent form of the pretest. The results of the post-test are presented in the Table 5.

Table 5. The Students' Score of Post-test of Experimental Class

No.	Initial	Fluency	Accuracy	Obtained Score	Maximum Score	Standard Score	Category	Qualification
1	AA	13	11	24	30	80	Very Good	Successful
2	AD	11	12	23	30	76	Good	Successful
3	ARS	14	12	26	30	86	Very Good	Successful
4	BI	14	14	28	30	93	Excellent	Successful
5	BW	12	11	23	30	76	Good	Successful
6	DM	11	10	21	30	70	Good	Successful
7	DS	12	10	22	30	73	Good	Successful
8	ES	14	12	26	30	86	Very Good	Successful
9	FA	11	12	23	30	76	Good	Successful
10	FF	14	13	27	30	90	Excellent	Successful
11	HS	10	11	21	30	70	Good	Successful
12	IZ	11	11	22	30	73	Good	Successful
13	JN	12	13	25	30	83	Very Good	Successful
14	LS	13	13	26	30	86	Very Good	Successful
15	MA	14	12	26	30	86	Very Good	Successful
16	MJ	12	10	22	30	73	Good	Successful
17	RF	14	13	27	30	90	Excellent	Successful
18	SHM	12	11	23	30	76	Good	Successful
19	SK	13	13	26	30	86	Very Good	Successful
20	TU	12	11	23	30	76	Good	Successful
21	YN	11	12	23	30	76	Good	Successful
Mean		12.38	11.76	24.14	30	80.05		

After applying the treatment, all the students passed the post-test and got 93 as the highest score. The result of the test shows that all the students were successful because there are 3 students categorized excellent, 7 students are categorized very good, and 11 students are categorized good. The mean score of experimental class on post-test is 80.05. It showed that there is a significant development of the students' speaking skill. It rises from 40.81 to 80.05.

Table 6. The Students' Score of Post-test of Control Class

No.	Initial	Fluency	Accuracy	Obtained Score	Maximum Score	Standard Score	Category	Qualification
1	AB	8	7	15	30	50	Poor	Failed
2	AN	11	9	20	30	66	Fair	Failed
3	BS	9	10	19	30	63	Fair	Failed
4	BZ	9	10	19	30	63	Fair	Failed
5	CSB	10	10	20	30	66	Fair	Failed
6	DA	8	7	15	30	50	Poor	Failed
7	DI	12	14	26	30	86	Very Good	Successful
8	GP	12	11	23	30	76	Good	Successful
9	GS	10	10	20	30	66	Fair	Failed
10	KL	12	10	22	30	73	Good	Successful
11	LM	11	11	22	30	73	Good	Successful
12	MH	13	11	14	30	46	Very Poor	Failed
13	NA	12	12	14	30	46	Very Poor	Failed

No.	Initial	Fluency	Accuracy	Obtained Score	Maximum Score	Standard Score	Category	Qualification
14	NS	13	12	15	30	50	Poor	Failed
15	OK	11	9	20	30	66	Fair	Failed
16	PG	13	13	26	30	86	Very Good	Successful
17	RR	9	6	15	30	50	Poor	Failed
18	SH	13	11	24	30	80	Very Good	Successful
19	US	12	12	24	30	80	Very Good	Successful
20	WR	14	14	28	30	93	Excellent	Successful
21	ZM	14	13	27	30	90	Excellent	Successful
Mean		11.24	10.57	20.38	30	67.57		

Based on the Table 6, there are 9 students who were successful in the post-test and got 93 as the highest score while the lowest score is 46. Moreover, there were 12 students who fail in the post-test. The mean score of control class in the post-test is 67.57. It shows that the mean score of the experimental class in post-test 80.05 is higher than the mean score of control class 67.57. It means that the treatment using CTL that was implemented in experimental class is effective in improving students' speaking skill.

After calculating the mean scores of pre-tests and post-tests, the researcher continued calculating deviation and square deviation. The purpose of this is to find out the significant difference of students' deviation pre-test and post-test of experimental and control classes. The results are presented in Table 7.

Table 7. Experimental Class' Deviations on Pre-test and Post-test

No.	Initial	Students' Scores		Deviation (d)	Square Deviation (d^2)
		Pre-test	Post-test		
1	AA	66	80	14	196
2	AD	30	76	46	2.116
3	ARS	40	86	40	1.600
4	BI	76	93	17	289
5	BW	40	76	36	1.296
6	DM	40	70	30	900
7	DS	20	73	53	2.809
8	ES	73	86	13	169
9	FA	33	76	43	1.849
10	FF	56	90	34	1.156
11	HS	46	70	24	576
12	IZ	23	73	50	2.500
13	JN	50	83	33	1.089
14	LS	20	86	66	4.356
15	MA	30	86	56	3.136
16	MJ	26	73	47	2.209
17	RF	83	90	7	49
18	SHM	10	76	66	4.356
19	SK	16	86	70	4.900
20	TU	43	76	33	1.089
21	YN	36	76	40	1.600
Mean		40.81	80.50	38.95	1820.95

Based on Table 7, it showed that the highest deviation of experimental group is 70 and the lowest one is 7. Then, the highest of square deviation is 4.900 while the lowest square deviation is 49.

Table 8. Control Class' Deviations on Pre-test and Post-test

No.	Initial	Students' Scores		Deviation (d)	Square Deviation (d^2)
		Pre-test	Post-test		
1	MNR	36	50	14	196
2	RSZ	43	66	23	529
3	AI	60	63	3	9
4	MS	50	63	13	169
5	MT	60	66	6	36
6	RN	40	50	10	100
7	HD	43	86	43	1.849
8	NR	66	76	10	100
9	MN	53	66	13	169
10	RA	60	73	13	169
11	BN	36	73	37	1.369
12	RM	43	46	3	9
13	MV	36	46	10	100
14	SK	46	50	4	16
15	HI	46	66	20	400
16	UG	50	86	36	1.296
17	SN	46	50	4	16
18	HL	40	80	40	1.600
19	MT	43	80	37	1.369
20	MA	66	93	27	729
21	FR	83	90	7	49
Mean		49.81	67.57	17.76	489.48

Relating to the Table 8, the researcher determines that the highest score of deviation (d) of the control class is 43. Whereas, the lowest score of the deviation is 3. In addition, the highest score of square deviation (d^2) is 1.849 and the lowest score is 9.

After calculating the mean deviation of both classes, it can be seen that the mean deviation of experimental class is higher than the control one. The mean deviation of experimental class is 38.95. On the other hand, the control class gets 17.76 for the mean deviation.

Testing hypothesis aims to find out whether the use of CTL is conducted successfully or not. The hypothesis of the research is accepted if t-counted is greater than t-table. Meanwhile, if t-counted is lower than t-table, the hypothesis of the research is rejected.

The result of the data analysis shows that the t-counted is 4.83. By applying 0.05 level of significant with the degree of freedom (df) 40, the researcher finds that t-counted (4.83) is higher than t-table (2.02). It means that the research hypothesis is accepted. In other words, the use of CTL is effective to develop students' speaking skill of semester 3 of AMIK Tri Dharma Palu.

Discussion

The objective of this research is to find out whether the using of CTL is effective to improve the students' speaking skill. In conducting this research, the writer gave pre-test to both classes, experimental and control classes, treatment only for the experimental class, and post test to both classes. The first test is pre-test. The purpose is to find out students' prior ability in speaking (fluency and accuracy).

The result of the pre-test showed that the students lacked in fluency and accuracy of speaking. Based on the result of the pre-test, there were 18 students who failed in experimental class. On the other side, there were 20 students who did not pass the pre-test in control class. It indicates that the level of speaking skill of both experimental and control classes in pre-tes was nearly equal because most of the students did not reach the qualification of successful. After giving the pre-test to both classes, the writer then did the treatment for six meetings using the CTL in order to improve students' speaking skill. It was done only in the experimental class, while the control class was taught by their own English lecturer.

The implementation of CTL in the teaching and learning process at a university level has become one of the alternative ways of encouraging the students' creativity. CTL is used to give some benefits to the students. For example, the students get an opportunity to practice and they can relate the subject to the real situation where they can make connections between what they are learning and how that knowledge will be used. In this discussion, the researcher focuses on the improvement of the students and development during and after the implementation of CTL.

The researcher provides some different topics in every meeting. However, the appropriate way of implementing CTL required a particular procedure. First, asking the students some questions about the topic being learnt at that day (questioning, constructivism). The writer asks some questions related to the topic and the students feel confident to answer the question. Second, asking the students to write down their own information based on the topics learnt today (constructivism, inquiry). The students write all the things they know about the topic. They are good enough to do it since the topic is related to their deparment. Third, giving a sheet of dialogue and reads the dialogue to the students (modeling). The researcher gives an example how to read the dialog correctly. Fourth, asking the students to read the dialogue with their friends (modeling). After listening to the writer, the students continue reading it together. Fifth, inviting the students to correct their friends' wrong pronounciation if it happens (learning community, modeling). Here, the students do peer correction. Sixth, asking the students to do the tasks given with the example for them (modeling). The students do the task related to the topics given before they practice it. Seventh, asking the students to practice the tasks given with their friends (learning community). After finishing the task, they should practice it together. Eighth, asking the students to tell their own information and their friends' information about the topic being learnt today (authentic assessment). They retell the information based on their understanding. It forces them to be creative and to be brave

(Surentu & Mertosono, 2020). Next, asking the students to make their own dialogue with their friend (learning community, authentic assessment). They have seen and practiced the previous dialog and now it is their time to make their own. Then, writing discordered sentences, words that arouse in the teaching learning process and asking the students to analyze whether the sentences are correct or not (self reflection). Last, summarizing the materials by explaining what is being learnt today (reflection). To check whether the students understand or not, they must summarize the material.

In the first day of the treatment, the researcher opened the class as what teachers usually do. However, before the writer taught the teaching materials to the students, the researcherr asked them about CTL. Then, the students only gave short response like translating the meaning of CTL itself. They got confused about CTL because they were not familiar with it. Therefore, the writer introduced the CTL to the students. Then, the researcher taught the teaching material. The first topic was What is a computer? The researcher presented the materials on power point slide. Thus, the students got attracted to learn it. The researcher taught the students using the procedures that she has already arranged in lesson plan. In the beginning of the lesson, the researcher asked the students to write what they know about computer. They wrote it freely. Some of them got difficulty to write using English because they had limited vocabulary. It is because when the teacher teach some skills to the students, teaching vocabulary is not emphasized (Difa and Suriaman,2020). And when they read the dialog given, they read it with too much pauses. At that time, they were not that active to interact and perform the dialog that they have made because they all adapt the new learning situation. By giving them some new method or technique in studying, it will make them use to do it and add their vocabulary words (Saleng et al., 2014).

In the second meeting, the topic was about Computers in everyday life. As usual, the researcher introduced the topic first. After that, the researcher implemented CTL to the students. The students did as the writer's instruction. The researcher watched the process of CTL itself by visiting each the students. The researcher saw some students read their dialog, and some students still practiced their dialog hesitantly. It seemed they paused, repeated the words when they were reading it. The researcher then suggested them to use gap filler in their speech such as well or umm. To help the students in speaking, the teacher can motivate them by giving some clues, media, or tools needed to make them easy to follow the class (Yunus et al., 2017). This happened because they did not have enough vocabulary. Hopefully, the other students who were more capable could help their friends like giving some vocabulary. However, if the the others also did not know the English of the vocabulary. They asked for help to the writer because that was the researcher's job as facilitator in the teaching and learning process.

In the third meeting, the topic that was given was Parts of the Computer. In this meeting, the students became little a bit active to read the dialog, to correct their friends' mistakes in pronouncing the words/ sentences, and to make their own dialog because the researcher taught the material which was connected to their department. It becomes easy

for the students when the teacher gives them the contextual material. They get easy to understand (Anugraini & manurung, 2020)

In the fourth meeting, the students learnt about Storage Devices. The students showed the same speaking ability as in the fourth meeting. However, they got a little a bit difficulty due to the vocabulary used in making their own dialog. The researcher expected that they have enough knowledge related to the topics. They shared they knowledge to their friends in group. They helped and discussed each other. From these activities, it showed that CTL could develop the students' ability because they could share what they know and give feedback if the others got error in their speaking. Indirectly, the students motivate each other to improve their speaking ability (Manurung & Mashuri, 2017).

In the fifth meeting, several students became better than the previous meeting. At that time, the students were more comfortable to express their ideas by writing and presenting about the dialog they made Input and Output Devices. Some of them speak fluently and other students who listened the speech understood what the speaker said because the have good sentences to say. Furthermore, the students knew well about the topic since they had studied in other subjects. Thus, they easily got the ideas to make it a dialog. By implementing CTL, the students could improve their fluency and accuracy because when the other student spoke, the other one listened and followed the correct one becomes the examples for them. After that, they discussed it together shortly. It seemed that, they were accustomed with the CTL.

In the last meeting, the students were given other topics such as Internet. The researcher asked them about their understanding about the topic. Absolutely, the students got excited to learn it because they always use it in their everyday life. Thus, it could encourage them. Moreover, they have friends who can interact with them to discuss about the topic together. The students were able to perform their speaking well in these last meetings. Most of the students showed their development. In addition, the students also learnt to speak more freely and participated actively to contribute ideas in CTL. It can be concluded that CTL make the students became more active in the class since they had to do the great procedures given in CTL. During the teaching and learning process, they often practiced their speaking together and evaluated one to another. Practicing together when we plan to improve the students' skill is good strategy (Fortunela et al., 2017).

After treatment is done, the researcher directly continues giving the post-test to experimental and control class. It is given to check whether there is some improvement on students' skill in speaking after having the treatment or not. It is also compared with the control class' result.

In line with the treatment processes above, the researcher compared the result of error rate of post-test from both classes based on the scope of this research. In the result of post-test in experimental class, the researcher found that there was no student (0%) who made error in fluency and in accuracy. The result of the post-test in the control class showed that there were 2 students (10%) who made error in fluency and 3 students (14%) who made error in accuracy. After looking at the error rate, there were less students who made error in fluency and comprehensibility. They were from experimental class.

Comparing the error rate between experimental and control classes, the percentage of error rate in experimental class was lower than error rate in control class.

Based on the results, it can be concluded that the students' speaking skill in experimental class significantly developed rather than the students' speaking skill in control class. By seeing the students' development in experimental class, the researcher can state that accuracy is more difficult than fluency. Since it was a hard thing to speak smoothly and stay in normal rate of delivery yet it still has development. It is proved from the reduction of students' error percentages based on the scope of this research. It means that the implementing CTL can develop speaking skill of the students. Consequently, hypothesis of this research is accepted.

In summary, there are several strengths of CTL that made students achieve development in speaking fluency and accuracy. Firstly, the students learned better when they assisted one another. Learning together is more beneficial than learning alone because you can exchange your thoughts, give ideas to others, and correct you when you get wrong (Situmorang et al., 2016). Secondly, it was encouraging more positive attitudes toward learning. When students are asked to work in groups, they should have a good cooperation in obtaining a good result (Askia et al., 2016). Moreover, when another student has low confidence, the other student supports her or him as a result that student gets positive vibes from her or his friend. It also can motivate them in learning and using language (Mustamin et al., 2016). Thirdly, the students became independent in doing the task because they had to think by themselves and learnt from other students.

There were several problems taking place when the writer implemented CTL in this research. Firstly, it was about students' knowledge. All the students did not have the same ability in English especially in speaking. Thus, self-discovery would not occur if the whole students in one group consits of weak students (Wiraningsih et al., 2016). Secondly, it was time allocation. The process of CTL took quite long time because there are many things to do to make the students better in speaking. Therefore, the researcher decided to divide the groups consisted the active and the passive students must be put together in order they could help and share each other. Hopefully, those problems could be solved and the treatment runs well.

4. Conclusion

Based on the results of data analysis, it can be concluded that applying CTL can develop students' speaking skill of semester 3 students of AMIK Tri Dharma Palu. It can be proved from their achievement from pretest to posttest. After applying CTL, the students can utter the sentences smoothly and grammatically, they are able to speak fluently and grammatically. However, if it is compared to the class that is not taught by using CTL, the students are still unconfident to use English orally. It can be seen from their achievement from pretest to posttest, there is only a bit improvement from their score. It can be said that the group that is taught using CTL has greater improvement than

another. The results indicate that the alternative hypothesis (H_a) is accepted, while the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected.

There are some suggestions given based on the results of this research. First, the learners should keep practicing English in their daily life. Second, the teacher should give the students opportunities to speak. Third, the teacher must apply the appropriate technique or method based on the students' needs and problems, and CTL can be one of the alternative ways to teach and to improve students' speaking skill. Last, for the further research is to find out the other techniques or methods that can develop the students' speaking skill.

REFERENCES

Ambarwati. (2016). Improving Students' Speaking Ability in handling Telephone Call through CTL. *Jurnal Online Mahasiswa, 1*(1).

Anugraini, N. C., & Manurung, K. (2020). Improving Speaking Skills through Short Dialogue Memorization Technique. *E-Journal of English Language Teaching Society, 8*(1).

Askia, S., Manurung, K., & Wahyudin. (2016). Improving Speaking Skills through Active Learning Strategy of the Year Eight Students. *E-Journal of English Language Teaching Society, 4*(2), 1-13.

Astuti, K., Yufrizal, H., & Kadaryanto, B. (2015). The Implementation of CTL in Teaching Speaking. *Unila Journal of English Teaching, 4*(8).

Berns, R., & Erickson, P. (2001). *Contextual Teaching and Learning: Preparing Students for the New Economy.* Washington, USA: National Academy Press.

Blanchard, A. (2001). *Contextual Teaching and Learning.* New York, USA: Pearson Education.

Difa, N., & Suriaman, A. (2020). The Implementation of Riddle Game to Improve Students' Vocabulary Mastery. *E-Journal of English Language Teaching Society, 8*(2).

Fikri, A., Manurung, K., & Mashuri. (2014). Developing Speaking Skill through Narrative Text. *E-Journal of English Language Teaching Society, 2*(3), 1-15.

Fortunela, R., Manurung, K., & Nadrun. (2017). Improving Speaking Skill through Pair Work Interview. *E-Journal of English Language Teaching Society, 5*(1), 1-10.

Harmer, J. (2001). *The Practice of English Language Teaching.* London, England: Longman Publishing.

Heaton, T. B. (1988). *Writing English Language Test.* Hongkong: Longman Group.

Hornoby, A. S. (1995). *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current Language,* Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Johnson, E. B. (2002). *Contextual Teaching and Learning: What It is and Why It is Here to Stay.* Thousand Oaks, USA: Corwin Press Inc.

Manurung, K., & Mashuri. (2017). Implementing Interest Based Instructional materials to Minimize EFL Learners' Speaking Skills De-Motivating Factors. *Theory and Practice in language Studies, 7*(5), 356-365.

Muslich, M. (2007). *KTSP Pembelajaran Berbasis Kompetensi dan Kontekstual Panduan Bagi Guru, Kepala sekolah, dan Pengurus Sekolah.* Jakarta, Indonesia: Bumi Aksara.

Mustamin, S. H., Syafar, A.,& Usman, S. (2016). The Influence of Interview Technique on speaking Skills and Learning Motivation of EFL Learners LP3I Business College Palu. *E-Journal Bahasantodea, 4*(1), 125-133.

Philips, M. (1982). *Dialogue and the Human Image. Beyond Humanistic Psychology.* Newbury Park, USA: Sage Publication.

Richards, J. C, & Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in Language Teaching.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Rivers, W. M. (1968). *Teaching Foreign Language Skills*. New York, USA: The University of Chicago Press.

Saleng, M. A. S., Manurung, K., & Darmawan. (2014). The Implementation of Video Learning to Improve Speaking Ability. *E-Journal of English Language Teaching Society, 2*(3), 1-14.

Siregar, N. U., Dirgeyasa, I. W., & Husein, R. (2020). Developing English Speaking Material through CTL for Beauty Study Program. *Jurnal Linguistik Terapan Pascasarjana, 17*(1): 8-16.

Situmorang, D. L., Basri, H., & Usman, S. (2016). Overcoming Students' Speaking Anxiety in EFL Classroom through Role Play Technique at STIKES Widya Nusantara Palu. *E-Journal Bahasantodea, 4*(2), 38-46.

Surentu, J. Y., & Mertosono, S. (2020). Improving Speaking Skills through Imaginary Conversation. *E-Journal of English Language Teaching Society,* 8(2).

Widdowson, H. C. (1985). *Teaching Language as Communication*. New York, USA: Oxford University Press.

Wiraningsih, V., Manurung, K., & Budi. (2016). Developing Speaking Skill through STAD at Grade XI Students. *E-Journal of English Language Teaching Society,* 4(2), 1-10.

Yunus, I. H., Saidm, M.W., & Mertosono, S. (2017). Developing Students' Speaking Skill through Board Game at SMPN 1 Toli-Toli. *E-Journal Bahasantodea, 5*(1), 54-61.