The Effect of Contextual Teaching and Learning Strategies with Expository and Verbal Ability on English Learning Outcomes

Rahmiati[1], Harun Sitompul[2], R. Mursid[3]

{zierahmi@gmail.com [1], prof_runsit@yahoo.co.id [2], mursid@unimed.ac.id [3]}

Educational Technology, Postgraduate, Universitas Negeri Medan, Medan, North Sumatera, Indonesia[1,2,3]

Abstract. This study aims to determine the English learning outcomes of students with higher CTL compared to expositories, see whether students with high verbal abilities can have higher English learning outcomes than low verbal abilities, and find out whether there is interaction between learning strategies and verbal abilities to influence English learning outcomes. The research methods used are such as quasi-experimental design with a factorial design of 2 x 2 by inferential statistics with a bidirectional ANOVA. The results showed that the results of learning English using CTL were higher compared to Expository, then the results of learning English with high verbal ability were higher compared to low verbal ability, and there was an interaction between CTL and verbal ability to English learning outcomes.

Keywords: contextual teaching and learning, verbal ability, English.

1 Introduction

English is a language that can be communicated orally and in writing. Communicating is a way of understanding and providing information, thoughts, and the development of science, technology, and culture. Communicating becomes the ability of discourse, which must be able to understand or produce spoken and or written texts in accordance with language skills, namely listening, speaking, reading, and writing [1]. This skill is used to create discourse in social life [2]. Thus, the application of English subjects is aimed at developing skills so that they can communicate.

Literacy in English such as performative, functional, informational, and epistemic. In performative, literacy includes the ability to read, write, listen, and speak with the symbols used. In functional, literacy such as the ability to use language as a necessity of daily life. In information, literacy such as being able to access knowledge with language skills, while epistemic is like the ability to express knowledge in language. In English language learning at

the junior high school / MTs level, it is aimed at students to be able to achieve functional, namely communicating orally and in writing to solve problems.

One of the main subject matters in the competency-based 2013 curriculum is English, and the competency standards that are expected to be possessed by junior high school graduates in learning English are: (1) being able to listen and understand various spoken English discourses, (2) can explain opinions, ideas, and feelings of various forms of English discourse orally, (3) can read and understand texts by reading written English, and (4) can express various thoughts, ideas, opinions and feelings in English writing.

The low ability in reading comprehension is also caused by several things: (1) Students are less enthusiastic about taking lessons. This can be seen when following reading lessons, students show an indifferent attitude and do not pay attention to the lesson completely, (2) Students have difficulty understanding English subject matter. This is because students think reading lessons are difficult and boring, (3) Students feel bored in English subjects which are monotonous and less interesting, (4) Teachers find it difficult to arouse students' interest during reading learning, and students show a lack of attitude. interested and less enthusiastic, (5) Teachers find it difficult to find the right model in teaching reading comprehension material. So far, when teaching material on reading comprehension, teachers still use the lecture and assignment method so it is still the old method.

1.1 Contextual Teaching and Learning (CTL)

Contextual Teaching and Learning (CTL) is a learning concept to combine the material taught with the student's circumstances [3][4]. This concept has a constructivist philosophical and perspective that learning will mean if the student "discovers" what is learned, not "knows" from others. So, learning outcomes are expected to be meaningful for students, because the learning process takes place naturally in student activities, namely work and experience from teacher to student [5]. Afriani [6] mentions that the elements of contextual learning are: (a) Activating Knowledge; (b) Acquiring Knowledge; (c) Understand knowledge; (d) Applying Knowledge; and (e) Reflecting Knowledge.

The Contextual Teaching and Learning learning strategy consist of 7 (seven) components, namely: (1) constructivism as a learning philosophy, (2) there is always an element of questioning, (3) knowledge and experience are obtained from finding activities, (4) forming and creating society. learning, (5) there is a model that is imitated, (6) carry out reflection activities, and (7) there is an actual assessment. A class can successfully use the CTL approach if it has implemented the CTL learning component.

1.2 Verbal Ability

Thurstone, stated that verbal intelligence is an understanding of word relationships, vocabulary, and mastery of communication. Mardiati [7] states that verbal intelligence is the ability to communicate that begins with the formation of ideas through words, and directs the focus of the problem on mastering language or words, which will determine whether or not the understanding of the ideas conveyed is clear.

Experts argue verbal ability is not the same for everyone. In addition, the level or degree of this verbal ability develops or increases according to a person's interaction with his environment [8]. BasicallVerbal is a talent, while the aptitude test is intended to predict a person's success in following certain lessons can be predicted [9]. In this study, to measure students' verbal ability, DAT was used, which was completely collected by psychologists.

The problems is: (1) Whether english with CTL with strategies are higher than expository learning strategies; (2) Do students with high verbal ability get higher results than low verbal ability, and (3) any interaction with learning strategies and verbal skills that has an impact on English learning outcomes?

2 Method

This research was conducted at MTs Miftahussalam Medan. The implementation of the research begins with a review of the research location to find out about the state of the class number and class VIII (eight) students. Learning is carried out in the second semester, from May to June of the 2021/2022 Academic Year. Conducted according to the English lesson schedule in class VIII is the target of research as many as 8 (eight) meetings with each meeting 2 x 45 minutes. The population of this study was 8 (eight) class VIII (eight) students at MTs Miftahussalam Medan. The research used is quantitative research and quasi-experimental type with a factorial design of 2x2.

The data analysis technique in this study was carried out using the 2 x 2 factorial ANOVA technique with the F test. Previously, the requirement test was carried out on the collected data, namely using the normality test, the Liliefors test and the homogeneity test using the F test and the Bartlett test. According to the third hypothesis when it is significant, so that there is interaction, then the research test is continued with the Scheffe test for multiple comparison, because the sample size of each in the research design is not the same.

3 Results and Discussion

Learning outcomes from variations in learning models in experimental groups (taught using CTL were higher than expository learning strategies. The description of the result data is based on variations in verbal ability. English learning outcomes have high verbal ability compared to those with low verbal ability.

| Variable | | Learning strategies (A) | | Total |
		CTL (A1)	Exploration (A2)	
Verbal Ability (B)	Tinggi (B1)	n_1 = 17 $\sum X_1$ = 1390 $\overline{X}_1$ = 79,41 S_1 = 7,75	n_2 = 19 $\sum X_2$ = 1334 $\overline{X}_2$ = 70,21 S_2 = 7,91	n_{B1} = 36 $\sum X_{B1}$ = 2714 $\overline{X}_{B1}$ = 74,81 S_{B1} = 80,53
	Rendah (B2)	n_3 = 14 $\sum X_3$ = 780 $\overline{X}_3$ = 55,71 S_3 = 7,75	n_4 = 15 $\sum X_4$ = 707 $\overline{X}_4$ = 60,23 S_4 = 8,48	n_{B2} = 29 $\sum X_{B2}$ = 1487 $\overline{X}_{B2}$ = 57,97 S_{B2} = 9,01
Total		N_{A1} = 31 $\sum X_{A1}$ = 2130 $\overline{X}_{A1}$ = 68,71 S_{A1} = 14,07	N_{A2} = 34 $\sum X_{A2}$ = 2041 $\overline{X}_{A2}$ = 60,04 S_{A2} = 14,13	N_t = 65 $\sum X_t$ = 4171 $\overline{X}_t$ = 64,37 S_t = 14,40

Based on the normality test, it showed of subjects were normally distributed, so it was concluded that the study sample came from a normally distributed population and a group of subjects when given CTL with expository learning strategies based on homogeneous high and low verbal abilities. After that, it is necessary that the results for all the data of the subject group are distributed normally and have a homogeneous variance, so that the requirements related to the analysis of two-way variance have been met.

Table 2. Two-way ANOVA Calculation Results

Source Variance	DK	Number of Squares (JK)	Average Sum of Squares (RJK)	Fcount	F_{table} α= 0,05
Learning Strategy (A)	1	5478	5478	413	4,07
Verbal Ability (B)	1	14705	14705	34	4,07
Interaction (A x B)	1	509	509	14	4,07
Between groups	3	16433	5478	-	-
In Group	61	2173	36	-	-
Total	67	39298	-	-	-

From the data, using the CTL were 68.71 and have standard deviation 14.67, while the Expository was 60.04 and the standard deviation was 14.13.

Based on the results of the analysis of variance in Table 2, the results of the calculation of learning strategy data are obtained, where the value of $F_c = 413$, while the value of F_t with DK $= (1.61)$ and $= 0.05$ is 4.00. These results indicate that $F_c = 413 > F_t = 4.00$ so the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted, thus the research hypothesis states that students' learning outcomes of English taught with CTL Learning Strategies are higher than those of students. taught with the Expository Learning Strategy is proven true.

From the data obtained, learning outcomes with high verbal learning ability were 74.81 and had a standard deviation of 7.83 compared to students with low verbal ability was 57.9 and with a standard deviation was 9.01.

Based on the results of hypothesis testing, the results of the calculation of verbal ability data are obtained, where $F_h = 34$, while the value of F_t with DK $= (1.61)$ and $= 0.05$ is 4.00. These results indicate that $F_c = 34 > F_t = 4.00$, so Ho is rejected and Ha is accepted, thus the research hypothesis states that the English learning outcomes of students who have high verbal learning abilities are higher than students who have low learning verbal abilities. the truth.

From the results of the calculation of the data, it is obtained that the average learning outcomes of students taught English with CTL Learning Strategies and high verbal abilities are 79.41 and standard deviations are 7.75, while the average learning outcomes of students taught using CTL Learning Strategies and Skills low verbal ability of 55.71 and standard deviation of 9.53 while the average student learning outcomes of English taught by Expository Learning Strategies and high verbal ability of 70.21 and standard deviation of 7.91 while the average student learning outcomes of English taught with Expository Learning Strategy and low verbal ability of 60.23 and standard deviation of 8.48.

The interaction of learning strategies and verbal abilities, where $F_h = 14$ and the value of F_t with DK $= (1.61)$ and $= 0.05$ is 4.00. These results indicate that $F_c > F_t$ $(14 > 4.00)$, so Ha is accepted and Ho is rejected, meaning that there is an interaction between learning strategies and verbal ability in influencing English learning outcomes. Thus the hypothesis that there is an interaction between learning strategies and verbal abilities in influencing the results of learning English is proven true.

The interaction in this study was tinged by conducting further tests using the Scheffe test. Summary of Scheffer test calculation results

Table 3. Summary of Scheffe's Test Calculation Results

No	Subject Group	Statistical Hypothesis	F_{count}	F_{table}	Criteria
1	$A_1B_1 - A_2B_1$	$H_0: \mu_{A1B1} = \mu_{A2B1}$ $H_a: \mu_{A1B1} > \mu_{A2B1}$	11,00	2,76	Significantly different
2	$A_1B_1 - A_1B_2$	$H_0: \mu_{A1B1} = \mu_{A1B2}$ $H_a: \mu_{A1B1} > \mu_{A1B2}$	4,62	2,76	Significantly different
3	$A_1B_1 - A_2B_2$	$H_0: \mu_{A1B1} = \mu_{A2B2}$ $H_a: \mu_{A1B1} > \mu_{A2B2}$	9,07	2,76	Significantly different
4	$A_2B_1 - A_1B_2$	$H_0: \mu_{A2B1} = \mu_{A1B2}$ $H_a: \mu_{A2B1} > \mu_{A1B2}$	4,84	2,76	Significantly different
5	$A_2B_1 - A_2B_2$	$H_0: \mu_{A2B1} = \mu_{A2B2}$ $H_a: \mu_{A2B1} > \mu_{A2B2}$	2,04	2,76	Not Significantly Different
6	$A_2B_2 - A_1B_2$	$H_0: \mu_{A2B2} = \mu_{A1B2}$ $H_a: \mu_{A2B2} > \mu_{A1B2}$	6,90	2,76	Not Significantly Different

The results of the study, Fc > Ft, the learning outcomes of students using high CTL learning strategies compared to those using expository learning strategies. Because in the students of the CTL Learning Strategy group, they are more accepting of the potential possessed by students. On CTL strategies, students engage in many classroom activities, such as training the brain, creating cards for objectives, designing mind maps, role-playing, simulations, activation tasks, and demonstrations. They will have high verbal ability to be more excited and motivated, so they don't feel bored.

On the other hand, this type will get bored quickly through expository learning strategies dominated by teachers. Students listen a lot and there are not many class activities so it encourages students. Students are easily curious and try something expository learning strategy. So that students become bored and not enthusiastic. So it can be concluded, high verbal ability gets high English learning outcomes if given a CTL learning strategy compared to expository learning strategies.

Regarding the results of the research conducted, the same thing Haerazi, Prayati, and Vikasari [10] in their research on the Effectiveness of Contextual Methods (CTL) on Motivation to Learn English in Junior High School Students proved that contextual methods in the process of learning English greatly affect motivation to learn English. student. The process of learning English, which is taught using this contextual method, can increase students' motivation to learn English [11]. In general, the resu this study illustrate that students are highly motivated in English.

The results of Alfiah's research [12] discuss the Process of Improving Learning in This Is My Word Material Using a Contextual Approach in learning English in Junior High Schools show that classical learning outcomes from 83% with good predicates to 88% with good predicates, and a quantitative increase of 3%. This means that there is a good increase after being given a contextual approach.

CTL learning applies with results that are expected to help students in understanding the strengths and advantages of their potential to be developed. In addition, according to Rahmayanti [13] mentioned, our expectations for students to have good grades are in accordance with the achievement of learning outcomes, if students' expectations are high for the lesson it

will be in line with achievement and vice versa. Thus, a learning strategy is needed with a series of practical approaches to learning with the CTL strategy.

Research conducted by Mursid [14], shows the same thing: student learning achievement that learns to draw techniques using Contextual Innovative Models is higher than students who learn drawing techniques using Direct Instructional Models, students' achievement in technical drawings Higher Creative Thinking Ability is the achievement results of students who have Low Creative Thinking Ability to draw technical and there is an interaction between learning creative thinking skills in influencing students' technical drawing achievement.

Simbolon [15] mentions that to teach learning about speaking English, it is better to use a contextual learning approach instead of conventional learning. From the sentence above, it can be seen that the result used with the CTL learning strategy is that the learning process becomes effective, efficient, and fun. Thus, the use of CTL learning strategies has an influence on English learning outcomes when compared to using expository learning strategies [16].

The results of the data resulted in a higher average score of learning English using verbal ability than students with low verbal ability. This kind of mentions that high verbal ability is more able to understand the lesson than students with low verbal ability [15].

Verbal is like a message or symbol that can have an influence on the feedback process because it proves that there is a guarantee that it has reached the listener. Verbal ability is very important because as a result of learning expressed on cross-curriculum competencies that are part of the competency-based curriculum [17], such as students applying language to understand, develop, and communicate and inform interpersonally, as well as interact with others. Supported by research by Utomo and Harmiyanto [18], it is stated that there is a positive relationship between bilingual ability and verbal ability in class X students of SMAN 4 Malang.

The use of CTL learning that has verbal ability can explore the potential in it [19]. The existence of high verb ability, makes it easier for students to understand and solve problems. In this case, describing students as having verbal abilities is more suitable to be taught using CTL. The interaction between learning strategies and verbal abilities makes it an important point that in addition to CTL, student characteristics, in this case verbal ability, are factors that can influence English learning outcomes.

4 Conclusion

In this study, conclusions were given such as: (1) the results of learning English taught with CTL were higher than using expositories; (2) English learning outcomes have higher high verbal ability than low verbal ability; and (3) the interaction between CTL and verbal ability towards English learning outcomes. Students have verbal skills with high learning outcomes in English if taught CTL rather than expositori, while students who have low verbal skills will have higher ones if taught using expository than CTL.

References

[1] Siswandi.: Proses Pembelajaran Bahasa Inggris Di Smp Negeri Pekanbaru Provinsi Riau, J. Ilmu Pendidik. Sos. Sains dan Hum., vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 395–412 (2018)

[2] Driyono, D.: Peningkatkan Pembelajaran Bahasa Inggris dengan Keterampilan Membaca Peserta Didik Kelas X TKR 1 SMK N 1 Blora Semester Genap Tahun Pelajaran 2019/2020, DWIJALOKA J. Pendidik. Dasar dan Menengah, vol. 1, no. 2. doi: 10.35473/dwijaloka.v1i2.590 (2020)

[3] Fauziah, A. M., and Nurita, T.: Activities of students in using worksheet based on Contextual Teaching and Learning, J. Phys. Conf. Ser., vol. 1417, no. 1. DOI: 10.1088/1742-6596/1417/1/012088 (2019)

[4] Satriani, I., Emilia, E., and Gunawan, M. H.: Contextual teaching and learning approach to teaching writing," Indones. J. Appl. Linguist., vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 10–22. doi: 10.17509/ijal.v2i1.70 (2012)

[5] Amirudin, J., Ruswandi, U., Erihadiana, M., and Rohimah, E.: Implementation Of The Ctl Learning Model Through Islamic Moderate Values In Improving The Attitude Of Students ' Tolerance In School," vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 690–703 (2022)

[6] Afriani, A.: Pembelajaran Kontekstual (Contextual Teaching and Learning) dan Pemahaman Konsep Siswa, Al Muta'aliyah STAI Darul Kamal NW Kembang Kerang, vol. I, no. 3, pp. 80–88, http://ejournal.kopertais4.or.id/sasambo/index.php/mutaaliyah/article/view/3005/2208 (2018)

[7] Mardiati, I. M.: Hubungan Antara Tingkat Kreativitas Verbal Dengan Kemampuan Berbahasa Inggris Pada Mahasiswa Jurusan Psikologi Islam Iain Pontianak Angkatan 2017/2018, J. Psikol. Talent., vol. 6, no. 1, p. 65. doi: 10.26858/talenta.v6i1.7245 (2020)

[8] Wicaksono, L.: Bahasa dalam komunikasi pembelajaran, J. Pembelajaran Prospektif, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 9–19 http://jurnal.untan.ac.id/index.php/lp3m%0A http://jurnal.untan.ac.id/index.php/lp3m/article/download/19211/16053 (2016)

[9] Kemdikbud.: Kriteria Seleksi Masuk Perguruan Tinggi the Predictive Validity of Scholastic Aptitude Test and, pp. 515–534 (2014)

[10] Haerazi, H., Prayati, Z., and Vikasari, R. M.: Practicing Contextual Teaching and Learning (CTL) Approach To Improve Students Reading Comprehension in Relation To Motivation, English Rev. J. English Educ., vol. 8, no. 1, p. 139, 2019, DOI: 10.25134/erjee.v8i1 (2011)

[11] Solicha, M.: Analisis Implementasi Pendekatan Kontekstual Berbasis Vidio Online terhadap Hasil Belajar Bahasa Inggris Siswa Kelas XI IPA 4 SMA Negeri 1 Paguyangan Semester 2 TP.2019/2020 Selama Masa Pandemi Covid 19, Orbith, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 182–190 (2020)

[12] Alfiah.: Peningkatan Pembelajaran Pada Materi This Is My Word Menggunakan Pendekatan Kontekstual," vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 42–51 (2022)

[13] Rahmayanti, V.: Pengaruh Minat Belajar Siswa dan Persepsi atas Upaya Guru dalam Memotivasi Belajar Siswa terhadap Prestasi Belajar Bahasa Indonesia Siswa SMP di Depok, SAP (Susunan Artik. Pendidikan), vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 206–216. doi: 10.30998/sap.v1i2.1027 (2016)

[14] Mursid, R.: Promoting Creative Thinking Ability Using Contextual Learning Model in Technical Drawing Achievement," IOP Conf. Ser. Mater. Sci. Eng., vol. 306, no. 1. DOI: 10.1088/1757-899X/306/1/012109 (2018)

[15] Simbolon, N.: Pengaruh Pendekatan Pembelajaran Dan Kemampuan Verbal Terhadap Kemampuan Berbicara Bahasa Inggris Siswa Sma Negeri 14 Dan 21 Medan, J. Cakrawala Pendidik., vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 225–235. doi: 10.21831/cp.v2i2.2149 (2014)

[16] Suprapto, E.: Pengaruh Model Pembelajaran Kontekstual, Pembelajaran Langsung Dan Motivasi Berprestasi Terhadap Hasil Belajar Kognitif," Innov. Vocat. Technol. Educ., vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 23–40. doi: 10.17509/invotec.v11i1.4836 (2017)

[17] Muhali, M.: Pembelajaran Inovatif Abad Ke-21, J. Penelit. dan Pengkaj. Ilmu Pendidik. e-Saintika, vol. 3, no. 2, p. 25. doi: 10.36312/e-saintika.v3i2.126 (2019)

[18] Utomo, D., and Harmiyanto, H.: Hubungan Keterampilan Komunikasi Interpersonal Dan Kepercayaan Diri Siswa Kelas X Sman 1 Garum Kabupaten Blitar," J. Kaji. Bimbing. dan Konseling, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 55–59. doi: 10.17977/um001v1i22016p055 (2016)

[19] Hu, G.: Potential cultural resistance to pedagogical imports: The case of communicative language teaching in china, Lang. Cult. Curric., vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 93–105. DOI: 10.1080/07908310208666636 (2002)