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ABSTRACT

This paper presents a research to examine whether or there is any significant difference of reading comprehension between low and high vocabulary achievers taught using CTL approach and those taught using traditional approach, and To describe the students’ perception toward the use of contextual teaching and learning approach. The participants consisted of 62 students with high and low vocabulary knowledge. The participants were divided into an experimental group (n = 33) and a control group (n = 29). The research employed a mixed method (quantitative and qualitative). Standardized reading test and inferential statistical analysis were employed to measure the difference of reading comprehension between students using CTL approach and traditional approach. Then semi structured interview and intra case analysis were performed to describe students perception toward the use of CTL approach. Results showed that: (1) there is no significant difference of reading comprehension between low achievers taught using CTL approach and those taught using traditional approach; (2) there is a significant difference of reading comprehension between high achievers taught using CTL approach and those taught using traditional approach; (3) in general, the use of CTL approach in teaching reading was
perceived positively by students. The impacts of using this approach were noticeable on the emergence of students’ fun and motivation to learn reading. However the use of this approach was not affective enough to improve the reading comprehension of students with limited vocabularies.

1. INTRODUCTION

Reading is one of the most important skills in learning a language. The success of language learner is largely influenced by his/ her reading practice. “Reading is useful for language acquisition…the more they read, the better they get. Reading also has a positive effect on students’ vocabulary knowledge, on their spelling and their writing” (Harmer, 2008). Therefore, teacher must develop reading habit in students in order to help them enhance target language efficiency. This can be done by motivating students to read, especially by giving them reason to read.. In short, reading stands as bedrock for learners’ success in learning a second language, therefore it is language teachers’ responsibility to cultivate reading culture in students.

While reading skill takes a very vital role in English teaching and learning, the problem of poor English reading ability doesn’t seem to end for most senior high school in our country. Based on Executive summary of UN 2016 by Litbang Ministry of Education, form the nine competence of English National Exam, students commonly fail in understanding functional text and responding short dialogue. In addition, in regional level, there are numbers of English teacher voicing low students’ reading comprehension. In his investigation on reading achievement of the eleventh graders of SMAN 1 Raha, the researcher was shocked by high rate of poor reading achievement. English teachers of the eleventh graders asserted that 23-26 out of 37 students on average got bad comprehension in daily, mid or final test.

Several causes have been identified in regard to students’ poor English reading comprehension. Jitendra et al (2005) First of all, vocabulary is an important component to reading comprehension. Some researchers believe that vocabulary is the strongest component of proper reading comprehension and studies have shown that students who have a large working vocabulary receive better grades than students who do not (Stahl & Fairbanks, 1986) Students should be able to know the meanings of 80%-90% of the words in a text to be able to gather meaning from the text (Yildirim, Yildiz, & Ates, 2011). If an individual is reading, and does not understand what two or three of the words mean, then they may be able to gather some meaning out of the text to understand it. However, if an individual who is reading does not understand what the majority of the words mean then it is going to be very difficult for them to understand what they are reading. Individuals who have comprehension problems generally have a more limited vocabulary than those who do not.

The next cause is that the teachers do not have good approach and strategy in teaching reading. The teachers used to paraphrase and translate reading texts into Indonesia and students had to remember words meaning, answers to the questions
asked and other tasks. It was teachers who would read the text and make students understand the content, especially by translating them in Indonesian language. Furthermore, while teaching reading text, teachers used to ask them to read aloud in the class and they would do it. However, they would rarely understand the text given to them. Students had a problem in making sense out of those texts, hence they did not like reading. Sometimes, when they were asked to underline the difficult words, they had many underlined words in the text and teacher used to write the meaning of those words, make us learn them by heart and then he would deliver very long and fine lecture on the content of the text. The students went through reading class without even knowing the necessity of reading English texts. They had neither any reason nor any interest to read those difficult and boring texts. The poor teaching approach like this can lead to students’ failure in reading comprehension.

As stated by Ekwall and Shanker (1988), more than 90 percent of learners’ reading failures could or should be blamed on poor teaching. This is in line with the observational studies by Durkin (1978-1979) and Pressley and Wharton-McDonald (1997) which found that teachers regularly assigned reading tasks to their students and then tested their reading comprehension, but rarely taught the reading strategies or methods needed by their students.

At the present time, SMAN 1 Raha is implementing two types of curriculum: curriculum of 2013 which is so-called K13 for the tenth grade and curriculum of 2006 which is so-called KTSP for the eleventh and twelfth grade. The researcher views that there has been malpractice of KTSP in terms of teaching English specifically reading. Why so? Because the practice is away from the spirit of KTSP. The curriculum of KTSP by definition is an operational curriculum compiled by and implemented in each educational unit (BSNP 2006: 5). Therefore, the curriculum is designed and developed by each educational unit to suit the characteristics, conditions, and potential of the region, schools, and learners of each educational unit. KTSP provides broad autonomy on every educational unit and community involvement in order to activate the process of teaching and learning in schools. Autonomy is provided for each educational unit and school to have the flexibility to manage resources, data sources, learning resources and allocate them according to priority needs, and be more responsive to local needs. As the manifestation of the goal of KTSP in English learning, the instructional design and the learning content must be in accordance with the context of student’s real life. It is at this point that the researcher argues the urgency of contextual teaching and learning, which SMAN 1’s English teacher ignored in the process of teaching and learning reading.

In responding to the reality of reading learning in schools, the researcher applied the approach and strategies that accommodate the needs of learners. The approach is called Contextual Teaching and Learning (CTL). CTL is a system of instruction which is based on the philosophy that students learn when they see meaning in academic material and they see meaning in schoolwork when they can connect new information with their prior knowledge and their own experience. Elaine B. Joohnson (2002) argued that contextual teaching and learning is a system that stimulates the brain to weave patterns that express meaning. Contextual teaching and learning is a brain compatible system of instruction that generates meaning by linking academic content with the context of a student’s daily life. Several researchers have conducted
an experimental research to investigate the effect of CTL on reading comprehension. They demonstrated that there is a significant effect of CTL in promoting students’ reading comprehension which is indicated by a higher score achieved by CTL-Treated students. Muhlison (2010) “The Effectiveness of Contextual Teaching and Learning to Teach Reading Comprehension for The Eight Grader Students of MTs At-Thosari Kalirejo Ungaran Timur”. The test score indicated that CTL promoted students reading comprehension.

The fact that CTL promises students’ engagement and motivational learning as well as the previous research indicating positive effect of CTL encouraged the researcher to conduct similar research but in different view point. It is view point of students’ vocabulary knowledge which was disregarded in previous research. As well known that vocabulary is basic in reading. Breadth and depth vocabulary occupy primary and central position in understanding reading. Paul and O’Rourke (1988) identified word knowledge as an important component in reading comprehension and they indicated it as one of the most important components.

Further, to know the student's perception toward the practice of CTL in learning reading becomes crucial for the following reasons. Firstly, the result of a statistical test will not represent how a student feels about CTL. It may happen that the students feel good but just feeling safe is not sufficiently helpful to comprehend the text. Secondly, it is a need to know students positive and negative opinion. Students are maybe motivated or demotivated for certain reasons. Students opinion may potentially affect learning outcomes. So these cases must be deeply analyzed to get a comprehensive fact of the effectiveness of CTL to teach reading comprehension.

1.1. Research Question
This research question are :
1. Is there any significant difference of reading comprehension between low achievers taught using CTL approach and those taught using traditional approach
2. Is there any significant difference of reading comprehension between high achievers taught using CTL approach and those taught using traditional approach
3. What are the students’ perceptions toward the use of contextual teaching and learning approach

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Definition of Reading Comprehension
Kennedy (1981: 192) defines reading comprehension as a thought process through which readers become aware of an idea, understand it in terms of their experiential background and interpret it in relation to their own needs and purpose. Pardo (2004) suggests four elements of reading comprehension: reader, text, context, transaction. The readers’ background knowledge can ease them to construe the writer’s message and comprehend the text, the clear text structure helps readers to interact with the text, context provides clues which can be used to infer the meaning of an unknown
vocabulary within the text, and transaction occurs after the readers build mental
Reading comprehension is a complex balance between recognizing printed symbols
and interpreting the meaning behind the symbols (Rayner, 2011)

2.2. Classroom and Approach to Teach Reading
Maughin, Barbara, et al (1996) say that there are some common problems that
teachers have in teaching reading. They are learners lack motivation to read;
teachers are uncertain as to how they should carry out language preparation;
teachers are unsure about selecting and devising reading – related activities.
Furthermore, he proposes three phases to teach reading: pre-reading, while-
reading, and post-reading.

Pre-reading
In this phase the teacher is to introduce and arouse interest in the topic, to
motivate learners by giving a reason for reading, to provide some language
preparation for the text. In some cases the language might already have been
introduced, or there may be no particular language problems. In any case,
language preparation does not mean that the teacher should explain every
possible unknown word and structure in the text, but that he should ensure that
the learners will be able to tackle the text tasks without being totally frustrated
by language difficulties.

While-reading
This phase draws on the text, rather than the learner’s ideas previous to reading.
The aims of this phase are:

- to help understanding of the writer’s purpose
- to help understanding of the text structure
- to clarify text content

The traditional ‘comprehension exercise’ at the end of a text is a typical while-
reading activity. In other cases the learners may be asked to find the answers to
questions given at the beginning of the text (pre-text questions), or to questions
inserted at various points within the text. Completing diagrams or maps, making
lists, taking notes are other types of while-reading work.

In this phase, learners are supposed to know the function of this text, how the
text is organized, the content, the inference, and the reading styles.

Post-reading
The aims of post-reading work are to consolidate or reflect upon what has been
read to relate the text to the learners’ own knowledge, interests, or views the
work does not refer directly to the text, but ‘grows out’ of it. Post-reading may
also include any reactions to the text and to the while-reading work, for
example, learners say whether they liked it, and found it useful or not. The
learners in the last phase are hoped to know and present a similar situation to that presented in the text.

2.3. Contextual Teaching and Learning

In the beginning, contextual teaching and learning approach was derived from the theory of behaviorism and then continued with the theory of constructivism. According to Berns & Ericson (2001:2) behaviorism is teaching and learning theory that was proposed by E.L. Thorndike who suggested that learning resulted from links formed between stimuli and response through the application of rewards. It means that learners study behaviorism theory that emphasized in the observable behavior produced by a learner in order to response to the stimuli. The theory was applied in the form of conventional way that emphasized in drill or memorization.

Then, a new theory was born that is constructivism in order to response to the behaviorism theory. According to Berns & Ericson (2001:2) in constructivism, students could construct their own knowledge by testing ideas based on the prior knowledge and experience, applying these ideas to a new situation and integrating the new knowledge gained with the pre-existing intellectual construct. In this case, constructivism as learning theory emphasized in the role of students rather than the teacher.

2.3.1 The Principle of Contextual Teaching Learning

- **Principle of Interdependence**
  Human being could not establish intimacy with one another (Johnson, 2002:28). It means that although the approach consists of authentic learning activity that is conducted group, there is no one can intimidate the other’s to follow the certain students. It is a sharing and discussing section when it is conducting in group, so the principle stresses that all of the learners have the interdependence.

- **Principle of Differentiation**
  When the students are different in their creativity, they could be free to explore their individual talents, cultivate their own learning styles, and progress at their own pace (Johnson, 2002). It means that contextual teaching and learning approach can be conducted to the students with different characters, talents, and ability.

- **Principle of Self-Regulation**
  Self-regulation means everything is set up, maintained, and recognized by yourself. The principle motivates the students to show all of their potentials. Moreover, it also explores them to get the new talents. The teacher should give them belief by giving responsibility for taking the decision, behavior, choice, plan, solution etc.

2.3.2 Component of Contextual Teaching and Learning

Contextual teaching and learning also consists of some components that must be conducted as the part of its application. There are seven components of contextual teaching and learning that are useful to gain success in applying it (Elaine B. Johnsoni, 2002).
Constructivism. From the history of contextual teaching and learning, constructivism is a theory that emphasizes the way how the students construct their own knowledge. It has five steps of learning. They are activating knowledge, acquiring knowledge, understanding knowledge, applying knowledge, and reflecting knowledge.

Inquiry. The principle shows how learning is conducted by including the process of discovery that needs critical thinking. In this case, knowledge as the part of learning does not get by considering a number of facts but also from stimulating learning that allows the students to find their own material in the real context.

Questioning. Questioning is one of the parts in teaching learning process. The students’ ask something because they want to know something that they do not know.

Learning Community. Contextual teaching and learning is conducted in group because its purpose is wants the students to have sharing and discussing section without the intimacy of others.

Modeling. Modeling is derived from the word “model”. Model means example. The component of modeling means the teacher gives example to the students if they find difficulties in real way.

Reflection. Reflection is the ways of thinking about what the students have learned and thinking about what they have done in the past. In this case, the teacher can do about the information that acquired in the action.

Authentic Materials. It is important to have assessment for the teacher in order to check whether the students have learned the material or not.

3. METHODS
This research employed quantitative and qualitative method. The design is quasi-experiment with control and experimental class. The selected design was shown in table below :

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Pre test</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Post Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>HA</td>
<td>T1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>HA</td>
<td>T1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the table, in both experimental and control class, there were low achievers (LA) and high achievers (HA). Both class were given pre test to check out their reading comprehension before the experiment. Then experimental class taught reading using CTL approach while control class was taught using traditional approach. Finally they were given post test to check out their reading comprehension after treatment period.

Participants are eleventh graders of IPA and XI IPA3. There are 62 students participating in this research; 32 students for the experimental group consisting of 17
high vocabulary achievers and 15 low achievers, while in the control group there were 30 students consisting of 16 high achievers and 14 low achievers.

Data collection was initiated by administering vocabulary knowledge test to classify low and high achievers. The vocabulary levels tests used in this research were receptive and productive vocabulary tests. The receptive test used the second version of the levels test revised and validated by Schmitt et al. (2001). It was originally produced by Nation in 1983 and was later revised by him in 1990 and the productive test by Laufer and Nation (1995). Afterwards, the researcher collected quantitative data through pre and post test of reading comprehension. Finally researcher collected qualitative data through semi structure interview.

After collecting all the required data, some analysis were performed. Data analysis began with quantitative analysis. To analyze the quantitative data, this study used descriptive and inferential statistical analysis. Descriptive statistical analysis aimed to determine the minimum score, maximum score and standard deviation of students from pre test and post test while the inferential statistical test aimed to measure the effect of treatment on reading comprehension. In the first stage, paired sample t test is performed to see the improvement in the group. Regarding the research question whether CTL caused a significant difference on students' reading comprehension, independent sample t test was used. It compared the N-gain experimental class and control class. Analysis using SPSS version 20. Furthermore, qualitative data analysis was conducted. Intra-case analysis was applied to analyze the components with the components requested in the interview process. It aims to know deeply about what happened, how and why something happened.

4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

There were three findings and discussion in this research to answer the three research questions above.

4.1 Finding
It was found that CTL approach and traditional approach were not significantly different in term of promoting low achievers reading comprehension. It was showed in table below;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Samples Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Sig. (2-Tailed) value in our was 0.073. This value was greater than .05. Because of this, we can conclude that there was no statistically significant difference between the means core of reading comprehension of low achiever taught using CTL and traditional approach. So, it confirmed that the use of CTL in teaching reading comprehension to students with limited vocabulary knowledge was not influential in term of promoting reading comprehension ability.

The fact they know less words in a reading text hinder them in successfully implemented strategies of CTL (e.g; activating prior knowledge, making prediction, making inference and using context clues strategy). The problem is displayed in the following description.

In *component of Constructivism*, low achievers experienced difficulties to construct an idea or an opinion on the given text. It’s true that the text was in accordance with their life context and experience, but when it comes to understand the whole paragraph, they failed to gain the idea of the text. Lack of vocabulary knowledge is the reason for that. Lack of knowledge in word meaning results in them being unable to process certain information which is critical to the understanding of the whole text. The use of scanning, skimming and context clues strategy doesn’t much help students to make good interpretation of the text. In contextual teaching and learning, The essence of the constructivism is that the students must discover and transform complex information to other situation. If they want its information, it becomes theirs. The students construct their own knowledge and experiences, applying the idea to the new situation, and integrating the new knowledge gained with pre-existing intellectual constructs. Infact, the finding shows that the theory of constructivism failed to be proved here. Limitation in English vocabulary, therefore, may impede the transmission of information.

The facts above implied that the text comprehension does rely on sufficient background knowledge of the text, the use of strategies and sufficient vocabulary knowledge. Once the unfamiliar words are dominant in a text, context clues strategy
as well as background knowledge cannot function properly. It caused misinterpretation and poor comprehension.

Similarly to constructivism, low achievers cannot afford to maximize the process of inquiry learning. There were three steps of inquiry applied, they are proposing hypotheses (making prediction of text content), doing observation/collecting data through reading a text to find idea of the text and testing hypothesis (confirm the prediction). In practice of these three steps, in fact, they did not get big trouble to make a prediction. Troubles are accrued when process of reading and confirming the prediction. They should have struggled greatly when they tried to find the idea of the text. In this part, the context clues is hard to be implemented. Context clues require extra creativity by low achievers. Learning about the context clue is difficult. For the low achievers, this way will require a longer time. Process of identifying the problem and information are two big deals that make the they need more time.

Component of Learning community. Learning community suggests the result of teaching and learning got from cooperation with the other. Learning outcome is got from sharing with friends, groups, and the known student to the unknown student. One involved in learning community activity gives the information needed by her or his learning partner. The partner or other members of group shares what they know. The fact is that low achievers did get an idea about the text being discussed but they hardly transform the idea in form of communicative language. This situation led to the missing link of communication. The missing link leads reluctance for sharing the idea. It is at this point that the dominance of the high achievers and the dependence of low achievers are undeniable.

Component of questioning. The functions of questioning are also to check the students understanding, to know how far the students’ curiosity and what thing known by the students, to focus the students’ attention, and to refresh the students’ knowledge in learning activity. The question was applied between the student and the student, the teacher and the student, the student and the teacher, also between the student and the other person coming in the class. Questioning leads to raise a critical thinking and to exchange the way of thinking, and it adds the students’ knowledge. The finding implied that except questioning in learning community, low achievers enjoyed the questioning section over all.

Component of modeling. A model is imitated by student is better in teaching the skill and learning the certain knowledge. The model gives the great chance for teacher to give the examples how something works before the students do the duty. The finding implied that low achievers got benefit from this since they know the strategy of learning reading comprehension.

Component Reflection. Reflection is a way of thinking about what something is newly studied, thinking to the back about what we had been done on studying in the past, the students participate what they are newly studied as a new structure of the knowledge. This process is the enrichment and the revision from the previous knowledge. Reflection also responds toward to recurrence, the activity, and the new knowledge being accepted.
The next problem is self regulated learning. The goal of CTL is to enable students to be independent learner. That’s why, in learning, all students were given scaffolding by modeling the strategy, providing example giving additional explanation and asking what students need and problem. Scaffolding is critical since the students can not afford to practice the strategy automatically. But scaffolding can not be used on and on. It need to withdrawn as the students demonstrate understanding. At this point, they can be a independent learner. The problem is the scaffolding hard to be taken down from low achievers. They needed it on and on as their complication of building understanding. Low vocabulary knowledge is undeniably a hindring factor in making prediction, activating prior knowledge, and contextualizing unfamiliar words to build text understanding. The vocabulary drawbacks affected by their previous teacher centered learning experience lead them more dependent learners; dependent to teacher, friends and dictionary.

Beside problems in learning process, low achievers got trouble to practice strategy in a test. They could not make use of activating background knowledge strategy, context clues, skimming and scanning strategy to infer meaning of unfamiliar word, to get main idea, specific information, synonim, antonym and reference.

This finding further confirms contradiction to the previous reseach. As the previous researches claimed the significant effect CTL on students’ reading comprehension, the present research disagree in one term. It’s in term of low level vocabulary knowledge. CTL approch was convincingly unable to give significant improvement on low achievers’ reading comprehension.

4.2 Finding and Discussion of the Second Research Question

As low achievers did not get significant impact of the use of CTL approach, high achievers, on the other hand, perceived different thing. The finding showed that CTL approach did give significant improvement on high achievers reading comprehension. It led to significant difference from those taught using traditional approach. It showed in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Samples Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The independent sample t test above showed that the Sig. (2-Tailed) value in was 0.001. The value was less than .05. It confirmed that there was a statistically significant difference between the means score of reading comprehension of high achievers taught using CTL and traditional approach.

There are facts explaining how high achievers can improve their reading comprehension through CTL process. The process of knowledge construction as suggested in constructivism process, needs a background knowledge and an ability to make integration or connection of a text to prior knowledge. The integration is dependent on how many words the students understand from the text. When the students know more words in the text, the process of knowledge-text integration is easier. When the integration succeeds, students can construct a good idea and understand what the the idea of the text. Of course It doesn’t mean to justify that vocabulary is the main tool of reading comprehension, but interactive reading approach as in chapter 2 clearly suggested that in order to be good comprehender, one needs to make combination between bottom-up approach and top down approach. It is the combination of knowledge of linguistic features and prior knowledge. This is what happened to high achievers. They got knowledge of the text as well as good vocabulary. Similarly to constructivism, high achievers got benefit from the process of inquiry learning. Inquiry learning which is actually roots from constructivism focused on self-discovering knowledge. It is initiated by making hypotheses (making prediction of text content), then, doing observation/collecting data through reading a text to find idea of the text, finally, testing hypothesis (confirm the prediction). Practically, high achievers manage to well translate the steps either in learning process or in test time. The process of making accurate hypothesis needs the one who can think aloud. High achievers highly tends to think aloud because there is an extra inner motivation as the result of more words acknowledgement. This situation help them to read confidently. Being confident in reading leads to unyielding students. This profitable situations facilitate the high achievers to be good comprehender.

Another supporting elements of high achievers good outcome is strategy of context clues, they use context clues strategy to make lexical inference. by support of good vocabulary knowledge, high achievers were sucessfully to make use of context clue. Futhermore, the learning community through collaborative learning also facilitated high achievers to perform good reading. By sharing ideas with friends. The knowledge increases, the ability to apply strategy is better, and the motivation arises. In contrast to the low achievers who got communicative distruption, high achievers perceived collaborative learning as a good medium to solve a reluctant communication with teacher or friend. These is a part of scaffolding process that leads the high achievers to be independent learner. As they become independent, they can perform well in either reading learning process of in a test time.
Afterwards, questioning process also contribute to high achievers comprehension. The high achievers are actively producing questions. Questioning affect comprehension in three sides; they are (a) active text processing, (b) knowledge use, and (c) attentional focus. According to some authers (e.g., Davey & McBride, 1986;) it is possible that the generation of questions improves reading comprehension as a result of active text processing. Linden (1981). When asking questions, students are involved in multiple processes requiring deeper interaction with text. During questioning, students ponder relationships among different aspects of the text. A second explanation for the association between questions and reading comprehension is the influence of prior knowledge on students’ questions. In particular, prior knowledge may play a very specific role in the types of questions a student asks. A third possibility is that the impact of questioning on reading comprehension is explained by attentional factors. By asking questions related to a specific topic, the questioner directs his or her attention to text sections that contain information necessary to provide appropriate answers.

Another supporting element of significant effect of CTL on reading comprehension is that it gave complete parts of reading motivation. As noted in earlier paragraph that motivation to read is constructed of three element, those are, (1) interest, (2) dedication, and (3) confidence. They found that learning reading something interesting, they read enjoyable, compete to take chances to express answer and ideas. And most importantly they have a good trust on their own ability.

Cambria (2010) stated Belief in yourself is more closely linked to achievement than any other motivation throughout school The reason is that confidence, which refers to belief in your capacity, is tied intimately to success. When one believe in his/her ability, he will have top spirit and do the best he/she can to get good achievement. Based on the observation during learning process and test section, the HAs amzing spirit, high intensity of engagement and top concentration. These facts, supported by the theory motivation showed the most likely contributive factor of good reading achievements.

4.2 Finding and Discussion of the Third Research Question

It was found in this research that LAs and HAs reveals important facts of their perception on CTL. In term the usefulness of the approach, the low achievers and high achievers are different in a few cases but share common sense in many cases. The difference is in that the LAs are hard to apply context clues to deal with some difficult new words. The reason for this is the limitation of vocabulary. The more vocabulary one’s gets, the easier to practice it, conversely the less the more complicated. On the other hand the HAs are really successfully applying context clues for their vocabulary advantage.

Another difference is that LA is interested and like CTL but, they did not have their good confidence to execute tasks. They are doubting their abilities. The real dilemma is the fact that they exaggerate their limitations. Appearing to be worse than they really are, they stop trying completely. Retreating from all text interactions, they reduce their own opportunity to do what they want to make more than anything—to be a good reader. Their low confidence undermines them even
further in a cycle of doubt and failure. On contrary the high achievers are always positive thinking to their ability, successfully activate their background knowledge before reading, all out in organizing and integrating new information by searching for main ideas, inferring, synthesizing. They focus on complete attention on reading even when they dealt with some difficult words.

Furthermore, in term discussion section the HAs enjoyed and really took full advantage of learning. They found it easy to share things with others as they got many things from it. Group discussion enabled them to be active and creative since it provided more time and space than the whole class discussion. Conversely, the LAs felt little different thing. It doesn’t mean to say that a group discussion gave no benefit.

Apart from those diversities they share common perception on CTL. It was found in the present study that the students had very positive perception toward CTL. The interview showed that the respondent either low or high achiever perceived the CTL approach is a different approach. It had never been before they found such learning. They took it enthusiastically because CTL was very interesting. As one of the respondents said:

R1.: Saya sangat menikmati pembelajaran menggunakan CTL. Karena Ini baru pertama kali saya menerima pelajaran seperti ini dan saya merasa senang dalam belajar. beda dengan sebelumnya bosan

R2 : saya senang sekali belajar dengan membaca dengan CTL karena pembajajaran menyenangkan

Students were also concerned in contextual material. It’s fun because they felt school life set them away from their real life. It’s quite right. In CTL teachers must make learning school to real life based as well as set good planning to manipulate the situation . Excellent teachers plan carefully for learning situations in which students can experience the felt meaning. Careful planning is needed because often students do not automatically connect new information to the familiar. It may happen although students may bring memories or prior knowledge that is relevant to a new learning situation. They can fail to recognize its relevance. When teachers both provide environments in which students activate memories or prior knowledge and recognize the relevance of the memories or knowledge.

Further more, respondents asserted that they felt comfortable during learning because the teacher was close to them. They like when teachers actively moving around the class to ask and giving solutions some problem faced by students. They got sense of being protected and understood. As quoted from the respondents;

R3; pelajaranya nyaman karena guru dekat dengan kita.


What the respondents said did make sense since in the whole process of learning teacher showed what is so called teacher immediacy. Teacher immediacy is
the term used to refer to communication behaviors that reduce the perceived distance between teacher and students. For example, when the students are shy to express idea for being inferior, teacher comes close to him and talke by heart to heart to stimulate the students braveness to speak out. In such circumstance, they got a sense of being understood and protected. So by time they increased courage to take part in learning process disregarding their inferiority. This situation then drove them to high learning participation.

Despite few diversities, both respondents of LAs and HAs perceived that CTL is positive and worth-defended. They felt as if they were just free of extremely stiff situation where the creativity was restricted and learning headed to a different direction from real life need. That’s why CTL was warmly welcomed because not only did it raise their awareness that learning especially reading is inseparable from real life need, but also gave clear direction and guidance how to make use of learning to get a better life.

5. CONCLUSION
In summary, CTL is a model of how students learn and how learning takes place. The student is always active when learning takes place. The central focus is that knowledge is constructed by individual, therefore, instruction was student centered. In addition, knowledge is built-in social contexts. That’s why reading content was designed to accommodate students’ life context. It aimed to ease students’ understanding and to create benefits of learning. The implication was that pedagogy must encourage student-to-student interactions. Furthermore, knowledge construction was strongly influenced by prior experience; so students were treated as individuals. No one’s knowledge was an accurate reflection of reality. It means there are always rooms in class to express free individual interpretation on a subject.

The present research, however, found that there was a certain circumstance which did not go in line with ideal result of CTL. CTL did not afford to create significant reading achievement for those who were low achievers. Despite the higher mean score of in CTL class in comparison to traditional class, the mean difference was not really significant. It confirmed that the mean different was not caused by CTL intervention but merely period of maturity, the nature that students got improved after being taught. The two distinct findings suggested that the superiority CTL class, as a whole, over traditional class is most likely caused big achievement of high achievers. Capacity of vocabulary knowledge made a difference. Reading comprehension suggested that the more vocabulary one’s has the easier he/she understand the reading text. Additionally, despite the practice of context clues to find the meaning of unfamiliar words, comprehending the text remains difficult for low achievers because the amount of unfamiliar words was more than the familiar ones. Further the present research found that context clues strategy much work when the familiar words are majority not minority. It doesn’t mean to say that context clues doesn’t work at all when unfamiliar words are more than the familiar ones, but for sure, the research found that context clues lead to hesitative prediction. The hesitative prediction leads to misinterpretation and misinterpretation raises misleading understanding. That’s why, vocabulary
inferiority put low achievers into poor comprehension. These facts asserted that
good approach and strategy in teaching reading doesn’t automatically result to good
comprehender because vocabulary knowledge is also count. So the finding clarified
that CTL and vocabulary knowledge are interdependent in term of creating good
comprehender.

Apart from the statistical result, the present research also investigated how
students perceived the use of CTL in learning reading. It is critical since we may not
djudge the educational process partially in on students score of the test. It has been a
common traditional school sense that students are considered successful if they get a
good mark in their test. Of course, it’s not in line with the principle of our
educational system. To judge students success to what they get in the test is not fair
since the school is the place for students to explore their soft and hard skill. So
teacher as important part of educational system should provide a good approach
and a good strategy that facilitated learning situation which is comfortable for
students with varied background, free of pressure, as well as enables students to
find their enjoyment and motivation of learning. Enjoyment and motivation create
confidence and determination.
References


Muhlison (2011) The effectiveness of ctl to teach reading comprehension. UGM.


Yildirim, K., Yildiz, M. & Ates, S. Is vocabulary a strong variable predicting reading comprehension and does the prediction degree of vocabulary vary according to text types. Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice, 11(3), 1541-1547.