

APPROVAL SHEET

The thesis by Siti Fatimah entitled *The Effect of Storytelling Technique in CTL Approach to Improve Students' Speaking Ability at SMA POMOSDA Nganjuk* has been examined on 10th February 2012 and approved by the board of examiner.



Dean,

Dr. H. Nur Hamim, M. Ag

NIP. 196203120991031002

The board of examiners

Chairman,

M. Hanafi, MA

NIP. 197408042000031002

Secretary,

Rizka Safriyani, M. Pd

NIP.198409142009122005

First Examiner,

Dra. Irma Soraya, M. Pd

NIP.196709301993032004

Second Examiner,

Dr. Muhammad Salik, M. Ag

NIP.196712121994031002

writer also uses random to decide the class. In teaching speaking, the problems come out because the students are having lack of speaking practice in the target language. Moreover, the teacher often uses the students' native language. The writer is interested in this school because it is one of the bilingual schools in East Java, which uses English and Arabic as the daily communication.

In teaching grammar, especially on the subject of tenses some problems may occur. The students remain confused on applying those tenses' rule in meaningful sentences. It is caused by the teacher that emphasizes more on the students understanding to the formula of each tense.

Another problem occurring during the process of learning speaking is the teacher very often uses the classical approach. Firstly, the teacher comes to the class and directly asks the students to open the book. Secondly, the teacher writes the formula of certain tenses then explains it. Thirdly, the teacher gives the example. At last, the teacher evaluates students by using writing test. As a result, the students are lazy to study especially when they are in the class.

The goal of integrating of teaching grammar to speaking (expressing past events) was unsuccessful because the result of the test at the first reflection was under the minimum passing grade (KKM) for English lesson. The minimum passing grade for English lesson at SMA POMOSDA is 75 and only two students got high score over the minimum passing grade from 28 students. The first student got 80 score and second student got 78 score.

and a way to improve the students' speaking ability in expressing past events, because this technique gives much time to the students to practice and improve students' speaking ability. It will be easier because it uses the CTL approach that related to the students' real context, so they can correlate the theory from the learning material that they get from school into their own life.

From the previous statement, the writer thinks that storytelling could be one of the good techniques to increase the students' Speaking Ability in expressing the past events. It is suitable as medium to improve their expressing the past events, and storytelling is a medium that requires the students to talk more. By using this technique, the teacher not only gives assignments on grammar to the students by giving writing tasks but also evaluate the students' speaking ability much in every meeting after getting explanation about the grammar rules from the teacher.

Based on those reason, the writer is interested in solving the problems, as the focus of the study entitled The Effect of Storytelling Technique in CTL. Approach to Improve the Students' Speaking Ability at SMA POMOSDA Nganjuk.

1.	AHMAD ARIFIN				75					8	78
2.	ASTUTI				75					75	75
3.	BINTI ROHMATUL KHASANAH					85				80	83
4.	DEDE KHARIS SUHUDI SYAIFULLOH			63						71	67
5.	DEWI RIYANTI				76				60		68
6.	ERNI NURHAYATI			63						63	63
7.	FATHUR ROHMAN BASTOMI HADI			63					55		59
8.	FREDI VIDIA TAMTOMO			60					55		58
9.	IGA APRIATAMA				74					67	70
10.	IKHWAN NUR KHARIM		53						60		57
11.	IMAM RAMADAN		52						58		55
12.	IYUS YUSUP					87				84	86
13.	KIKI KRYSDIANTO					80				85	83
14.	KRISTANTO			70					59		65
15.	LINDA LISTIN ASTUTI				71				60		66
16.	M. BASHORI		58					47			53
17.	MAULINATUL FAJRIYAH		51						51		51
18.	MOH. LAILUL KHAKIM				73					71	72
19.	MUHAMMAD ANDRI BARITO				70				70		70
20.	NANIK SETIA RINI		53						51		52
21.	SITI NURJANAH					80				75	78
22.	SITI ZULLAYKHAH	44						42			43
23.	THORIQ ROZAQ ROSYADI		56						50		53
24.	UMINATUS SHOLIHAH				65					70	68

	3. Explaining the goal of the learning		
	4. Motivate the students		
	PROCESS		
2	10. Giving students many chances to express past events and ask questions		
	11. Helping students when they make groups and get problems		
	12. Setting students mind focus on their daily life		
	13. Inviting students in a discussion about their past activities by using storytelling in the learning process		
	14. Inviting students to present their story in front of the class one by one		
	15. Learning process is centralized on life issue		
	16. The learning process is the integration between academic with real life experience		
	17. Instruct the students personally		

	10. Learning process is centralized on life issue		
	11. The learning process is the integration between academic with real life experience		
	12. Instruct the students personally		
	13. Invite the students to visualize the abstract ideas		
	ASSESSMENT		
3	14. Giving students many chances to assess students' friends' works		
	15. Giving assessment for both of individually work or groups work		
	THE RESULT OF THE TREATMENTS		
4	16. students like the learning model of learning past tense by using CTL approach with storytelling as the media		
	17. Students' understanding about past tense was improved after learning by using the approach.		

	8. Inviting students in a discussion about their past activities by using storytelling in the learning process	✓	
	9. Inviting students to present their story in front of the class one by one	✓	
	10. Learning process is centralized on life issue	✓	
	11. The learning process is the integration between academic with real life experience	✓	
	12. Instruct the students personally	✓	
	13. Invite the students to visualize the abstract ideas	✓	
3	ASSESSMENT		
	14. Giving students many chances to assess students' friends' works	✓	
	15. Giving assessment for both of individually work or groups work	✓	
4	THE RESULT OF THE TREATMENTS		
	18. Students like the learning model of	✓	

8.	DESITA ERIN ISTIQQOMAH		65				60				62.5
9.	FAHRUL IHSAN			70			60				65
10.	FAISAL FARUQ		55				60				57.5
11.	IKA DYAH KURNIA SARI		65				65				65
12.	ISMA ULIA RESTUTI					85				85	85
13.	ITSNA ARIZA NURFADLILA					85				85	85
14.	LAELATUL ISTIQQOMAH			70			60				65
15.	MAR'ATUS SHOLIKHAH			68			60				64
16.	MOCH. WILDAN HABIBI		70				65				67.5
17.	MUKMINATUL ANUR JARIAH		55				50				52.5
18.	MUKSIN			65					65		65
19.	OKKY KURNIA SETIAWAN			70			65				67.5
20.	SAROH NUR HIDAYATI		60				49				48
21.	SELASTRI				80					78	79
22.	SILFI MAYRUROH		53				50				51.5
23.	SRI LESTARI			65			68				66.5
24.	SUAMIN				80				75		77.5
25.	WIGIK DARSONO		55						65		60
26.	ZAENAL FANANI			70			70				70
27.	ZIDNI ALQADRI			68					70		69
28.	ACHMAD ZAKIYA ZAM ZAM		60				60				60

Table 4.7 the result of post-test from control class

No	Name	Grammar					Vocabulary					Total Score
		0-50	51-60	61-70	71-80	81-90	0-50	51-60	61-70	71-80	81-90	
1.	AHMAD ARIFIN				75						85	80
2.	ASTUTI				70				65			67.5
3.	BINTI ROHMATUL KHASANAH					80					80	80
4.	DEDE KHARIS SUHUDI SYAIFULLOH		60						70			65
5.	DEWI RIYANTI				70			60				65
6.	ERNI NURHAYATI		60						63			61.5
7.	FATHUR ROHMAN BASTOMI HADI			65				55				60
8.	FREDI VIDIA TAMTOMO	50						55				52.5
9.	IGA APRIATAMA				75				65			70
10.	IKHWAN NUR KHARIM	50						60				55
11.	IMAM RAMADAN		55					60				57.5
12.	IYUS YUSUP					90					85	87.5
13.	KIKI KRYSDIANTO					85					85	85
14.	KRISTANTO			70				55				62.5
15.	LINDA LISTIN ASTUTI			70				60				65
16.	M. BASHORI		55				45					50
17.	MAULINATUL FAJRIYAH		51					51				51
18.	MOH. LAILUL KHAKIM				75					71		73
19.	MUHAMMAD ANDRI BARITO				70				70			70
20.	NANIK SETIA RINI		55					50				52.5

Table 4.9 the result calculation of standard deviation (SD) and t—value

Group	N	Mean	SD	T- value	T- table
Experimental group	28	4,86	5,73	4,49	2.00
Control group	27	0,89	2,45		

Based on the data in the table 4.9 above, the standard deviation (SD) of the experimental group 5,73 was higher than SD of control group 0,86. Then, from the result of the t-test calculation, the t-value was 4,49 with the level of significant of 5% and 54 degrees of freedom, while the t-table was 2,00. So, the t-value was higher than the t-table. It meant that the differences of post-test scores between experimental and control groups were significant.

Next, the writer calculated the scores of pre-test and post-test of the experimental group. The purpose was to find out whether or not there was an increase in the whole scores of pre-test and post-test in the experimental group. The result was presented in the table 4.10 bellow:

Table 4.10 the result of pre-test and post-test calculation from both groups

Group	Pre- Test	Post- Test	SD	T- value	T- table
Experimental	61,79	66,64	5,73	4,49	2,05
Control	64,85	63,96	2,45	1,88	2,06

From the result above, there was an increase in the whole scores of pre-test and post-test of experimental group. From the calculation of t-test formula, it was found out that t-value was 4,49 with 27 degree of freedom and 5% level of significance, while the t-table was 2,05. It meant that the result of pre-test and post-test calculation of the experimental group were higher than t-table and the difference was significant.

The writer also calculated the scores of pre-test and post-test of the control group. In this part, the purpose was to find out whether there was an increase in the whole scores of pre-test and post-test in the control group or not. The data were collected from pre-test and post-test scores of the control group. From the table above, it showed that the scores of pre-test and post-test of control group was increased. the t-value was 1,88 with 26 degrees of freedom and 5% level of significant was 2,06 , so it means that the result of pre-test and post-test calculation of control group was lower than t-table and the difference was significant.

The difference between pre-test and post-test scores of the experimental and the control groups were done by the researcher. She calculated and made a list of pre-test and post-test scores difference between pre-test and post-test of both groups which could be seen in appendix 8.

So, it was clear that there was significant difference in students' speaking ability between the students who are taught by using Storytelling and those who are not taught by using Storytelling. In another words, the treatments by using

