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Abstract The objective of this research was to find out whether there is a significant increase in students’ reading comprehension achievement of narrative texts taught through Directed Reading – Thinking Activity Strategy. The sample of the research was the first year students of SMP PGRI 2 Katibung Lampung Selatan in the year 2012/2013. The result of the test shows that there is a significant increase from pre-test to post-test after being taught through Directed Reading-Thinking Activity. The increase is from 70.84 up to 77.51 and the gain is 6.67. This proves that the treatments given by the researcher has a positive effect on the students’ achievement, which means Directed Reading-Thinking Activity can increase students’ reading comprehension achievement of narrative text.
I. INTRODUCTION

The DRTA strategy is one of reading strategies which has been proved, through many studies, to have been able to improve students’ reading comprehension. The DRTA strategy is developed by Stauffer in 1969 to help the students in comprehending a text. The DRTA strategy has many advantages in the teaching and learning of reading. First, the DRTA strategy can help to develop critical reading skills. Second, the strategy can encourage the students to be active readers. Third, it can activate the students’ prior knowledge. Then, the strategy can monitor students’ reading comprehension as they are reading. Finally, the strategy can enhance students’ curiosity about particular texts or text types. From the statements above, it is obvious that the DRTA strategy is effective to improve the students’ reading comprehension; so it is appropriate to be used by English teachers in teaching reading.

Clark and Silberstein (1987) state reading as an active cognitive process of interacting with print and monitoring comprehension to establish meaning. While Mackay (1979) in Simanjuntak (1988: 15) defines reading is an active process. The readers from preliminary expectation about the material then select the fewest, most productive cues necessary to confirm or reject the expectation. This is a sampling process in which the reader takes advantage of his knowledge of vocabulary, syntax, discourse, and the real world. Therefore, reading involves an interaction between taught and language. Moreover, Nuttal (1982:12) defines reading as the meaningful interpretation of printed or written verbal symbols.
Someone has a purpose when he is reading. Usually the purpose of reading a passage is to find ideas from the reading passage. As Suparman (2005:1) states that there are two major reasons for reading (1) reading for pleasure; (2) reading for information (in order to find out something or in order to do something with the information readers get).

At the same time, Richard (1986) defines comprehension as the process by which the person understands the meaning of the written or spoken language. From these statements, the writer concludes that comprehending is the process of mind’s act understanding the meaning of written or spoken language.

Finocchiaro and Bonomo (1973:132) suggest that reading comprehension is ability which depends on the accuracy and speed of grapheme perception, that is, perception of written symbol, control of language relationship and structure, knowledge of vocabulary items and lexical combination, awareness of redundancy, the ability to use contextual clues and recognition of cultural allusion.

To implement the teaching strategy above, the researcher chooses SMP PGRI 2 Katibung Lampung Selatan as the setting of her research. Based on her pre observation, she finds that the students have difficulty in comprehending an English reading text, such as: the students have difficulty in finding the main idea of the passage with long sentences, main topics, and explicit and implicit specific information in reading text.
II. METHOD

The researcher used one group pretest-posttest design (Hatch and Farhady, 1982:20). She used one class as the experimental class and another one class as a try out class. This research is intended to see whether there is an increase of students’ reading comprehension in narrative text after being taught using DRTA strategy.

The pretest has been conducted to measure students’ reading comprehension achievement before treatments, and the posttest is conducted to find the students’ reading comprehension achievement after being taught using DRTA strategy. Then, the means of both pretest and posttest was compared to find out the progress before and after the treatment. This research conducted pretest, treatments, and posttest. The research design was represented as follow:

\[ T_1 \times T_2 \]

- T1 : Pre-Test
- T2 : Treatments
- T3 : Post-Test

(Hatch and Farhady in Setiyadi 2006:131)

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This research has been conducted to find out whether there is any increase of students’ reading comprehension achievement after being treated using DRTA Strategy. Comparing the result of the pretest and the posttest from this research in which the mean score of the pretest was 70.84 and the mean score of the posttest was 77.5, it could be seen that the mean of the students’ scores in the pretest and the posttest were significantly different, it increased from 70.84 to 77.51. The highest score of the pretest was 86 and the highest score of the posttest was 90.
The gain score was 6.67. The lowest score of the pretest was 56 and the lowest score of the posttest was 56. It was also found that the total number of items of the students’ correct answer for the five aspects (determining main idea, specific information, inference, reference, vocabulary) on the pretest was 704 while on the posttest was 766. It indicates that there was a significant difference from the pretest 704 to the posttest 766. The increase was 62. In testing the hypothesis repeated measures t-test was used.

**Table 4. Mean Scores of Pre-test and Post-test of Narrative Text**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Samples Statistics</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest Scores in Experimental Class</td>
<td>70.8485</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.55034</td>
<td>1.31434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest Scores in Experimental Class</td>
<td>77.5152</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.21163</td>
<td>1.25538</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Samples Test</th>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest Scores in Experimental Class</td>
<td>Posttest Scores in Experimental Class</td>
<td>-6.66667</td>
<td>6.58913</td>
<td>1.14702</td>
<td>-9.00307 to -4.33026</td>
<td>-5.812</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As stated in the previous results of the pret-est and post-test, it can be stated that applying DRTA strategy on reading section in the classroom could increase the students’ reading comprehension of narrative text significantly. From the analysis of Paired Samples Test, it can be seen that DRTA strategy can be used to increase students’ reading achievement significantly. From the table below, it can be seen that the total number of students who choose the correct answer in post-test is higher than in pre-test. The total scores of the pretest are 2338 up to 2558 in posttest, and the mean of pretest 70.84 up to 77.51 in post-test. Students’ gain of mean pre-test and post test score can be seen on the table and the graph below:
From the graph above, it is very clear that the students’ achievement in reading comprehension of narrative text had increased after they were taught using DRTA strategy. The mean score of the pre-test was 70.84 and the mean score of the post-test was 77.51. In order to prove whether the data was increased or not, Repeated Measures t-Test was used. It was used in comparing the data of t-test which was called as t-ratio and t-table as the criteria level of significance. In this case, the level of significance was 0.05 and t-table was 2.045. The result showed that t-ratio was higher than t-table (17.013 > 2.045). From table below, it can be seen that the result of t-test computation, t-ratio can be seen higher than t-table (17.013 > 2.045) and with the level of significance p<0.05 and sig. 2-tailed is p= 0.000 (p<0.05). It means that there is any significance increase of students’ reading comprehension after they are taught through DRTA strategy.

Treatments were done after pretest. It was to find out the previous score before being given the treatment and to find out how far the gain was achieved. In the pre-test result, the data showed that 86 was the highest score, 56 were the lowest
score, and 70.84 were the mean score. There were 2 students who got the highest score and 1 person who got the lowest score. In the post-test result, the data showed that 90 were the highest score, 56 were the lowest score, and 77.51 were the mean score. There were 3 students who got the highest score and 1 person who got the lowest score. For three treatments the researcher was introduced and how to run the procedures in reading comprehension was explained. The procedures began with brainstorming the students about the reading material, and introducing DRTA as one of the useful strategy to help the students in comprehending the text. They seemed enthusiastic after being given the explanation about how to implement DRTA strategy in reading. Some questions related to the material of the text were asked as brainstorming to the students. Such as “Do you know the story of Monkey and Crocodile? Have you read it? Could you give some examples of narrative text?”

Such questions were used to enable the students to use their background knowledge in order to make for them easy in comprehending the text. After brainstorming; the procedures of implementing it in reading comprehension were explained. The procedures of DRTA strategy:

a. Predicting

In the first step, the teacher sets the students for reading and helps them think about what they are going to read before begin. The children learn to predict what they are going to read basically on available clues that in the text, pictures, italic, and bold-face terms and underline word provide in the passage or by skimming. The students learn to pose questions about what they are
going to read and to set up hypothesis before reading begins. During this step of the strategy, the teacher’s role is to both activate and agitate thought by asking students to defend their hypotheses. This is time to guess, anticipate and hypothesize. Ask students “What do you think?” Why do you think so?”

b. Reading

The next steps are reading. The students are asked to read the text silently to verify the accuracy of their predictions. Some of their hypotheses will be rejected and some will be confirmed or rejected by further reading. There are no rights or wrong predictions rather some responses are judged to be less accurate than others are. Once the predictions are made, teacher give a brief idea of what the chapter is about and ask the students to think about what questions they want answered when they read the chapter. The teacher records some questions on chart paper. The questions help set up a purpose for reading. The researcher found that students are much more in tune with the story and are better able to answer questions with detail and enthusiasm.

c. Proving

During this step, students read back through the text and point how they are able to verify their prediction. Students verify the accuracy of their predictions by finding statements in the text and reading them orally to the teacher. The teacher serves as the mentor, refining, and deepening the reading or the thinking process. This step is built on the previous stages, in which the children make prediction and read to find evidence. In this step, the children will confirm or revise their predictions. Ask students to cite the text which caused them to confirm or change a prediction. Ask students, “What in the passage
make u think that? Can you prove it?” Made changes to the predictions on the transparency or chalkboard.

The procedures were explained clearly to ensure the whole students could comprehend them well. The concept of narrative text (including the text purpose, text organization, and language features of text) was explained to the students as well as the five aspects of reading text (main idea, details, inference, references and vocabulary). After that, the students were asked to try to apply DRTA strategy in reading the text.

In the first treatment, narrative reading texts entitled ‘Brer Rabbit and the Tar baby’ were distributed to the students. Since the research was conducted to see whether DRTA Strategy could be used to increase students’ reading comprehension achievement or not, the researcher gave an evaluation by giving the students a text and they had to answer some questions representing the five sorts of reading comprehension at the end of every treatment. It was expected that by having knowledge about DRTA Strategy the students would not find difficulty in comprehending the text. However they were still confuse how to understand the inference and reference the text. For example in identifying the main idea, the teacher asked “What is the main idea of paragraph 6?” In specific information the teacher asked “Why Brer Rabbit get angry?”. In inference the teacher asks “What do you think about the story?”. In reference the teacher asked “The word “he” in paragraph 3, line 2, refers to?” and example for vocabulary the teacher asked “The word “yells” in paragraph 4, has the closest meaning?”. From 5 questions, only
few students could answer all of them since still had difficulties to find the main idea and inference.

In the main activity, the researcher showed the students how to use DRTA strategy. Firstly, the teacher asked the students to read the text to get an overview of its main idea. The researcher asked the students to skim the text quickly. After that, the teacher asked the students to make some questions to the text before they read the whole text. This activity involved some attempts at prediction. The students formulated their own questions as first before answering the questions given by the teacher. There was a problem in question stage, some students made mistakes in making questions in English so that the teacher taught them how to make question in English. After question stage, the teacher asked the students to read the whole text carefully. They had to read the text in detail. They were interested in reading that text, because they had never read that story before. In this activity, the students looked for the answers based on the questions made. After that, teacher asked the students to recite the questions they had made.

In the second treatment, almost the similar steps were run as in the first treatment, except the text distributed was “The Monkey and The Crocodile”. The study still investigated the five sorts of reading comprehension: determining the main idea, finding the detail information, reference, inference, and vocabulary. In the second treatment, they had already been able to determine the main idea of each paragraph, its detail information, and made inference of the text, that the use of pronouns is a part of reference. For example when students found the word
“Foolish” in paragraph 8 and they need to find out the closest meaning of “Foolish”. For example in Identify the main idea, the teacher asked “What is the main idea of paragraph 6?”. In specific information the teacher asked “Why the monkey asked the crocodile to swim back to the river bank?”. In inference the teacher asks “What do you think about the story?”. In reference the teacher asked “The word “he” in paragraph 3, line 2, refers to?”. From 5 questions, only few students could answer all of them since they still had difficulties in understanding some new words in the text.

The researcher helped the students to discuss the meaning of the words. While overcoming the reference problem, the researcher re-explained about the concept of pronouns. In this second treatment, the researcher noted that there was an increase of the students’ activity in running the procedure of DRTA Strategy, but there was no significant improvement yet in reading comprehension achievement.

The third treatment, the researcher asked the students to be more concerned about the vocabulary and reference. This could help them in determining the main idea, supporting detail and inference. In this third treatment the researcher distributed the text entitled “The Little Mailman of Bayberry Lane”. The researcher still applied the same procedure from the beginning till the end of the teaching learning process. At that time, more improvement was shown by the students, greater and better than that in the previous treatments. The students tried to comprehend the text well enough; they also seemed very active when running the procedures of DRTA Strategy. For example is when students tried to find out
about the specific information from the text of The Little Mailman of Bayberry Lane “What Mrs. Pig waiting for?”. In identifying the main idea, the teachers asked “What is the main idea of paragraph 6?”. In inference the teacher asked “What do you think about Mrs. Pig?”. In reference the teachers asked “The word “her” in paragraph 3, line 5, refers to?” and example for vocabulary the teachers asked “The word “open” in paragraph 4, what the synonym of open?” from 5 questions, only few students who could answer all of them since they still have difficulties to find main idea and inference.

In those treatment, the students had been able to determine main idea, supporting detail and make inference. Although this researcher was focused only on whether DRTA Strategy can be used to increase students’ reading comprehension measured from their reading comprehension achievement toward narrative text, the process itself was found to be remarkable.

In this discussion, the general process of the research is reviewed. In the first treatment, DRTA Strategy was introduced and how to run procedures in reading comprehension was explained. The procedures began with the students brainstorming about the reading material, and introducing DRTA Strategy as one of the useful strategy to help the students in comprehending the text. Since the regular teaching of reading comprehension in SMP PGRI 2 Katibung, Lampung Selatan used conventional teaching-learning, the students felt bored with the process but their enthusiasm was obvious when they were given the explanation about how to implement DRTA Strategy in reading. Some questions were asked
as the students were brainstormed about the material of the text. Such questions were used to enable the students to use their background knowledge in order to make it easier for them to comprehend the test.

Finally, it can be inferred that DRTA strategy is appropriate, useful, and also applicable in teaching reading comprehension. As it helps the students to create a good mental framework of the text, in which the students can fit fact correctly. It is particularly useful when it comes to setting. They key points that may help the students to reach their goals in reading narrative text.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In line with the result of the data analysis, the researcher draws the conclusion as follows:

1. There is a significant increase of students’ achievement in reading comprehension of narrative text taught through DRTA Strategy. This can be identified from the gain of the score that is 6.67 of students’ reading comprehension achievement of narrative text. It can be seen from the mean of students’ score pre-test and post-test which increase from 70.84 up to 77.51 and the increase is 6.67.

2. DRTA Strategy is appropriate and effective strategy to be used in increasing students’ reading comprehension achievement using narrative text. The students’ are very interested because the texts and the strategy are closely related. The texts they learned through past experience and the strategy they
learned through their prior knowledge make it easy for them to understand the
texts.
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