



The Implementation of Directed Reading Thinking Activity (DRTA) to Improve Students' Reading Comprehension.

Nurmadina HS¹, Yuliah²

^{1) 2)} STMIK Handayani Makassar

¹⁾ Nurmadinahs@handayani.ic.id

²⁾ yuliahharis3112@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The goal of this research is to look into the use of Directed Reading Thinking Activity to improve students' reading comprehension in the tenth grade at SMAN 1 Tanete Riaja. The following research questions were addressed in this study: 1) How does the implementation of Directed Reading Thinking Activity (henceforth DRTA) improve students' reading comprehension? 2) What are the students' perceptions toward the DRTA strategy's implementation? This study employs a quasi-experimental design with both an experimental and a control group. The experimental class was taught using the DRTA strategy, while the control class was taught using the conventional strategy. The participants in this study were chosen at random and were divided into two classes: class X-1, which consisted of 32 students as the experimental class, and class X-2, which consisted of 30 students as the control class. The data was gathered through a reading comprehension test and a questionnaire. According to the findings of this study, using the DRTA method increases students' scores more than using the conventional strategy. The experimental class has a mean score of 76.40, while the control class has a score of 50.3. It indicates that the DRTA strategy significantly improves students' reading comprehension and makes a positive contribution to their cognitive development. Furthermore, the results of the questionnaire show that the majority of students respond positively to the implementation of the DRTA strategy in the classroom.

Keywords: Reading Comprehension, DRTA, Quasi Experimental, Perception, Thinking Skill.

INTRODUCTION

Reading is mainly a process of thought. It requires a sort of reader reaction. Reading is one skill that significantly contributes to improve and enhance the knowledge of students. According to Grobe and Stoller (2002), the interpretation of this data is the ability to draw meaning from the printed page. It is all about understanding

reading. Moreover, Wolley (2015) in Astri & wahab (2018) stated that reading comprehension is the process of extracting meaning from text. Reading comprehension is a complex process that involves various abilities.

However, most students' practices in high schools have shown that the students do not have enough reading skills to understand the

reading texts well. Most students' reading skill involves learning the material assigned or completing their job. They have difficulty processing text-based information. Furthermore, in order to determine the severity of the problems, a pre-test was administered to the students of class X -1, and the results show that the students' reading comprehension score is at a low level. It is possible to say that the students in class X-1 had poor text comprehension. In the cases mentioned above, the writer considers using DRTA to improve students' reading comprehension. The Directed Reading Thinking Activity (DRTA) is a strategy that encourages students to ask questions or make predictions about a text. The next step is to read to confirm or refute their predictions. The DRTA process encourages students to learn more and to be thoughtful readers, which improves their comprehension.

This study focused on the use of DRTA to improve reading comprehension in tenth grade students at SMAN 1 Tanete Riaja during the second semester of the 2013/2014 academic year. The reading portion was limited to a few units from the English textbook, *Developing English Competencies X*. This study focused on two types of reading comprehension levels: inferential and literal comprehensions.

Reading comprehension is one process that requires the development of decoding skills through the development of a large repertoire of sight words, the study of the content of various

vocabularies encountered in texts, and the ability to summarize the text.

Previous research has been conducted that is relevant to the current study. The first study by Many and Flyfe (1996) looked at the impact on reading performance and higher-quality thought by using direct reading thinking and writing activities. The researchers conducted a reading test and a writing test on 51 students. Both reading and writing skills were significantly improved. The results showed that the student's performance can be improved if appropriate reading strategies are used.

On the other hand, El-Koumy (2006) studied the impact on Egyptian first year second stage students of the EFL Directed Reading Thinking Activity. The findings indicate that referential and inferential comprehension skills are developing, which can only be accomplished through a strategy that forces students to use these skills while reading. As a result, improving one's reading comprehension is supposed to go hand in hand with improving one's thinking skills.

The purpose of Erliana's (2011) study was to describe how the Directed Reading Thinking Activity (henceforth DRTA) strategy can help with reading comprehension. The information was gathered through observation, field notes, a questionnaire, and an examination. And the findings show that the DRTA not only improved students' comprehension but also increased their motivation to study. Meanwhile, the weakness of this research, namely action

research, necessitates more time; the length of time spent conducting a study affects the mood of cognitive process.

Richard et al (1985) define reading comprehension as the result of the receipt of a written text to understand the content. Reading understanding is evaluated by means of three types of reminder scores for common ideas and main ideas in a text. Comprehension of reading is commonly used to describe how well readers understand a text. It demonstrates how well readers understand the implicit and explicit meaning in the contents, by Sung-Hyun (2003). Furthermore, people's ability to comprehend reading material varies, so teachers must be aware that there are three main levels or standards of comprehension itself. According to Akmar (1999), there are three levels of comprehension: literal, interpretive, and critical.

METHODOLOGY

The study used a quasi-experimental design, which included both an experimental and a control group and pre-test and post-test results. One is the test group using the Directed Reading Thinking activity, and the other represents the controlling group by using the conventional strategy. The other is the students who were assigned randomly to one of the two study conditions. Pre and post-test students in both groups were given to evaluate their understanding of the English language.

Experimental Group	O1 X O2
Control Group	O1 -- O2

Where:

1. O1: the pre-test given in both groups for students.
2. O2: the post-tests given in the two groups to the students.
3. X: represents the treatment of the directed reading thinking activity
4. --: means conventional strategy teaching.

The experimental group was taught using the DRTA, while the control group was taught by the conventional method.

This study's population was the tenth grade students of SMAN 1 Tanete Riaja, with a total population of 234 students. The sample was divided into two classes: class X-1, which was the experimental class, and class X-2, which was the control class. X-1 had 32 students and X-2 had 30 students, both of whom were chosen at random.

Random samples are defined by Gay et al. (1990) as the selection process of this sample, in order to provide the same independent chance that every individual in the defined population will be chosen from the sample.

The test was divided into two sections: pre-test and post-test. The same questions appear on both the pre and post-test. The test was a multiple-choice format in which students were asked to choose only one answer from five options. The total of the questions were 20 questions. Before the implementation of the

DRTA, a pre-test was given to assess the students' proficiency in reading comprehension, followed by a post-test after the implementation of the DRTA. Through the DRTA strategy, the test was given to measure the students' knowledge in mastering the material text. In this research's students were given a questionnaire as an instrument, which was used to determine the students' perceptions of the DRTA's implementation.

The reading comprehension test consisted of 20 questions and was designed to assess students' prior knowledge in reading proficiency. A test was administered on a single day. To describe the success and failure of research, qualitative and quantitative data were used. The quantitative data came from the test results, while the qualitative data described the process of learning outcomes obtained through observations, as outlined in the observation sheet. The pre-test was designed to assess students' prior knowledge of reading proficiency, and the reading comprehension exam consisted of 20 questions. In January 2014, it took one day to administer a test.

Implementation of DRTA

Before implementing this strategy, the classroom environment must be created in which students are free to express and share their ideas. This is especially important for students who are not willing to take risks. Because the students want to pass on their first try, DRTA can motivate them.

The steps for giving a DRTA treatment are as follows:

1. A reading passage is chosen as an introductory material by including several suitable stopping points for predictions created, verified or defined by students.
2. The students' thoughts are guided by the use of questions when using this strategy. Place open questions and encourage students to predict while appreciating all ideas and supporting them.
3. Write the book title or passage on a blank or whiteboard at the beginning of the lesson. The students ask, "What do you think the passage will be about?" Take every prediction and write it on the class board. Ask students to get justifications and activate previous knowledge "Why do you think that?"
4. Instruct students to revise their predictions in light of the new information. Changes were made to the predictions that were still on the board so that all students could see the changes clearly.
5. Allow students read for themselves. Stop it after the first part of the passage and talk to a class to confirm or produce forecasts. "What makes you believe that in the passage?" students are asking. For the second time, "Can you prove it?," modify the predictions.
6. Repeat this process until all sections of the passage have been read by the students.

7. To help students become more comfortable with the process, have them write down their predictions on a piece of paper. Students can then discuss and share their predictions in small groups. After that, have students summarize statements and compare their predictions to the passage. The procedures for administering post-tests by the teacher to all students in both the experimental and control groups were similar to those used for pre-tests. On April 14, 2014, the post-test was completed in 90 minutes.

At the end of the study, students were given a questionnaire to assess their attitudes toward the implementation of DRTA in the reading process.

The data was collected and analysed using SPSS version 17.0, and the researcher was required to use descriptive and inferential

statistics. The descriptive statistic included the percentage of students who scored, the mean differences between the control and experimental groups, and the standard deviation of the data, whereas the inferential statistic was the significant differences between students or the t-test value. The researcher used descriptive and inferential statistics to analyse the data using SPSS version 17.0. The descriptive statistic included the percentage of students' score, the mean differences between the control and experimental groups, and the standard deviation of the data, whereas the inferential statistic was the significant differences between students or the t-test value.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Mean score and standard deviation of experimental class and control class

Table 1. The mean scores of the pre-test in the experimental and control class

One-Sample Statistics				
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pretest: experimental	32	59.22	11.853	2.095
Pretest: Control	30	49.50	8.341	1.523

The table shows the mean of the experimental class is 59.22, with a standard deviation of 11.853, and the mean of the control class is 49.50, with a standard deviation of 8.341. Finally, the analysis results show that the experimental class's mean pre-test score

increased more than the control class's, but this result had no effect on students' ability to absorb the lessons. One of the goals of the pre-test is to determine students' reading comprehension and prior knowledge.

Table 2. Mean score of post-test on experiment and control:

One-Sample Statistics				
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Post-test: experimental	32	76.41	7.955	1.406
Post-test: Control	30	50.33	9.463	1.728

The data in the table above are the results of the mean scores of the two classes, namely the control and experimental classes. These data show the extent to which the comparison rate and the mean score of the control and experimental classes differ. The mean score for the experimental class is 76.41, with a standard deviation of 7.95, and the mean score for the control class is 50.33, with a standard deviation of 9.463.

The mean score is one of the benchmarks in the field of statistical analysis for determining the progress of the students in this study; these data show that the mean scores between the control and experimental classes differ from each other, and the mean score of the experimental class expresses a greater number than the mean score of the control class. Furthermore, it demonstrates that the

experimental class post test results were significantly improved over the previous pre-test results. This is due to the implementation of DRTA in the classroom. The following output is the independent sample test, which presented the results of the SPSS average difference analysis and the significance of the t-test.

Independent sample t-test for post- test score of control and experimental class.

In order to determine the significance of differences between control and experimental groups the independent sampling t test was used. The analysis will show whether the control and the experimental classes after implementing DRTA have improved significantly or not. The improvement was demonstrated when the t-observed is less than 5% at the significance level or p value of 0.050.

Table 3. Mean and standard deviation of post-test of control class and experimental class.

Group Statistics					
Class		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Score	Control	30	50.3333	9.46257	1.72762
	experimental	32	76.4063	7.95495	1.40625

The analysis result in table 3 shows that the mean post-test score across experimental and control classes was significantly different from one another. The experimental class's post-

test mean scores are higher than the control class's (figure 1). The mean for the control group is 50.33, while the experimental group scored 76.40. The independent t-test was used to

determine whether such a difference was significant. The result of the independent sample t test shows that the t observed is less than 5% at the level of significance (, 000, 050) or if p

value 0.50 (H0) is rejected. That means the improvement of experimental group highly significant than control group, and alternative hypothesis (H1) is accepted.

Table 4. Independent sample t-test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper	
score	Equal variances assumed	.534	.468	-11.771	60	.000	-26.07292	2.21508	-30.50374	-21.64209
	Equal variances not assumed			-11.704	56.824	.000	-26.07292	2.22760	-30.53391	-21.61192

In the preceding case, the p value or sig. (2-tailed) is 0.000 where 0.05. The difference was statistically significant or significant at 0.05 probability because 0.000 0.05. The assumption is that HO is rejected and H1 is accepted.

The second section discusses students' reactions to the implementation of the Directed Reading Thinking Activity. The results show that the DRTA was well received by the majority of students.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Conclusion

The study's findings indicate that implementing DRTA significantly improves the reading comprehension of tenth grade students at SMAN 1 Tanete Riaja.

The students' perception to the implementation of DRTA was very positive; they agreed that DRTA could force their way of thinking in making predictions and reading

comprehension. Predictions can support students' basic knowledge, which is the foundation of their thinking, and clear up any misunderstandings they had previously. Students were motivated and challenged by this activity.

Suggestion

For the future researcher, the research can be conducted with a small group to see the intensity with which they are developing their thinking skills in reading comprehension. Furthermore, further researchers can investigate other skills, such as writing, speaking, and listening. In addition, it can be carried out with varying levels of proficiency.

REFERENCES

- Abdel Salam A. El-Koumy (2006). The effects of the Directed Reading Thinking Activity on Egyptian first-year secondary stage EFL students' referential and inferential reading comprehension.
- Astri, Z., & Wahab, I. (2018). The Effect of Reading Teaching Material for Different Learning Styles in Improving Students' Reading Comprehension. *Jurnal Bahasa Lingua Scientia*, 10(2), 215-230. <https://doi.org/10.21274/lis.v10i2.1251>
- Chung-Shan ,H. (2000). Concepts of EFL Reading among Taiwanese College Students of Low Reading Proficiency, Medical & Dental College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 345837
- Erliana, Santi (2011) the study was to describe how the Directed Reading Thinking Activity (henceforth DRTA) strategy can improve reading comprehension.
- Gay, L.R. (1990) educational research competencies for analysis and application, 3rd edition .Singapore. Machimillan publishing company.
- Gay, L.R., Mills, G.E. & Airasian, P.(2006). Educational research competencies for analysis and applications (8th ed). New Jersey: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Grobe,W and F.L.Stoller.2002. Teaching and Researching Reading. England: Pearson Education.
- Many, J. & Flyfe, I. (1996). The Effect of Using Directed reading Thinking and Writing Activity on Scottish Elementary Students. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 55 (2), 104-119.
- Mohammad, Akmar. The Internet TESL Journal, Vol. V, No. 12, December (1999). What Do We Test When We Test Reading Comprehension?University Sains Malaysia
- Richard , jack et al (1985) Longman dictionary of applied linguistic. England ; Longman house
- Sung-Hyun, M. (2003) The Effect of Interesting Text on the Reading Comprehension of Korean College EFL Students: A Comparison of Seductive Details and Interesting Elaborations. Ed.D. dissertation, The University of Texas ,Austin, USA. Retrieved September 16, 2008, from Dissertations & Theses Row.