

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION

This chapter elaborates the research findings and discussion. The research present the data collection technique which was the validity test analysis and the reliability test analysis. Then, data analysis as the result of this research. The data was found from the test. The research findings were obtained from pre-test and post-test outcomes indicating the effect of directed reading thinking activity for student's comprehension on twelve grade at SMK NU GRESIK. The research finding was included of the calculation of pre-experiment, experiment, and post-experiment analysis, while the discussion was in the last part of this chapter.

4.1. Data Collection Technique.

4.1.1. The validity test analysis.

Instrument was assumes as valid if the instrument measure what it should be measure. In the case, the instrument which would be tested toward experiment and control group had been validated trough try out toward class which the background as same as control and experiment group. The researcher used SPSS 21.0 through Pearson product moment to measure validity construct in the instrument, item in the instrument was correlated with total score of item in the instrument.

The researcher distributed 20 items both of pre-test and post-test. After calculating the result of the try out using SPSS 21.0, she found that were 17 valid items and 3 invalid items in pre-test. Then, for post-test there were 18 valid items and 2 invalid items because both of pre-test and post-test should be same, so the researcher decided to take 20 items in pre-test and post-test to make easier for giving score. Further information about the result of validity test could be seen in appendix.

4.1.2. The reliability test analysis.

There were some procedure in measuring reliability of the test in SPSS 21.0. First, open the SPSS 21.0 program then choose file, new data. Second, input the data in data view. After that click analyze, click scale and click reliability analyze. It will appear dialogue box named reliability analysis. Input all variables in items box then choose alpha in the model. Last, click OK.

If Cronbach's Alpha value $>$ r-table, the test items are reliable but if Cronbach's Alpha value $<$ r-table the test items are not reliable. Based on the result of try-out for the pre-test and post-test, the researcher found that both pre-test and post-test were reliable if Alpha Cronbach $>$ 0.70. It was found from the result of test items' reliability in SPSS 21.0. The reliability of in pre-test was the very high reliability because Cronbach's Alpha value was higher than r-table that was 0.861. Thus, the reliability in posttest was the very high reliability because Cronbach's Alpha value was higher than r-table that was 0.841. For the result of pretest and posttest reliability in SPSS 21.0 version, it was shown in the appendix.

4.2. Pre-experiment Analysis.

4.2.1. Homogeneity test of variance.

To analyze the homogeneity, the researcher used SPSS version 21.0. The homogeneity assumption was checked in SPSS by Levene's test with the following procedures. The first procedure was inserting the pre-test data both control group and experiment group using data view. The second procedure was going to the analyze menu, selecting compare means then choosing independents sample t-test. The last steps was interpreting the homogeneity test output, the researcher needed to see Levene's test column to know whether the equality of variances in the groups of scores were homogeny or not.

The result of independent sample t-test could be seen in table below:

Group Statistics					
	VAR00002	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
VAR00001	1	37	63.65	12.453	2.047
	2	29	60.86	12.397	2.302

Table 4.1. Group Statistic Homogeneity.

Independent Samples 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
VAR00001	Equal variances assumed	.005	.943	.904	64	.369	2.787	3.082	-3.371	8.944
	Equal variances not assumed			.905	60.411	.369	2.787	3.081	-3.375	8.948

Table 4.2. Independent Sample T-Test (Pre-Test).

The result showed that the mean score of experimental group was 63.65 and 60.86 for control group. Moreover, Levene's test for equality of variance showed that significance was 0.943. If the Levene's test is higher than significance level, we can conclude that both groups are homogeneous. In contrary, if the Levene's is less than significance level, we can conclude that both groups are not homogeneous. Based on data above, the result of Levene's test was higher than the level significance 0,05 ($0.943 > 0,05$). Thus, the result of pre-test score in both experiment and control group is higher than level if significance 0.05, so the variance scores of pre-test were homogenous or equal.

4.2.2. Normality of distribution test.

In this study, the researcher used pre-test to know whether the data are in normal distribution or not. Kolmogorov-Smirnov test used to analyze the normality distribution both of experimental group and control group. The pre-test score of experimental group was 63.65 and the control group was 60.86.

The result of this test was presented in the following:

Tests of Normality							
	VAR00002	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
VAR00001	1	.108	37	.200*	.962	37	.229
	2	.130	29	.200*	.966	29	.456
*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.							
a. Lilliefors Significance Correction							

4.3. Test of Normality.

The result showed that pre-test score both of experimental group and control group were in normal distribution. The result of pre-test score of experimental group was 0.200 which was higher than the level of significance 0.05 ($0.200 > 0.05$) and the result pre-test score of control group was 0.200 which was higher than the level of significance 0.05 ($0.200 > 0.05$). The result of pre-test score in both of experiment and control group is higher than level significance. So, the scores were normally distributed.

4.2.3. Pre-test.

The pre-test was conducted on October, 25th, 2017 for control group and experimental group. In the pre-test, the participants of experimental group were 37 and the participants of control group were 29. There researcher conducted pre-test in experimental group first then gave the pre-test in control group. When pre-test was conducting, the researcher gave twenty questions and has been finish it to the students and all of questions were multiple choices.

4.2.4. The scoring of Pre-test.

In scoring of pre-test, the researcher asked the students to do the items of pre-test. The score of pre-test was given only by the researcher. She took the score of pre-test by some categories. If the answer was correct the score will be 1. In other hand, if the answer was wrong the score will be 0 because this pre included in objective test. From the result of pre-test, the average score of experimental group was higher than control group. Where, the average score of experimental group was 63.65. Meanwhile, the average score of control group was 60.86.

4.3. Experiment Analysis.

In this research, the class was 2 class for the researcher has been to given pre-test, treatment and posttest at SMK NU Gresik. It is 12 MM as experimental group and 12 TKJ as control group. Directed Reading Thinking Activity conducted for this research. The teaching partner was English teacher of twelve grade at SMK NU Gresik.

This study was conducted for six meetings. The first meeting was pre-test. The last meeting was post-test and the other meeting was doing treatment. The procedure of collecting data was done by the researcher following of the schedule's English lesson.

The students used material that provided by the researcher, such as the slide of power point, reading text and some worksheet. During the teaching learning process, the researcher was accompanied by the English teacher as teaching partner. The teacher partner was Ms. Heni Pudji Hastuti, S. Pd as the English teacher twelve grade at SMK NU Gresik.

In this study, the head master and the teacher of English gave the chance to teach the Directed Reading Thinking Activity based on schedule English lesson at twelve grade.

NO	Date	Activities
1.	October 25 th ,2017	Giving pre-test for experimental group and control group
2.	October 26 th ,2017	Giving first treatment “ Procedure text” for experimental group and control group
3.	November, 1 st ,2017	Giving second treatment “procedure text” for experimental group Giving second treatment “procedure text” for control group.
4.	November, 2 nd , 2017	Giving third treatment “Short functional text” for experimental group. Giving third treatment “ Short functional text” for control group.
5.	November, 8 th , 2017	Giving fourth treatment “Short functional text” for experimental group. Giving fourth treatment “Short functional text” for control group.
6.	November, 9 th , 2017	Giving post-test for experimental group and control group.

4.4. Schedule of implementation.

4.3.1. The implementation.

4.3.1.1. The implementation for first treatment.

The researcher conducted the first treatment of Directed Reading Thinking Activity on October 26th , 2017 for experimental group (XII-MM) which 37 students then all the students are female and control group (XII-TKJ) which 29 students then all students are female. The theme about “Procedure Text”.

4.3.1.1.1. First Treatment.

The first meeting was conducted on Wednesday, 26 October 2017. The researcher started the teaching and learning process by greeting the students, asking then to pray and checking the students’ attendance list. Topic for the first meeting was “*Procedure Text*”. Then, before giving the treatment by used Directed Reading Thinking Activity to the experimental group. The researcher explained about “*Procedure Text*” and given a little material about explanation text. The purpose of researcher was given an explanation text was to given

information different between procedure text and explanation text. Both of text has same structure about make a something but researcher still focus on procedure text. On procedure text tell about something what they can but explanation tell about something of nature. After that, the researcher given a example of both of text. Then, when researcher did directed reading thinking activity strategy students can doing it. Next, the researcher explained to the students about the aim, steps, goal, and activities in teaching learning process used directed reading thinking activity.

The first step is choose a title. Before student were chosen a text the researcher has been explained about kind of the text. There are explanation and procedure. Teacher was given some of the title and asked student to choose which on text include on explanation and procedure. If they choose procedure give checklist, if no given cross on the box.

The second step is activate honor students' prior knowledge. Researchers was given a some question about procedure .Such as “what is the purpose of procedure text?”, “what is the generic structure of procedure text?” and “Can you give an example of procedure text?”. They guessed with different answer which made the class crowded because some of them gave jokes to their friends' answer but they answered using BAHASA. So, the researcher asked them to answered using English or mix with Bahasa. Then, they still looked confuse about what is the purpose of procedure text so that researchers make explained again about procedure text including details of goal, generic structure based on example on the slide. Then researcher given a text on worksheet and asked student to classify text based on generic structure of procedure text in pair.

After that, the research asked the students to make a group consist of 5 until 6 students based on number of absent in the class. In this step, have a student make a prediction about what they will read about in the text. After that researchers given a checklist prediction verification worksheet. It can help the student to answer a question on checklist prediction verification worksheet. Before did prediction with their group, researcher was guided how answer a prediction using checklist prediction verification worksheet. In prediction stage, there were some vocabularies or meaning which was they felt difficult to comprehension that text.

After, asked the student would to confirm their prediction about the result. Researcher asked students for pointed a member of group to come forward to given the result of prediction. Students confirm by answers questions on checklist prediction verification then matched with the results of their answers before a prediction. Then, researcher show up all of text to make student's comprehension on text and make correction result of discussion on the group. After that, the students collected the worksheet and the researcher gave a simple question about the material to promote their thinking. The researcher told them that their discussion was enough for the first meeting. Even there were some problem but it was ok. She hoped that for the next treatment, they could be better than now. Then the researcher closed the class.

At the first treatment at experimental group, the teaching learning process did not totally run well as the lesson plan because in first treatment, the researcher used more time to explain about this strategy and them less comprehension the text because they lack of vocabulary. For lack vocabulary, researcher was asked

them to bring dictionary and take a note. During given questions to the students, they always answered in Bahasa. The researcher given motivated and told them that they must answer the question in English or mix with Bahasa not answering only used English. In prediction stage, the student still confused how the predicted and answer the question on worksheet. Addition, they can't stimulate their thinking to predict on the text.

Meanwhile, the first treatment of control group was conducted on Wednesday, 26 October 2017 to (XII TKJ). The theme was same as the experimental group. That was "procedure text". At the beginning learning process, researcher explained about procedure text. The teacher explained about procedure text and gave example of procedure then asked student to identify which one text include procedure text by individually. After that, student did their worksheet. Teacher given a worksheet was classify a text based on generic structure of the text. In last step, the teacher given a text then asked them to read the text. After that, answer the 5 question based on the text in pair. Next, activity well done. The last, researcher and the students discussed about the text together. She was gave evaluation to every group and conclusion about the text and lesson had been learned. After the activities well done and the bell rang, the researcher closed the lesson.

At the first meeting of control group, the teaching learning process did not run well as the lesson plan. In the first problem the student did not pay attention to researcher perhaps it was first meeting then they got difficulties comprehension between question and their answer. When they read on the text, student asked to teacher about the meaning of word on the text, asked about vocabulary. In the next meeting, researcher reminded them to bring English dictionary.

4.3.1.2. The implementation for second treatment.

The researcher conducted the second treatment of Directed Reading Thinking Activity on November 1st, 2017 for experimental group (XII-MM) which 37 students then all the students are female and control group (XII-TKJ) conducted on November 1st, 2017. The subject are 29 students then all students are female. The theme about “Procedure Text”.

4.3.1.2.1. Second treatment.

The second meeting was conducted on Wednesday, 1 November 2017. The researcher started the teaching and learning process by greeting the students, asking them to pray and checking the students’ attendance list. Topic for the second treatment was “*Procedure Text*”. Then, before giving the treatment by used Directed Reading Thinking Activity to the experimental group. In second meeting, researcher review about “Procedure Text”.

After the researcher review about procedure text, researcher did directed reading thinking activity strategy students can doing it. After that the researcher explained again to the students about the aim, steps, goal, and activities in teaching learning process used directed reading thinking activity.

The first step is choose a title. Researcher was given some of the title and asked student to choose which on text include on procedure text. If they choose procedure text, they could be given reason choose it.

The second step is activate students' prior knowledge. Researcher given question related with topic to review about the material. To make sure they still remember about procedure text, researcher asked the students a question related the material randomly:

T: Yesterday, we have been learn about procedure text so what did you know about procedure text?

S: The text is designed to describe how something is achieved through a sequence of actions or steps.

T: Oke very good, what is the purpose of procedure text?

S: To describe a step.....

T: What did generic structure of procedure text?

S: The generic structure of procedure text was goal, ingredients, and step.

T: Can you give me an example of procedure text?

S: How to use television.

So, the researcher asked them to answered using English or mix with Bahasa. But, they still answered the questions using Bahasa but some of them answered using English or mix with Bahasa. Then researcher given a text and asked student to classify text based on generic structure of procedure text.

After that, the research asked the students to make a group consist of 5 until 6 students based on set-up their sit. Researcher make a different member with the first treatment. They had new friend in their group. In this step, have a

student make a prediction about what they will read about in the text. After that researchers given a checklist prediction verification worksheet. It can help the student to answer a question on checklist prediction verification worksheet. Before did prediction with their group, researcher was guided how answer a prediction using checklist prediction verification worksheet. In previous treatment, student was still looked confuse fill in prediction verification worksheet so the researcher decided to observe and help student to fill the answer and come from group other group. To observe that problem on first treatment, in this meeting researcher asked student to bring dictionary to translate difficult word.

The previous meeting, there was not students read a section of the text so on second meeting, researcher did it. Fourth step and have students read a section of text. Researcher asked student to read a section of the text on the slide.

On fourth step and have students read a section of text. Researcher asked student to read a section of the text on the slide.

R: *What is The Date Today?*

S: *Today is Wednesday, 1 November 2017.*

R: *So, Who is Absent on 1 in Here?*

S: *She is adella.*

Then researcher asked Adella to come forward. It is not for Adella but researcher did again based on number on absent. When student read a section of the text, they shy and afraid to speak up.

After that, ask the student would to confirm their prediction about the result. Researcher asked students for head of a member of group to come forward to given the result of prediction. Students confirm by answers questions on checklist prediction verification then matched with the results of their answers before a prediction. When researcher check their worksheet, researcher found cheat with other group so that answer each group most same. After that, the students collected the worksheet and the researcher gave a simple question about the material. The researcher told them that their discussion was good enough for the second meeting. Even there different problem but can solve problem. She hoped that for the next treatment, they could be better than now. Then the researcher closed the class.

At the second treatment at experimental group, the teaching learning process still did not totally run well as the lesson plan because in second treatment, the researcher used more time to guide the student about this strategy and asked their difficulties in comprehension the text. During given questions to the students, they always answered in Bahasa. The researcher remind they to answer the question in English or mix with Bahasa not answering only used English. Addition, when the student asked to read come forward they still shy but there is increase their confident. In prediction stage, the student cheat answer with other group and they confused how the predicted and answer the question on worksheet so that researcher doing observe and help the students and give a punishment if there are group each cheat with other group.

Meanwhile, the second treatment of control group was conducted on Thursday, November 1st to (XII TKJ). The theme was same as the experimental group. That was “procedure text”. At the beginning learning process, researcher explained about procedure text. The teacher explained about procedure text and gave example of procedure then given review material about procedure text. To test what they understood about the material procedure yesterday. Teacher was given a simple question which include purpose, generic structure, and example of procedure text. After answer and question section teacher asked student read the text silently then asked them to identify title and communicative purpose of the text. After that, student did their worksheet by individually. Teacher given a worksheet was classify a text based on generic structure of the text. In last step, the teacher given a text then asked them to read the text. After that, researcher given a text and question as many as 5 questions based on the text in pair. When students answer the question on text, teacher reminder them to comprehend the question and content of text so that they can answer the question. Next, activity well done. The researcher asked the volunteer member of group to come forward in the class. Thus, student representatives to share a result discussion. The last, researcher and the students discussed about the text together. She was gave evaluation to every group and conclusion about the text and lesson had been learned. After the activities well done and the bell rang, the researcher closed the lesson.

At the second treatment at control group, the teaching and learning process also doesn't totally same with lesson but better than the first meeting because most of the students had already want to give pay attention to the teacher's instruction but some student talking with their friend. Addition, the students still difficult to comprehend because student were less knowledge of vocabulary so for next meeting researcher reminder student to bring dictionary beside that student less comprehension about question's on the text. Then, when they share a result discussion in pair, they shy and afraid to speak up.

4.3.1.3. The implementation for third treatment.

The researcher conducted the third treatment of Directed Reading Thinking Activity on November 2nd, 2017 for experimental group (XII-MM) which 37 students then all the students are female and control group (XII-TKJ) conducted on November 2nd, 2017. The subject are 29 students then all students are female. The theme about "*Short functional text*".

4.3.1.3.1. Third Treatment.

The third meeting was conducted on Thursday, 2 November 2017. The researcher started the teaching and learning process by greeting the students, asking then to pray and checking the students' attendance list. Topic for the first meeting was "*Short functional text*". Then, before giving the treatment by used Directed Reading Thinking Activity to the experimental group. The researcher explained about "*Short functional text*". In this meeting, researcher given material short functional text but researcher only focus on business letter. On the first researcher asked to student about short functional.

After the researcher explained about short functional text, researcher did directed reading thinking activity strategy students can doing it. After that the researcher reminder to the students about the aim, steps, goal, and activities in teaching learning process used directed reading thinking activity.

The first step is choose a text. Researcher was given 3 kind of letter and asked student to choose which on text include on complaint letter. If they choose complaint text, they could be given reason choose it.

The second step is activate students' prior knowledge. Researcher given question related with topic such as "what is short functional text?", "what kind of short functional text?" etc. After that researcher asked question then researcher explain business letter include complaint letter, application letter and decision letter. So, the researcher asked them to answered using full English because this is third meeting. Then researcher given a text and asked student to classify complaint letter based on generic structure of letter.

After that, the research asked the students to make a group consist of 5 until 6 students. Researcher asked them to count from one until six to make a group. After that they gathering with their friends. In this step, have a student make a prediction about what they will read about in the text. After that researchers given a checklist prediction verification worksheet. It can help the student to answer a question on checklist prediction verification worksheet. Before did prediction with their group, researcher was more guided the student how answer a prediction using checklist prediction verification worksheet. The researcher only observe their group but sometime researcher helped them.

On fourth step and have students read a section of text. Researcher asked student to read a section of the text on the slide. Then researcher asked delegation to come forward from first slide until the last slide to different students. When student read a section of the text, they was enough increase confident to read section on the slide.

After that, ask the student would to confirm their prediction about the result. Researcher asked students for 2 member each group to come forward to given the result of prediction. When prediction stage activity, researcher give a warning don't be cheating because researcher wants to know their creative answer prediction. Students confirm by answers questions on checklist prediction verification then matched with the results of their answers before a prediction. When researcher check their worksheet, the student can cooperation with their self-group and not cheat with other group. After that, the students collected the worksheet and the researcher gave a simple question about the material. The researcher told them that their discussion was good than second meeting. Even there different problem but can solve problem. She hoped that for the last treatment at next meeting, they could be better than now. Then the researcher closed the class.

At the third treatment at experimental group, the teaching learning process did almost same run well as the lesson plan because in third treatment, the researcher can guide the student about this strategy and helped their difficulties in comprehension the text. During given questions to the students, they had been using English but there is a little using Bahasa. So, the researcher remind they to answer the question in English or mix with Bahasa not answering only used

English. On vocabulary, researcher asked them to open their dictionary physical or electronic. In addition, to make it easy, researcher suggested that if they don't know a word in their vocabulary, they can search for a synonym. In the prediction stage, the student has been working independently with their group and not cheating with other groups. Thus, they can pay attention to the researcher.

Meanwhile, the third treatment of the control group was conducted on 2nd November 2017 to (XII TKJ). The theme was the same as the experimental group. That was "Short functional text". At the beginning of the learning process, the researcher explained about short functional text. The teacher explained about short functional text but the researcher focused on business letters and gave examples of business letters such as complaint letters, decision letters, and application letters. In this meeting, the researcher explained more about complaint letters. Then, after the answer and question section, the teacher gave the worksheet and asked the student to read the text silently, then asked them to identify the communicative purpose of the letter. After that, the student did their worksheet individually. The teacher gave a worksheet to classify a text based on the generic structure of the complaint letter. In the last step, the teacher gave a text and asked them to read it. After that, the researcher gave a text and asked as many as 5 questions based on the text in pairs. Next, the activity was well done. The researcher asked the volunteer member of the group to come forward in the class. Thus, student representatives shared the results of the discussion. In the end, the researcher and the students discussed about the text together. She gave an evaluation to every group and a conclusion about the text and lesson had been learned. After the activities were well done and the bell rang, the researcher closed the lesson.

At the third treatment at control group, the teaching and learning process almost totally same with lesson but better than the first and second meeting because most of the students had already want to gave pay attention to the teacher's instruction. Addition, the students enough to comprehend because student has been bring dictionary so that they can understood vocabulary on the text and can answer question. Then, when they share a result discussion in pair, they enough confident to share the result of discussion in pair.

4.3.1.4. The implementation for fourth treatment.

The researcher conducted the fourth treatment of Directed Reading Thinking Activity on November 8th, 2017 for experimental group (XII-MM) which 37 students then all the students are female and control group (XII-TKJ) conducted on November 8th, 2017. The subject are 29 students then all students are female. The theme about "Short functional text".

4.3.1.4.1. Fourth treatment.

The fourth meeting was conducted on Wednesday, 8 November 2017. The researcher started the teaching and learning process by greeting the students, asking then to pray and checking the students' attendance list. Topic for the fourth meeting was "*Short functional text*". Then, before giving the treatment by used Directed Reading Thinking Activity to the experimental group. The researcher review about " Short functional text, and complaint text".

In this meeting, researcher given material short functional text but researcher only focus on application letter. For the first researcher give the review about short functional text and complaint letter

T: *“What did you know about short functional text?”*

S: *Short Functional Text is a short text that has particular meaning and purpose, and can be used in our daily life.*

T: *“What kind of short functional text?”*

S: *Announcement, advertisement, letter.*

T: *“What is complaint letter?”*

S: *Complaint letter is a sort letter which we use to help you achieve your goals from your complaint.*

T: *“How is business format letter?”*

S: *There are 9 part of business format letter. It is letterhead, date, recipient address, reference line, salutation & name, then body, closure, signature and title, last is enclosure.*

After that researcher question and answer section then researcher explain application letter. After the researcher explained about application letter, researcher did directed reading thinking activity strategy students can doing it. After that the researcher reminder to the students about the aim, steps, goal, and activities in teaching learning process used directed reading thinking activity.

The first step is choose a text. Researcher was given 2 kind of letter and asked student to choose which on text include on application letter. If they choose application text, they could be given reason choose it.

The second step is activate students' prior knowledge. Researcher given question related with topic. So, the researcher asked them to answered using full English because that has been fourth meeting and researcher given motivation to speak English. Then researcher given a text and asked student to classify application letter based on business format letter.

After that, the research asked the students to make a group consist of 5 until 6 students. Researcher asked them to count from one until six to make a group. After that they gathering with their friends In this step, have a student make a prediction about what they will read about in the text. After that researchers given a checklist prediction verification worksheet. It can help the student to answer a question on checklist prediction verification worksheet. Before did prediction with their group, researcher was more guided the student how answer a prediction using checklist prediction verification worksheet. The researcher only guided from the in front of the class and give instruction because this is fourth meeting and the student can handle their worksheet with their group.

On fourth step and have students read a section of text. Researcher asked student to read a section of the text on the slide. Then researcher asked delegation to come forward from first slide until the last slide to different students. When student read a section of the text, they was good confident to read section on the slide.

After that, ask the student would to confirm their prediction about the result. Researcher asked students for 2 member each group to come forward to given the result of prediction. Students confirm by answers questions on checklist prediction verification then matched with the results of their answers before a

prediction. When researcher check their worksheet, the student can independently did their worksheet and their answer more creative. After that, the students collected the worksheet and the researcher gave a simple question about the material. The researcher told them that their discussion was very good. So, the student very happy and excited. Even there different problem but can solve problem. Before researcher closed this meeting, she gave the student feedback about the lesson that day. The researcher also gave a gift for the group that active in teaching learning process that day. Then the researcher closed the class.

Meanwhile, the fourth treatment of control group was conducted on Wednesday, 8th November 2017 to (XII TKJ). The theme was same as the experimental group. That was "Short functional text". At the beginning learning process, researcher explained about short functional text. The teacher review about short functional text but researcher focus on business letter and application letter. In this meeting, researcher explained only application letter. Then, after answer and question section teacher given the worksheet and asked student read the text silently then asked them to identify communicative purpose of the letter. After that, student did their worksheet by individually. Teacher given a worksheet was classify a text based on business format letter on application letter. In last step, the teacher given a text then asked them to read the text. After that, researcher given a text and question as many as 5 questions based on the text in pair. Next, activity well done.

The researcher asked the volunteer member of group to come forward in the class. Thus, student representatives to share a result discussion. The last, researcher and the students discussed about the text together. She was gave evaluation to every group and conclusion about the text and lesson had been learned. After the activities well done and the bell rang, the researcher closed the lesson.

At the fourth treatment at control group, the teaching and learning process totally same with lesson plan. Addition, the students comprehend because they can have over time to comprehend the text. Then, when they share a result discussion in pair, they confident to share the result of discussion in pair. Overall, the treatment process in fourth successful.

4.4. Post-Experiment Analysis.

At the end of treatment, students of two classes were given a post-test. The post-test was given to find out whether there was significant effect of using directed reading thinking activity for increase student's comprehension. The post-test to both experimental group and control group that researcher did analysis syllabus to check the validity of the post-test. The items of the post-test is experimental group and control group is multiple choice. Researcher was giving multiple choice type of the test student's reading comprehension which contain of 20 items. The post-test was held on November, 9th, 2017 for experimental group and control group.

4.4.1. Post-test

The post-test was conducted on November, 9th, 2017 for control group and experimental group. In the post-test, the participants of experimental group were 37 and the participants of control group were 29. The researcher conducted post-test in control group first then gave the post-test in experimental group. The steps were the same as in the pre-test. When the post-test was conducted, the researcher gave twenty questions and has been finished it to the students and all of the questions were multiple choice.

4.4.2. The scoring of post-test.

The researcher asked the students to do the items of the post-test. The score of the post-test was given only by the researcher. She took the score of the post-test by some categories. If the answer was correct the score will be 1. In other hand, if the answer was wrong the score will be 0 because this post included in objective test. From the result of the post-test, the average score of the experimental group was higher than the control group. Where, the average score of the experimental group was 79.05. Meanwhile, the average score of the control group was 70.17.

4.4.3. Hypothesis testing.

After getting data of post-test, then the researcher analyzed the data by using independent sample t-test. Before analyzing the data, the researcher calculated the hypothesis which had explained in chapter III. The hypothesis were on the below:

H₀: There is no significant effect directed reading thinking activity for student's reading comprehension on twelve grade at SMK NU GRESIK between experimental group and control group.

H₁: There is significant effect directed reading thinking activity for student's reading comprehension on twelve grade at SMK NU GRESIK between experimental group and control group.

To interpret the hypothesis testing by the probability or significance with α (0,05), that if sig. (2-tailed) $> \alpha$ (0,05), the researcher should accept the H₀, but if sig. (2-tailed) $< \alpha$ (0,05)so, the researcher can rejected H₀, it means H₁ is accepted. For brief explanation, significance two tailed is significance different value of experimental and control group in their reading comprehension. When the significant difference value is higher than alpha, it showed that there is no significance effect of directed reading thinking activity strategy on both groups. In contrary, if significance difference value is less than alpha, we can conclude that directed reading thinking activity strategy gave significance effect on experimental group and control group.

The result of independent sample t-test was presented as follow:

Group Statistics					
	VAR00002	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
VAR00001	1	37	79.05	7.249	1.192
	2	29	70.17	10.219	1.898

4.5. Group Statistics Hypothesis Testing.

Independent Samples 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
VAR00001	Equal variances assumed	1.440	.235	4.128	64	.000	8.882	2.151	4.584	13.180
	Equal variances not assumed			3.963	48.567	.000	8.882	2.241	4.377	13.386

4.6. Independent Sample T-Test (Post-Test).

The result in the table showed that sig. (2-tailed) of both group was 0,000. It showed the significance was less than α (0,05) level or $(0,000 < 0,05)$. It means that the null hypothesis can be rejected and there was significant effect of directed reading thinking activity strategy in reading comprehension between experimental group and control group. The result showed that there was different in skill between experimental group and control group after treatment. The average score of experimental also higher than control group. Where the average of experimental group was 79.05 and control group was 70.17.

The score of posttest was different when compared with pre-test. In pre-test the average score of experimental group was experimental group was 63.65 and 60.86 for control group. Null hypothesis can be rejected at 5% level because p-value is below than 0.05 that is 0.000. Then, It means that there was enough evidence to conclude that the used of directed reading thinking activity on reading comprehension significantly different.

Overall, the results reported here clearly reveal that there were significant effects of directed reading thinking activity toward reading comprehension, it means that there was a significant influence on the use of directed reading thinking activity toward reading comprehension before and after implementing. Having known from the finding of the study, it was indicated that directed reading thinking activity on reading comprehension at the SMK NU Gresik.

4.5. Discussion.

This study is about the effect of directed reading thinking activity for student's comprehension on twelve grade at SMK NU Gresik. The researcher would like to know whether the use of directed reading thinking activity significantly influence for student's comprehension on twelve grade at SMK NU Gresik or not because directed reading thinking activity is one method can be used to teaching reading comprehension. According to Stauffer (1980) directed reading comprehension is a problem solving discussion strategy designed to support comprehension. It is support from Wallace (1995) also adds that the DR-TA is teaching method that helps students improve comprehension.

This study, the researcher used quasi experiment. The population of this study was twelve grade of SMK NU Gresik. The sample was XII TKJ as the control group which consisted of 29 students and XII MM as the experimental group which consisted of 37 students. Before giving the treatment, the researcher gave pre-test for both experiment and control group to find out the primary between experiment and control group as they have a similar level of reading comprehension. After giving the treatment to the both experiment and control group for four times, the researcher did post-test to find out the influence of the treatment to their reading comprehension after giving the treatment. After pre-test and post-test score were given both groups, the researcher analyzed the data by using Independent Sample T-Test with SPSS 21.0 program.

The result of pre-test showed that the mean score of experimental group was 63.65 and 60.86 for control group. Moreover, Levene's test of equality of variance showed that significance was 0.943. It was higher than the level significance 0,05($0.943 > 0.05$). This has means that there was no difference reading comprehension between experimental group and control group because both of the group was homogeneous. Then, the result of of post-test showed that probability value of both groups was 0,000. It was less than significance level 0,05 ($0,000 < 0,05$). It indicated that directed reading thinking activity could significantly influence students' reading comprehension.

These findings were similar to the findings of Al Odwan (2012) mentioned, “The directed reading thinking activity is a much stronger model for building independent readers and learners. DRTA strategy was beneficial to enhance students’ ability in identifying the topics, main idea, and literal comprehension which included the students’ understanding of sequence of events and cause effect relationship. Further, she also explained that students’ improvement in reading comprehension was because the teacher activated and built schemata by utilizing the prior knowledge and trying to find out the relation with the existing information (Erliana, 2011).

Stahl (2008) explain that DRTA strategy is an effective strategy that can be used to promote students’ inferential and evaluative responses to text in all level of ability. However, the benefits of this direct instruction were not evident when maintenance testing was done. The researchers concluded, then, that these results show that a definite need does exist for more intense, prolonged instruction in these comprehension strategies to produce lasting benefits in reading comprehension (Brand-Gruwel, Aamoutse, & Van den Bos, 1998).

From the result of this study is line with previous study which focus on reading skill. Some the researcher proved that directed reading thinking activity has significant influence on student’s comprehension. It was supported by Talal Abd Al- Hameed Al Odwan (2012), in his findings indicated that directed reading thinking activity had significant effect of teaching reading on *Eleventh Grade in Jordanian public schools during the second semester* at Jordania. It is supported with researcher study, it gave significant effect for student such as their ability to understanding the text. The differences with Talal’s study were about the grade

and subject but the result showed the similar with the previous study. Beside that, Novianti Arianti (2013) in her research's title "*Teaching narrative text inference by using Directed Reading Thinking Activity*". In this research, novianti arianti has successful increasing student's comprehension using Directed Reading Thinking Activity. Addition, Santi Erlina (2011). The tittle is "*Improving Reading Comprehension through Directed Reading Thinking Activity*". On her researcher, research successful but she using qualitative research not quantitative research.

For making this study different with previous studies above, the researcher decided to focus more specific in the chosen subject, it was female student. The researcher chose XII SMK NU GRESIK because this class consist of female student. So, the researcher decided to investigate the effect of directed reading comprehension for female student. For collect data researcher used quantitative research. Furthermore, the researcher suggest for the next researcher to conduct their study using this strategy on both female and male students with the same skill or different skill and field. Addition, the next researcher can using different design and grade.