A COMPARATIVE STUDY IN TEACHING READING BY USING DRTA (DIRECT READING THINKING ACTIVITY) AND KWL (KNOW-WANT-LEARN) METHOD AT SECOND YEAR STUDENTS OF MTsN KANIGORO KRAS KEDIRI IN THE ACADEMIC YEAR 2013/2014

THESIS

Presented to

Faculty of Education and Teacher Training of State Islamic Institute (IAIN) Tulungagung in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Sarjana Pendidikan Islam in English Education Department

By

ISMIATUL FAIZAH
NIM. 3213103018

ENGLISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND TEACHER TRAINING
STATE ISLAMIC INSTITUTE (IAIN)
TULUNGAGUNG
July 2014
Advisor's Approval Sheet

Thesis with the title "A Comparative Study in Teaching Reading by Using DRTA (Direct Reading Thinking Activity) and KWL (Know-Want-Learn) Method at Second Year Students of MTsN Kanigoro Kras Kediri in the Academic Year 2013/2014" that is written by ISMIATUL FAIZAH NIM 3213103018 has been approved by the thesis advisor and for further approval by the board of examiners.

Tulungagung, July 11th 2014
Approved by
Advisor,

Faizatul Istiqomah, M.Ed
NIP. 19791220 200912 2 001

Acknowledge,
Chief of English Education Department

Arina Shofina, M.Ed
NIP. 19770523 200312 2 002
THE BOARD OF EXAMINERS’ APPROVAL SHEET

A COMPARATIVE STUDY IN TEACHING READING BY USING DRTA (DIRECT READING THINKING ACTIVITY) AND KWL (KNOW – WANT – LEARN) METHOD AT SECOND YEAR STUDENTS OF MTsN KRAS KANIGORO KEDIRI IN THE ACADEMIC YEAR 2013/2014”.

THESIS

Written by:
ISMIATUL FAIZAH
NIM: 3213103018

Has been maintained in front of the board of examiners at July 22nd 2014 and has been approved as the requirement for the degree of Sarjana Pendidikan Islam in English Education Department

Board Examiners

Chair :
Dr. Agus Zaenul Fitri, M.Pd
NIP. 19810801 2009 12 1 004

Main Examiner :
Muh. Basuni, M.Pd
NIP. 19780312 2003 12 1 001

Secretary :
Dr. Sokip, M.Pd.I
NIP. 19710420 2000 03 1 004

Approved by
Dean Faculty of Education and Teacher Training
IAIN Tulungagung

Dr. H. Abd. Aziz, M.Pd.I
NIP. 19720601 200003 1 002
MOTTO

“LIFE WITHOUT KNOWLEDGE IS LIKE WALKING ON THE DARK”
DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to:

- My “great” parents, Mr. IMAM SAHADI and Mrs. SITI FATIMAH, for their biggest support and hours of patience. Deeply, no words can represent my grateful feeling for all you both have done for me.
- My beloved grandmother who always guide me to be better person.
- My beloved brother and sister, Zumrotus Sa’adah and Nurul Huda that always become friend and support me.
- My beloved twins, Istifadatul Azizah who always accompany me in every where and every time.
- My best friends (latif, Nisak, Tya, erlin, ncus), Thank you for our inspiring friendship, both in finishing this thesis and our wonderful time for these years of togetherness.
- All of my classmates of TBI-A
- My Almamater IAIN Tulungagung
DECLARATION OF AUTHORSHIP

The undersign below:

Name : ISMIATUL FAIZAH
Place, date of birth : Blitar, July 23 \textsuperscript{th} 1992
NIM : 3213103018
Faculty : Faculty of Education and Teacher Training
Department : English Education Department (TBI)

State that the thesis entitled “A Comparative Study in Teaching Reading by Using DRTA (Direct Reading Thinking Activity) and KWL (Know-Want-Learn) Method at Second Year of Students MTsN Kanigoro Kras Kediri in the Academic Year 2013/2014” is truly my original work and helped by the expert of this matter. It is written and published as the requirement for the degree of Sarjana Pendidikan Islam in English Education Department, Faculty of Education and Teacher Training, State Islamic Institute (IAIN) Tulungagung in the academic year 2013/2014. Due to the fact, I am responsible for this thesis, if there is any objection or claim from other.

Tulungagung, July 11\textsuperscript{th} 2014

The writer

\textbf{ISMIATUL FAIZAH}

3213103018
ABSTRACT


Key words : DRTA (Direct Reading Thinking Activity) method, KWL (Know – Want – Learn) method, reading comprehension.

Reading may be considered as the most difficult skill that the students think. Therefore reading is the important skill that must be owned by the students. If the students understand what they read probably they will get much knowledge or easily to get some informations based on the text. In addition, many students have difficulty in comprehending the text especially narrative text if without have enough vocabulary. Facing those problem, it can be avoided by using stimulus from the teacher and the suitable method should be created in teaching and learning to help the students in comprehending text. In this research, two of the methods used in teaching reading are DRTA (Direct Reading Thinking Activity) and KWL (Know – want – learn) and then the result of two methods above will be compared.

The formulation of the research problems were : 1) How is the student’s score in reading taught by using DRTA method? 2) How is the student’s score in reading taught by using KWL method? 3) Which one is more effective between Direct Reading Thinking Activity (DRTA) or Know – Want - Learn (KWL) in teaching reading to improve the students achievement in reading comprehension? 

The purpose of this study were to : 1) know how is the student’s score in reading taught by using DRTA., 2) know how is the student’s score in reading taught by using KWL, 3) find out Which one is more effective between Direct Reading Thinking Activity (DRTA) or Know – Want - Learn (KWL) in teaching reading to improve the students achievement in reading comprehension.

Research method: 1) the research design in this study was comparative design with quantitative approach, 2) the population of this research was all students of second year at MTsN Kanigoro Kras Kediri, 3) the sample were VIII\textsuperscript{E} class consisting of 42 students and VIII\textsuperscript{I} class consisting of 39 students, 4) the research instrument was test, 5) the data analysis was using T test.

The result showed that the student’s score taught by using DRTA (Direct reading thinking activity) was 87 while the score taught by using KWL (Know – want - learn) method was 80. The $T_{\text{count}}$ was 4.987. It was higher than $t_{\text{table}}$ at either 5% or 1% significant level. In the 5% level, the value was 1.99 while in 1% was 2.64. So the value was significant at level 1% or 5%. It can be seen that
1.99 < 4.987 > 2.64. This means that $H_a$ which states that there is significant different score in teaching reading by using DRTA (Direct Reading Thinking Activity) and KWL (Know – Want – Learn) method at second year students of MTsN Kanigoro Kediri in the academic year 2013/2014 is accepted. Whereas, $H_o$ which states that there is no significant different score in teaching reading by using DRTA (Direct Reading Thinking Activity) and KWL (Know – Want – Learn) method at second year students of MTsN Kanigoro Kediri in the academic year 2013/2014 is rejected. In other words, DRTA (Direct Reading Thinking Activity) is more effective method than KWL (Know – Want – Learn) method in teaching reading at Junior High School level.
ABSTRAK


Kata kunci : metode Direct Reading Thinking Activity (DRTA), metode Know – Want – Learn (KWL) , pemahaman membaca

Latar belakang : memahami sebuah teks dalam proses membaca bisa diartikan sebagai keahlian yang paling sulit dirasa oleh sebagian siswa. Selain itu membaca merupakan keahlian yang sangat penting yang harus dimiliki oleh masing masing siswa. Jika siswa mampu memahami apa yang mereka baca maka mereka akan mendapatkan pengetahuan atau dengan mudah memperoleh informasi berdasarkan tekt bacaan tersebut. Selain itu, banyak siswa yang merasa kesulitan dalam memahami tekt jika tidak didasari dengan kosa kata yang cukup. Permasalahan itu bisa dihindari dengan menstimulus murid menggunakan metode yang sesuai dengan pengajaran dan pembelajaran  untuk membantu siswa dalam memahami teks. Dalam penelitian ini, peneliti menggunakan dua metode yaitu metode DRTA dan metode KWL dalam proses pembelajaran membaca siswa yang kemudian akan dibandingkan untuk mengetahui metode yang lebih efektif dalam proses belajar mengajar pemahaman membaca siswa.

Rumusan masalah dalam penelitian ini adalah : 1) bagaimana nilai siswa dalam proses pemahaman membaca dengan menggunakan metode DRTA?, 2) Bagaimana nilai siswa dalam proses pemahaman membaca dengan menggunakan metode KWL ?, 3) metode apa yang lebih efektif diantara 2 metode yaitu metode DRTA dan KWL di dalam pembelajaran membaca siswa?

Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah : 1) untuk mengetahui nilai siswa dalam proses pemahaman membaca dengan menggunakan metode DRTA, 2) untuk mengetahui nilai siswa dalam proses pemahaman membaca dengan menggunakan metode KWL, 3) Untuk mengetahui salah satu metode yang lebih efektif diantara metode DRTA dan KWL dalam pembelajaran membaca siswa.

Metode penelitian : 1) rancangan penelitian yang digunakan oleh peneliti adalah rancangan komparatif dengan menggunakan pendekatan quantitative, 2) populasi dari penelitian ini adalah seluruh kelas VIII dari MTsN Kanigoro Kras Kediri, 3) sampel dari penelitian ini adalah kelas VIII E yang terdiri dari 42 siswa dan kelas VIII I yang terdiri dari 39 siswa, 4) instrument yang digunakan adalah test, 5) dan data ini dianalisis menggunakan T test

Hasil dari penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa nilai siswa dalam membaca menggunakan metode DRTA adalah 87 sedangkan nilai siswa dengan menggunakan metode KWL adalah 80. $T_{hitung}$ adalah 4,987. $T_{hitung}$ tersebut lebih
besar pada level signifikan 1% maupun 5%. 2,64 menempati pada level signifikan 1% sedangkan Nilai 1,99 menempati pada level signifikan 5%. Sehingga nilai tersebut dapat dikatakan menempati level signifikan 1% maupun 5%. Hal itu dapat dibuktikan bahwa $1,99 < 4,987 > 2,64$. Itu berarti Ha yang menyatakan terdapat perbedaan nilai yang signifikan pada pembelajaran pemahaman membaca menggunakan metode DRTA dan metode KWL pada siswa kelas VIII MTsN Kanigoro Keras Kediri tahun ajaran 2013/2014 adalah diterima. Sedangkan Ho yang menyatakan tidak terdapat perbedaan nilai yang signifikan pada pembelajaran pemahaman membaca menggunakan metode DRTA dan metode KWL pada siswa kelas VIII MTsN Kanigoro Keras Kediri tahun ajaran 2013/2014 adalah ditolak. Selain itu metode DRTA merupakan sebuah metode yang lebih efektif dari pada KWL dalam pembelajaran membaca pada level tingkat SMP.
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