

Volume 13, Nomor 2, Nopember 2013

ISSN 1412-2669

JURNAL DINAMIKA PENELITIAN

MAKNA SIMBOLIK TRADISI NYADRAN
A. Jauhar Fuad

STRATEGI PESANTREN DALAM MENINGKATKAN
KUALITAS SANTRI
Muh. Khoirul Rifa'i

STUDI HISTORIS PERKEMBANGAN TAREKAT QODIRIYAH
DAN PENGARUH DAKWAHNYA DI INDONESIA
Izzatul Laila

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DIRECTED READING THINKING
ACTIVITY STRATEGY IN READING COMPREHENSION OF
NARRATIVE TEXT AT THE FIRST SEMESTER
STAIN TULUNGAGUNG
Aulia Rahman & Akhyak

**Pusat Penelitian & Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat (P3M)
Sekolah Tinggi Agama Islam Negeri Tulungagung**

JURNAL DINAMIKA PENELITIAN	Volume 13	Nomor 2	Hlm. 123-246	Tulungagung Nopember 2013	ISSN 1412-2669
----------------------------------	-----------	---------	--------------	------------------------------	----------------

JURNAL DINAMIKA PENELITIAN

ISSN 1412-2669

Volume 13, Nomor 2, Nopember 2013

Terbit dua kali setahun pada bulan Juli dan Nopember. Berisi tulisan yang diangkat dari hasil penelitian di bidang sosial-keagamaan, baik penelitian lapangan maupun kepustakaan. ISSN 1412-2669.

Pemimpin Redaksi
Muhammad Ridho

Redaktur Pelaksana
Tadjudin

Anggota
Zainudin
Mashudi

Sirkulasi
Muhiburrohman

Alamat Redaksi dan Tata Usaha: Lembaga Penelitian, Pengabdian dan Penerbitan (LP3M) STAIN Tulungagung Gedung Rektorat Lantai II, Jl. Mayor Sujadi Timur 46 Tulungagung 66221. Telepon (0355) 321513, Fax (0355) 321656. email: p3m@stain-tulungagung.ac.id

Jurnal Dinamika Penelitian diterbitkan sejak 1 Juli 2001 oleh Lembaga Penelitian, Pengabdian dan Penerbitan (LP3M) STAIN Tulungagung.

Redaksi menerima sumbangan tulisan yang belum pernah diterbitkan dalam media lain. Naskah diketik di atas kertas HVS kuarto spasi ganda sepanjang lebih kurang 20 halaman, dengan format seperti tercantum pada "Pedoman Bagi Penulis" di bagian belakang jurnal ini. Naskah yang masuk dievaluasi dan disunting untuk keseragaman format, istilah dan tata cara lainnya.

Dicetak di Percetakan KKS Yogyakarta Isi di luar tanggung jawab Percetakan

The importance of reading is also stated by Grabe (2009:4): Reading is also important to recognize that many people around the world read in more than one language. Large populations of people have learned to read in second or third languages for variety of reasons, including interactions within and across heterogeneous multilingual countries, large-scale immigration movements, global transportation, advanced education opportunities, and the spread of language of wider communication.

In more formal settings, researcher expects to read in academic contexts or in workplace environments as part of learning or engaging in his jobs. Many of researchers also engage in reading that may be quite demanding in educational, professional, and occupational settings. In these latter settings, a great deal of learning occurs; part of that learning requires that researcher reads and interpret informational texts in line with the tasks that he engages in and the goals that he sets (or that are set for him). These settings often require him to synthesize, interpret, evaluate, and selectively use information from texts.

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 information. Here, to make students successful in reading, lecturer must have good strategy to improve their reading skills.

Several lecturers or lecturers when teaching reading narrative text in the class usually take position in front of class. They just explain the lesson or ask the questions in front of class and feel that the students sitting at the back understand what their explanation. But in the reality, there are many students sitting at the back do not understand what lecturer explains even though they are silent. It is because students sitting at the back do not pay any attentions well what their lecturer explanations, they do not understand the content of the text, even they feel difficult to answer questions about the text.

From discussion above, researcher is interested in carrying out a research dealing with teaching reading narrative text through DRTA strategy that stands for Directed Reading and Thinking Activities. This is one of strategies that provide a process for helping students learn to make predictions as purposes for reading. "For use with expository material (e.g., textbooks), the concept of a "prediction" is broadly defined as any speculation about the contents of the reading material. Whereas, with narrative materials or texts (e.g., literary fiction), the concept of the prediction involves the chronological sequence of events by speculating about future events" (Eanes, 1997: 127)." It draws on empirical research and demonstrates the effectiveness of predicting, clarifying, monitoring, and evaluating strategies, and so it has indirect but powerful support for its instructional activities " (Baumann, 1992; 2000; Stauffer, 1976; Trabasso & Bouchard, 2002).

From the statement which is explained before, The researcher wants to do research and to know the effectiveness of Directed Reading Thinking Activity Strategy in Reading Comprehension of Narrative Text at the First semester Students of STAIN Tulungagung. Researcher chooses this collage because this it never uses this strategy in teaching reading process.

Statement of Problem

Based on the background above, the problem of this study is, "Is the average score of STAIN Tulungagung first semester in reading comprehension of narrative text higher than their pre-test by using Directed Reading Thinking Activity strategy?"

Purpose of Study

The research has the objective to measure the Effectiveness of Directed Reading Thinking Activity Strategy in reading comprehension of narrative text at the first semester of STAIN Tulungagung.

Hypothesis

The hypothesis of this research is "teaching reading by Directed Reading Thinking Activity Strategy is effective at the first semester of STAIN Tulungagung".

Significance of Study

The result of the study can give some benefits: Firstly, for the researcher himself, this study gives the researcher understanding toward the implementation of Directed Reading Thinking Activity strategy for students' comprehension in reading narrative text. Up till now, the researcher only knows process approach theoretically. By implementing Directed Reading Thinking Activity strategy in students' reading comprehension of narrative text, it will provide useful practical experience for the researcher himself.

Secondly, for the students, the result of the study will help them to understand reading narrative text. By implementing Directed Reading Thinking Activity strategy, students are able to understand reading narrative text according to the stages suggested. As a result, their comprehension in reading narrative text will be much better. It means that this strategy is effective for students' reading comprehension of narrative text.

Thirdly, for the English lecturers, this study can provide contribution for them to apply another strategy dealing with the teaching learning process especially in the teaching reading narrative text. By considering the result of the study, they will not use monotonous method and change their orientation in teaching reading.

Finally, for future researchers the result of the study will be useful information to conduct further studies.

Scope And Limitation

To make the study can get the focus and easy to understand, the scope of study must be limited. Here, researcher limits the study in students of the first semester of STAIN Tulungagung and teaching reading by Directed Reading Thinking Activity Strategy.

Here, researcher just limits the study in the students of the first semester of STAIN Tulungagung because this level is appropriate to do research because English in this level as foundation or basic for the students to prepare final examination and to become the lecturers. Besides that, the students have more vocabularies and familiar with reading text. The researcher hopes that that the result of the data analyze can be generalized to the all students there.

Next, writer limits in the teaching reading because when teaching reading most of lecturer having problem to make students understand in reading text. Reading is the

most difficult one. Here the researcher just limits on reading narrative text.

The last, the researcher limits in DRTA strategy because it is good strategy and has been done by the previous researchers effectively. Directed Reading Thinking Activity is one of the strategies that invite the students and lecturer or researcher can do the steps together. They are; reading, thinking, predicting, proving, giving and answering the questions.

Assumption of The Study

The assumption of this study is: the students of the first semester of STAIN Tulungagung have similar ability in reading. Besides that, this collage never uses Directed Reading Thinking Activity to teach reading in the class.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design

Experimental design is the conceptual outline in doing experiment. It means the researcher uses a new method or technique as treatment, which is never, be done by the students. The purpose of experimental design is to know the appropriate of method or technique in teaching skill among the students.

In this research, the researcher uses the first experimental design by researching one class or group (pre-test)-(post-test) to be analyzed. Donald Ary (1979:247) designs the formula as the following:

Table 3.1. Design of Research Adopted by:
Ary Donald, Experimental Research in Education 1979.

Pre - Test	Treatments	Post - Test
Y_1/t_0	X	Y_2/t_1

Note :

X : represent the independent variable, which is manipulated by the experiment, it will be also being referred to as the experimental variable or the treatment.

Y : represent the measure of the dependent variable

Y_1/t_0 : represents the dependent variable before the manipulation of the independent variable (X2); it is usually pre-test of some type administered before the experimental treatment.

Y_2/t_1 : represents the dependent variable after the manipulation of the independent variable (X1); it is usually post-test administered to subjects after the experimental treatment

The researcher gives pre-test to students to know the basic ability of reading. After giving pre-test, students is given some treatments about information gap. The last step is the researcher gives post-test to know that there is an improvement or not after doing treatments. It aims to know how about the result of students' reading after getting treatment. It was done on September, 9th – 30th, 2013.

Location of Study

The study is implemented at STAIN Tulungagung is based on the consideration that this collage is one of the favourite and famous also available collages. Because that collage has credibility and ability in creativities and it has filled by some media and facilities that are so important. STAIN Tulungagung is located on Jl. Mayor Sujadi Timur no. 46, telephon 0355 321513.

Subject

Subject of sample in this study is the first grade students of C class English department, consisting of 30 students with 10 males and 20 females. The researcher chooses this class because they have to be helped to improve their reading before they are in the next semester. The sample is any subject of a population. It is a small proportion of the population selected for observation analysis data (Moor: 1983, best 1982) in Sukarno 2002.

Instrument

This research is experimental design. In this case, the researcher uses pre-test and post-test experimental research design to know the students reading skill before and after giving treatment. The definition of pre-test and post-test are as the following:

Data Collection Method

Data is fact of the data used in deciding or discussing something (Hornby 1995: 294). According to Sugiono (1997) there are two kinds of data analysis there are qualitative and quantitative. In this case the researcher uses the discrete data where is taken by counting. Its data is found in experiment researching. The data was collected by the way of the operational technique. The researcher uses test as the main data.

The questionnaire is given to the students. To get the data, the researcher implements Directed Reading Thinking Activity strategy to adjust the ability of reading skill. There are two kinds of test which is given to the respondent to full fill the data. They are pre-test and post-test.

Data Analysis

There are two variables that can be measured directly and existence of quantitative data. They are pre-test and post-test. Means of pre-test and post-test have been explained in the previous explanation, then standard deviation in pre-test and post-test.

$$S_1 = \sqrt{\frac{\sum X_1^2}{N_1} - \bar{X}_1^2}$$

S_1 = Standard deviation for post-test

$\sum X_1^2$ = Total number of post-test in square

N_1 = Number of students

\overline{X}_1^2 = Mean of post-test in square

$$S_2 = \sqrt{\frac{\sum X_2^2}{N_2} - \overline{X}_2^2}$$

S_2 = Standard deviation for pre-test

$\sum X_2^2$ = Total number of pre-test in square

N_2 = Number of students

\overline{X}_2^2 = Mean of pre-test in square

The following step is to know the standard error of the different between means.

$$SD_{\overline{X}} = \sqrt{\frac{N_1 S_1^2 + N_2 S_2^2}{N_1 + N_2 - 2} - \left(\frac{1}{N_1} + \frac{1}{N_2} \right)}$$

To know whether Directed Reading Thinking Activity is effective or not, t-test is done to get the validity of the data.

$$t = \frac{\overline{X}_1 - \overline{X}_2}{SD_{\overline{X}}}$$

\overline{X}_1 = mean from post-test

\overline{X}_2 = mean from pre-test

$SD_{\overline{X}}$ = standard error of the different between means

t = t-test

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Students' Reading Ability

In this case, the researcher would like to compare Students reading ability before they were taught by Directed Reading Thinking Activity and after taught by Directed Reading Thinking Activity. The descriptions are as follow:

Students' Reading Ability before Taught by Directed Reading Thinking Activity

To know students' reading ability before taught by Directed Reading Thinking Activity, the researcher did pre-test. The pre-test was given to know students' ability before the treatment given. In this part, the research measured students' reading ability, using multiple choices questions related to several texts

After doing the pre-test, the researcher calculated the score. Here, the correct answers were multiplied by four. From the pre-test above, the researcher got the data as below:

Table 4.1. Frequency Table of Pre-test Cumulative

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	48,00	1	3,3	3,3	3,3
	56,00	1	3,3	3,3	6,7
	60,00	3	10,0	10,0	16,7
	64,00	5	16,7	16,7	33,3
	68,00	9	30,0	30,0	63,3
	72,00	5	16,7	16,7	80,0
	76,00	4	13,3	13,3	93,3
	80,00	2	6,7	6,7	100,0
Total		30	100,0	100,0	

From the pre-test, the researcher got the data as follow: 48 score for 1 student (3.3%), 56 score 1 students (3.3%), 60 score for 3 students (10%), 64 score for 5 students (16.7%), 68 score for 9 students (30%), 72 score for 5 students (16.7%), 76 score for 4 students (13.3%), 80 score for 2 students (6.7%).

Students' Reading Ability after Taught by Directed Reading Thinking Activity

After the researcher did the treatment, the researcher would do post test. The post test was done in to answers questions in multiple choices questions related to several texts. It was done to measure students' reading ability after getting the treatment using Directed Reading Thinking Activity.

The correct answers were multiplied by five. Based on the data gotten from the post test, the researcher performed the data as follow:

Table 4.2. Frequency Table of Post-test Cumulative

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
PRETEST	30	68,0000	6,93	1,28654
POSTTEST	30	73,0000	7,26	1,34848

From the post-test, the researcher got the data as follow: 56 score for 1 students (3.3%), 60 score 2 student (6.7%), 68 score for 6 students (20%), 72 score for 9 students (30%), 74 score for 2 students (6.7%), 76 score for 3 students (10%), 80 score for 2 students (6.7%), 82 score for 1 students (3.3%), 84 score for 3 students (10%), 88 score for 1 students (3.3%).

Table 4.3. Table of Minimum and Maximum Score

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
PRETEST	30	48,00	80,00	68,0000	6,93
POSTEST	30	56,00	88,00	73,0000	7,26
Valid N (listwise)	30				

Based on the data above, there is enough increasing students' reading ability. The mean of post-test was 73. It means that the average score was above 70. In this case, the minimum score was 56 and the maximum score was 88.

The Significant Different between Students' Reading Ability before and after Taught by Directed Reading Thinking Activity

To know the whether there is significant different between before and after Taught by Directed Reading Thinking Activity, firstly the researcher looked for the different result between the pre-test and the post-test. Then the researcher looked for t-test.

At first, the researcher looked for the difference between students' reading ability between before and after getting reading as teaching method, the researcher also compared the score gotten and calculated the mean difference. The result was as follow:

Table 4.4 Table of Standard Deviation One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
PRETEST	30	68,0000	6,93	1,28654
POSTTEST	30	73,0000	7,26	1,34848

From the table above, the researcher reported that the number of students who followed pre test was 30 students. The mean of pre-test was 68.00. standard deviation in pre-test was 6,93 and standard error mean was 1.286.

From post-test, the researcher got the data that there were 30 students followed post-test . the mean score was 73.00, the standard deviation was 7.26. The standard error mean was 1.348.

At last, the researcher looked for t-test know the effectiveness of teaching reading by using Directed Reading Thinking Activity for the students of the first semester of English department STAIN Tulungagung at the level of significant used here is 0.01. The result would be significant if the result of the data by using the t-test is same or higher than t table. The first one is to know the means of pre-test and post-test, then is standard deviation in pre-test and post-test, after that is the standard error of the different between means, the last is t-test is done to get the significant or the effectiveness of the strategy, the datas are as follow:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Mean (pre-test)} &= \frac{\sum X_2}{N} = \frac{2040}{30} \\ &= 68 \\ \text{Mean (post-test)} &= \frac{\sum X_1}{N} = \frac{2190}{30} \\ &= 73 \\ S_1 &= \sqrt{\frac{\sum X_1^2}{N_1} - \overline{X_1}^2} \\ S_1 &= \sqrt{\frac{161452}{30} - 5329} \\ S_1 &= \sqrt{5381.73 - 5329} \\ S_1 &= \sqrt{52.73} \\ S_1 &= 7.26 \\ S_2 &= \sqrt{\frac{\sum X_2^2}{N_2} - \overline{X_2}^2} \\ S_2 &= \sqrt{\frac{140160}{30} - 4624} \\ S_2 &= \sqrt{4672 - 4624} \\ S_2 &= \sqrt{48} \\ S_2 &= 6.93 \end{aligned}$$

The following step is to know the standard error of the different between means.

$$\begin{aligned} SD_{\bar{x}} &= \sqrt{\frac{N_1 S_1^2 + N_2 S_2^2}{N_1 + N_2 - 2} - \left(\frac{1}{N_1} + \frac{1}{N_2} \right)} \\ SD_x &= \sqrt{\frac{30 \times 52.73 + 30 \times 48}{30 + 30 - 2} - \left(\frac{1}{30} + \frac{1}{30} \right)} \\ SD_{\bar{x}} &= \sqrt{\frac{1581.9 + 1440}{58} - \left(\frac{1}{15} \right)} \\ SD_{\bar{x}} &= \sqrt{\frac{3021.9}{58} - \left(\frac{1}{15} \right)} \\ SD_{\bar{x}} &= \sqrt{\frac{3021.9}{870}} \\ SD_{\bar{x}} &= \sqrt{3.473} \\ SD_{\bar{x}} &= 1.863 \end{aligned}$$

To know whether Directed Reading Thinking Activity is effective or not, t-test is done to get the validity of the data.

$$t = \frac{\overline{X}_1 - \overline{X}_2}{SD_{\bar{x}}}$$

$$t = \frac{73 - 68}{1.863}$$

$$t = \frac{5}{1.863}$$

$$t = 2.683$$

Therefore, it was found that the *t*-value was 2.683. The result was compared with the table of *t*-value at 0.05 and *t*-value at 0.01 level of significance. Those are 1.671 and 2.392. The value was higher than *t*-value limit at the table of *t*-value, they are $1.671 < 2.392 < 2.683$. This means that the result statistically is significant. Thus, there is significant in increasing reading ability using Directed Reading Thinking Activity.

The Effectiveness of Teaching Reading by Using Directed Reading Thinking Activity

The effectiveness is one aspect in proofing the research. The following is described how the researcher showed the effectiveness of teaching reading using Directed Reading Thinking Activity. In this case the data gotten from test observed and analysed using SPSS to know the effectiveness of the strategy. It has been explained above.

Table 4.5. Summary of Data Analysis

Strategy	t-Statistic	t-Table	Result
Directed Reading Thinking Activity	2.683	2.392	Significant

Interpretation of Data Analysis

After analyzing the data, the result of *t*-test is 2.683 while the *t*-table with the degree of freedom 58 at 0.01 significant level is 2.392. It is found that the *t*-test is higher than *t*-table. It means that teaching reading by Directed Reading Thinking Activity is effective at the first semester of STAIN Tulungagung 2013-2014.

Discussion

In this research the datas were obtained from the result of test. The test result would show whether there is significant different between the class that was not given the treatment yet and after it was given the treatment. Here, the students have similar ability. The treatment was teaching reading by Directed Reading Thinking Activity and teaching reading without Directed Reading Thinking Activity. Those results were gained from post test that done after the students were given treatment.

Meanwhile, the students would be given pre-test before they were given treatment. It is used to know the English achievement of the students when they were not given treatment yet.

After analyzing the data, the result of t-test is 2.683 while the t-table with the degree of freedom 58 at 0.01 significant level is 2.392. It is found that the t-test is higher than t-table. It means that teaching reading by Directed Reading Thinking Activity is effective at the first semester of STAIN Tulungagung 2013-2014.

Teaching reading by Directed Reading Thinking Activity is good to be used by the lecturer, by using Directed Reading Thinking Activity, lecturer can control class well because there is more than one lecturer that teaches in the class. Besides that, students can improve their knowledge because there is more than one lecturer that explains the lesson. The lecturers need more time to prepare the lesson plan. If the lecturers have good planning in the teaching learning process probably teaching learning will be success and all of lecturer can use Directed Reading Thinking Activity.

CLOSING

The researcher in this research did all the planning as in lesson plan. The researcher did a treatment, which consists of four meetings. At first, the researcher give pre-test to students, after that, he taught how to make questions words. Then, on the third meeting, the researcher taught reading and applied Directed Reading Thinking Activity by showing some texts and discussing each paragraph. On the slast meeting, the researcher gave pre-test. The teaching learning process used Directed Reading Thinking Activity as the method.

To know the students condition before the treatment is done using pre-test. Based on the pre-test, the students score average in reading is 68. It indicates that the score is very low.

Then based on the post-test the students' score average is 73. The score of the students is increased than before. So their reading ability becomes better.

To know the effectiveness, the researcher calculated t-test between pre-test score and post-test score. Based on the t-test, it can be gotten that t-test is 2.683. The value is higher than *t*-value limit at the table of *t*-value those are 1.671 at 0.05 and 2.392 at 0.01 level of significance. This means that the result of teaching reading by using Directed Reading Thinking Activity at the first semester of STAIN Tulungagung 2013-1014 is effective.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, M. & Kathy, A. 1997. *Text Types in English 2*. Australia: Macmillan.
- Anderson, M. & Kathy, A. 1997. *Text Types in English 3*. Australia: Macmillan.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L, C., and Razavieh, A. 1979. *Experimental Research in Education*. Surabaya: Usaha Nasional.
- Birnes, H. 1998. *Reading in the Beginning and Intermediate College Foreign Language Class*, (accessed on 20th March 2012).
- Brown, H. D. 2007. *Teaching by Principles, an interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. New York: Pearson Education. Longman.

- Burnaford, J. F. & David, H. 1996. *Teachers Doing Research; Practical Possibilities*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Association, Inc.
- Cunningsworth, A. 1995. *Choosing your Coursebook*. Macmillan: Heinemann.
- Eanes, R. 1997. *Context Area Literacy Teaching for Today and Tomorrow*. New York: Delman Publisher.
- Gareth, E, H. & Woodworth, S, R. 1966. *Statistic in Psychology and Education*
- Gebbard, G.J. 2000. *Teaching English as a Foreign or Second Language. A Teacher Self-development and Methodology Guide*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Grabe, W. 2009. *Reading in a Second Language. Moving from Theory to Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hardin, C. J. 2004. *Effective Classroom Management: models and strategies for today's classrooms*. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc., upper Saddle Rive.
- Harmer, J. 1998. *How to teach English*. 1998 Addison Wesley Longman.
- Hartfield, V. F. 1985. *Learning ESL*. Rowley London: Newbury House Publisher.
- Hornby, S. 1995. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hudson, T. 2007. *Teaching Second Language Reading*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Krashen, S.D. & Terrel, T.D. 1983. *The Natural Approach: Language Acquisition in the Classroom*. Englewoods Cliffs : Prentice Hall.
- Latief, M.A. 2010. *Tanya Jawab Metode Penelitian Pembelajaran Bahasa*. Malang: UM Press.
- Manzo, A. V. 1969. Improving reading comprehension through reciprocal questioning (Doctoral Dissertation, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY, 1968). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 30,5344A.
- Manzo, A. V. & Manzo, U. C. 1991. *An Informal Reading Thinking Inventor*. Paper Presented at the International Reading Association Annual Convention, Las Vegas, NTV.
- Mistar, J. 2010. *Pedoman Penulisan Tesis*. Malang: Program Pascasarjana Universitas Islam Malang.
- Murray, D.H. 1982. *Learning by Teaching*. Montclair, NJ: Boyton/Cook.
- Nuttal, C. 1982. *Teaching Reading Skills in a Foreign Language*. London: Heinemann.
- O'Malley, J.M & Pierce, 3. 1996. *Authentic Assessment for English Language Learners. Practical Approach for Teachers*. New York; Addison Walley Publishing Company.
- Solmon, M. H. 1984. *Introduction to Logic and Critical Thinking*. USA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
- Stauffer, R. G. (1970). *The language Experience Approach to the Teaching of Reading*. New York: Harper & Row.

- Stauffer, R. G. (1976). *Teaching Reading as a Thinking Process*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Suhadi, I. 2008. *The Effectiveness of Teaching Reading by Team Teaching at the Second Years of MTsN Kediri 1 2007-2008*. Unpublished. Kediri: Faculty of Teaching training and Education, English Department, Islamic university of Kediri.
- Team of Five. 2005. *Improving Reading Skill in English*. Jakarta: Prenada Media.
- Universitas Negeri Malang. 2000. *Pedoman Penulisan Karya Ilmiah, Skripsi, Thesis, Disertasi, Artikel, Makalah, Laporan Penelitian*. Malang: BAAPSI Universitas Negeri Malang.