## CHAPTER IV

## RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter describes about research finding that includes about the description of data, hypothesis testing, and the discussion based on the results of the research.

## A. Data Presentation

The purpose of the research was to know the effectiveness of Directed Reading Thinking Activity (DRTA) strategy on students’ reading comprehension ability of second grade at MTs Ma'arif Bakung Udanawu.

Based on research method in chapter III, teaching and learning process was divided into some steps to collect data. The first step was administered pre-test to experimental and control group to know students' reading comprehension ability before giving treatment. The second step was giving the treatment to experimental group by using DRTA strategy. And the next step of data collection method was administered post-test to experimental group and control group. It was intended to measure students' reading comprehension ability after treatment.

After the researcher got pre-test and post-test scores from experimental and control class, then scores of students pre-test and post-test can be arranged in the form of frequency through scoring criteria and it is divided into five criteria, those are: excellent, good, average, poor and very poor.

Table 4.1 Table of criteria students' score

| No. | Grade | Criteria | Range Score |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 1 | A | Excellent | $90-100$ |
| 2 | B | Good | $70-89$ |
| 3 | C | Average | $50-69$ |
| 4 | D | Poor | $35-49$ |
| 5 | E | Very poor | $0-34$ |

1. The data from the score of experimental class have been obtained as in the following:
a. Pre-test of the Experimental Group

Table 4.2 The students' score of Pre-test

| No. | Name | Score |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | AGH | 60 |
| 2 | AHM | 75 |
| 3 | AHMM | 55 |
| 4 | ALW | 70 |
| 5 | ANA | 45 |
| 6 | ANN | 70 |
| 7 | DAR | 60 |
| 8 | DIA | 50 |
| 9 | ELY | 60 |
| 10 | HEL | 70 |
| 11 | HEM | 70 |
| 12 | IMA | 55 |
| 13 | ISN | 65 |
| 14 | LUT | 70 |
| 15 | MAH | 65 |
| 16 | MIZ | 45 |
| 17 | MUJ | 80 |
| 18 | MUH | 40 |
| 19 | MU | 65 |
| 20 | MUHS | 60 |
| 21 | MUHF | 65 |
| 22 | MUHD | 50 |
| 23 | MNT | 60 |
| 24 | MZI | 80 |
| 25 | MKR | 70 |
| 26 | MNR | 60 |
|  |  |  |


| 27 | MWI | 65 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 28 | NA | 70 |
| 29 | NUR | 75 |
| 30 | NURL | 50 |
| 31 | NK | 55 |
| 32 | NSA | 65 |
| 33 | OC | 50 |
| 34 | ROM | 55 |
| 35 | RIS | 55 |
| 36 | RISK | 50 |
| 37 | SA | 65 |
| 38 | SF | 65 |
| 39 | SIK | 60 |
| 40 | WMB | 75 |

This test was intended to know the basic competence of the students reading comprehension ability especially about narrative text before using DRTA strategy. From the result of pre-test, the subject of pre-test in the experimental group consisted of 40 students. The highest score was 80 and the lowest score was 40.

Table 4.3 Descriptive Statistics

## Statistics

students' score of pre-test

| N | Valid | 40 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
|  | Missing | 0 |
| Mean |  | 61.75 |
| Median |  | 62.50 |
| Mode |  | 65 |
| Minimum |  | 40 |
| Maximum |  | 80 |

Based on the table 4.3 , it was known that the mean of students' score in pretest 61.75 , the median was 62.50 and the most frequent score was 65 as the
mode. The frequency of the students' scores was presented in the following table below

Table 4.4 Frequency of Pre-test
students' score

|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid <br> Percent | Cumulative <br> Percent |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid 40 | 1 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 |
| 45 | 2 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 7.5 |
| 50 | 5 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 20.0 |
| 55 | 5 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 32.5 |
| 60 | 7 | 17.5 | 17.5 | 50.0 |
| 65 | 8 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 70.0 |
| 70 | 7 | 17.5 | 17.5 | 87.5 |
| 75 | 3 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 95.0 |
| 80 | 2 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 40 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

From the table 4.4, it was found that student who got score 40,45 showed that their ability of reading comprehension was categorized as poor. Meanwhile, the students' who got score $50,55,60$ and 65 it means that their ability was categorized as average. Finally, the students who got score 70, 75 and 80 they were categorized as good.
b. Post-test of the Experimental Group

Table 4.5 The students' Score of The Experimental Group

| No. | Name | Score |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | AGH | 70 |
| 2 | AHM | 85 |
| 3 | AHMM | 60 |
| 4 | ALW | 75 |


| 5 | ANA | 50 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 6 | ANN | 70 |
| 7 | DAR | 60 |
| 8 | DIA | 70 |
| 9 | ELY | 70 |
| 10 | HEL | 75 |
| 11 | HEM | 75 |
| 12 | IMA | 55 |
| 13 | ISN | 80 |
| 14 | LUT | 80 |
| 15 | MAH | 70 |
| 16 | MIZ | 60 |
| 17 | MUJ | 90 |
| 18 | MUH | 70 |
| 19 | MU | 70 |
| 20 | MUHS | 70 |
| 21 | MUHF | 70 |
| 22 | MUHD | 55 |
| 23 | MNT | 70 |
| 24 | MZI | 90 |
| 25 | MKR | 80 |
| 26 | MNR | 60 |
| 27 | MWI | 80 |
| 28 | NA | 85 |
| 29 | NUR | 85 |
| 30 | NURL | 50 |
| 31 | NK | 65 |
| 32 | NSA | 75 |
| 33 | OC | 60 |
| 34 | ROM | 75 |
| 35 | RIS | 55 |
| 36 | RISK | 70 |
| 37 | SA | 75 |
| 38 | SF | 80 |
| 39 | SIK | 80 |
| 40 | WMB | 90 |
| 10 |  | 9 |

Post-test was done after giving treatment that used DRTA strategy to know the students' achievement after being taught using DRTA strategy. The subject of post-test in experimental group consisted of 40 students. The highest score was 90 and the lowest score was 55 .

Table 4.6 Descriptive Statistics

## Statistics

Posttest

| N | Valid | 40 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
|  | Missing | 1 |
| Mean |  | 71.38 |
| Median |  | 70.00 |
| Mode |  | 70 |
| Minimum |  | 50 |
| Maximum | 90 |  |

Based on the table 4.6 , it was known that the mean of students' score in post-test was 71.38 , the median was 70.00 and the most frequent score was 70 as the mode. The frequency of the students' scores was presented in the following table below.

Table 4.7 Frequency of Post-test
Posttest

|  |  | Frequ <br> ency | Perce <br> nt | Valid <br> Percent | Cumulative <br> Percent |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | 50 | 2 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
|  | 55 | 3 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 12.5 |
|  | 60 | 5 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 25.0 |
|  | 65 | 1 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 27.5 |
|  | 70 | 11 | 27.5 | 27.5 | 55.0 |
|  | 75 | 6 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 70.0 |
|  | 80 | 6 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 85.0 |
|  | 85 | 3 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 92.5 |
| 90 | 3 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 100.0 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total | 40 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

From the table 4.7, it was found that student who got score 50, 55, 60 and 65 showed that their ability of reading comprehension was categorized average. Then, the students' who got score $70,75,80$ and 85 it means that their ability was categorized as good. Finally, the students' who got score 90 , it means in categorized as excellent. It can be concluded that there is improvement of students' scores of the experimental group in post-test.
2. The data from the score of the Control Group have been obtained as in the following:
a. Pre-test of the Control Group

Table 4.8 The Students' Score of Pre-test

| No. | Name | Score |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | ANI | 55 |
| 2 | AB | 80 |
| 3 | BKA | 50 |
| 4 | DBS | 60 |
| 5 | DRS | 65 |
| 6 | EFH | 60 |
| 7 | ELS | 40 |
| 8 | ES | 60 |
| 9 | HM | 40 |
| 10 | INT | 55 |
| 11 | IN | 60 |
| 12 | IK | 55 |
| 13 | KMZ | 55 |
| 14 | LTh | 50 |
| 15 | MFA | 75 |
| 16 | MSA | 45 |
| 17 | MNF | 70 |
| 18 | MKA | 40 |
| 19 | MNHE | 80 |
| 20 | MRP | 80 |
| 21 | MTN | 75 |
| 22 | NA | 65 |
| 23 | NAA | 75 |
| 24 | NNS | 40 |


| 25 | NAIZ | 45 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 26 | NAF | 75 |
| 27 | NH | 60 |
| 28 | NAZ | 45 |
| 29 | NF | 50 |
| 30 | SN | 40 |
| 31 | SSS | 55 |
| 32 | SF | 40 |
| 33 | SIT | 60 |
| 34 | SZU | 55 |
| 35 | TWI | 75 |
| 36 | USY | 45 |
| 37 | USK | 50 |
| 38 | VNR | 80 |
| 39 | ZNA | 80 |
| 40 | ZIR | 50 |

Control group is a class which was given a treatment in reading comprehension ability without using DRTA strategy. The teaching and learning activity was done by the researcher as usual or didn't use DRTA strategy. From the result of table 4.7, subject of pre-test in the control group consisted of 40 students. The highest score was 80 and the lowest score was 40.

Table 4.9 Descriptive statistics
Statistics
Pretest

| N | Valid | 40 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
|  | Missing | 0 |
| Mean |  | 58.38 |
| Median |  | 55.00 |
| Mode |  | 40 |
| Minimum |  | 40 |
| Maximum |  | 80 |

Based on the table 4.9 , it was known that the mean of students' score in post-test was 58.38 , the median was 55.00 and the mode score was 40 . The frequency of the students' scores was presented in the following table below.

Table 4.10 Descriptive Statistics

|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid <br> Percent | Cumulative <br> Percent |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid 40 | 6 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 |
| 45 | 4 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 25.0 |
| 50 | 5 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 37.5 |
| 55 | 6 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 52.5 |
| 60 | 6 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 67.5 |
| 65 | 2 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 72.5 |
| 70 | 1 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 75.0 |
| 75 | 5 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 87.5 |
| 80 | 5 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 40 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

From the table 4.10, it was found that student who got score 40,45 showed that their ability of reading comprehension was categorized poor. Meanwhile, the students' who got score $50,55,60$ and 65 were categorized as average. Finally, the students' who got score 70,75 and 80 were categorized as good.
b. Post-test of the Control Group

Table 4.11 The students' score of Post-test

| No | Name | Score |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | ANI | 60 |
| 2 | AB | 85 |
| 3 | BKA | 50 |
| 4 | DBS | 60 |
| 5 | DRS | 75 |
| 6 | EFH | 75 |


| 7 | ELS | 45 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 8 | ES | 60 |
| 9 | HM | 35 |
| 10 | INT | 65 |
| 11 | IN | 60 |
| 12 | IK | 60 |
| 13 | KMZ | 55 |
| 14 | LTh | 55 |
| 15 | MFA | 80 |
| 16 | MSA | 55 |
| 17 | MNF | 75 |
| 18 | MKA | 25 |
| 19 | MNHE | 80 |
| 20 | MRP | 80 |
| 21 | MTN | 75 |
| 22 | NA | 65 |
| 23 | NAA | 80 |
| 24 | NNS | 45 |
| 25 | NAIZ | 45 |
| 26 | NAF | 80 |
| 27 | NH | 70 |
| 28 | NAZ | 50 |
| 29 | NF | 60 |
| 30 | SN | 40 |
| 31 | SSS | 65 |
| 32 | SF | 40 |
| 33 | SIT | 60 |
| 34 | SZU | 55 |
| 35 | TWI | 75 |
| 36 | USY | 45 |
| 37 | USK | 60 |
| 38 | VNR | 85 |
| 39 | ZNA | 80 |
| 40 | ZIR | 50 |
|  |  |  |

Post-test for control group was done to know the improvement of students' reading comprehension ability although the learning activity was without using DRTA strategy. The subject of post-test in control group consisted of 40 students. The higher score was 85 , and the lowest score was 35 .

Table 4.12 Descriptive Statistics

## Statistics

Posttest

| N | Valid | 40 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
|  | Missing | 0 |
| Mean |  | 61.5000 |
| Median |  | 60.0000 |
| Mode |  | 60.00 |
| Minimum |  | 25.00 |
| Maximum |  | 85.00 |

Based on the table 4.12, it was known that the mean of students' score in post-test was 61.50 , the median was 60 and the most frequent score was 60 as the mode. The frequency of the students' scores was presented in the following table below.

Table 4.13 Frequencies

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | 25 | 1 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 |
|  | 35 | 1 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 5.0 |
|  | 40 | 2 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 10.0 |
|  | 45 | 4 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 20.0 |
|  | 50 | 3 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 27.5 |
|  | 55 | 4 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 37.5 |
|  | 60 | 8 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 57.5 |
|  | 65 | 3 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 65.0 |
|  | 70 | 1 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 67.5 |
|  | 75 | 5 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 80.0 |
|  | 80 | 6 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 95.0 |


| 85 | 2 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 100.0 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total | 40 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

From the table 4.13, it was found that student who got score 25 showed that ability of reading comprehension was categorized as very poor. Students who got score 35,40 and 45 showed that their ability was categorized as poor. Meanwhile, the students' who got score 50, 55, 60 and 65 were categorized as average. Finally, the students who got score 70, 75, 80 and 85 were categorized as good.

## 3. Difference of Statistical Data in Post-test of The Control and Experimental

## Groups.

Based on the result of students' pre-test score of control and experimental group were normal and homogeneous, so the researcher only compared the students' score of post test.

The researcher compared students' score of post-test of both groups that consisted of the highest score, the lowest score and the mean score in reading comprehension ability. After that, the researcher found out the score of each group from students' score in post-test to know whether the students' reading comprehension ability was getting down, same or different. The result of difference of statistical data in post-test of control group and experimental group can be seen in the table below.

Table 4.14 Difference of Statistical Data in Post-test of the Control and
Experimental Group.

| No. | Name | Control group | Name | $\begin{gathered} \text { Experimental } \\ \text { group } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | ANI | 60 | AGH | 70 |
| 2 | AB | 85 | AHM | 85 |
| 3 | BKA | 50 | AHMM | 60 |
| 4 | DBS | 60 | ALW | 75 |
| 5 | DRS | 75 | ANA | 50 |
| 6 | EFH | 75 | ANN | 70 |
| 7 | ELS | 45 | DAR | 60 |
| 8 | ES | 60 | DIA | 70 |
| 9 | HM | 35 | ELY | 70 |
| 10 | INT | 65 | HEL | 75 |
| 11 | IN | 60 | HEM | 75 |
| 12 | IK | 60 | IMA | 55 |
| 13 | KMZ | 55 | ISN | 80 |
| 14 | LTh | 55 | LUT | 80 |
| 15 | MFA | 80 | MAH | 70 |
| 16 | MSA | 55 | MIZ | 60 |
| 17 | MNF | 75 | MUJ | 90 |
| 18 | MKA | 25 | MUH | 70 |
| 19 | MNHE | 80 | MU | 70 |
| 20 | MRP | 80 | MUHS | 70 |
| 21 | MTN | 75 | MUHF | 70 |
| 22 | NA | 65 | MUHD | 55 |
| 23 | NAA | 80 | MNT | 70 |
| 24 | NNS | 45 | MZI | 90 |
| 25 | NAIZ | 45 | MKR | 80 |
| 26 | NAF | 80 | MNR | 60 |
| 27 | NH | 70 | MWI | 80 |
| 28 | NAZ | 50 | NA | 85 |
| 29 | NF | 60 | NUR | 85 |
| 30 | SN | 40 | NURL | 50 |
| 31 | SSS | 65 | NK | 65 |
| 32 | SF | 40 | NSA | 75 |
| 33 | SIT | 60 | OC | 60 |
| 34 | SZU | 55 | ROM | 75 |
| 35 | TWI | 75 | RIS | 55 |
| 36 | USY | 45 | RISK | 70 |
| 37 | USK | 60 | SA | 75 |
| 38 | VNR | 85 | SF | 80 |
| 39 | ZNA | 80 | SIK | 80 |


| 40 | ZIR | 50 | WMB | 90 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Table 4.15 Descriptive Statistic of Control and Experimental Group
Statistics

|  | control | experimental |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| N $\quad$ Valid | 40 | 40 |
| Missing | 0 | 0 |
| Mean | 61.50 | 71.38 |
| Median | 60.00 | 70.00 |
| Mode | 60 | 70 |
| Minimum | 25 | 50 |
| Maximum | 85 | 90 |

Based on the table above, it can be seen the difference of the students' score in post-test of control and experimental group in reading narrative text. In post-test of control group showed that the highest score was 85, the lowest score was 25 and the mean score was 61.50 , while in posttest of experimental group showed that the highest score was 90 , the lowest score was 50 and the mean score was 71.38 .

The result above showed that the experimental group who were taught reading by using DRTA strategy was higher than the control group who were taught without using DRTA strategy. It showed that there was significant difference of the students' reading comprehension ability in narrative text by using directed reading thinking activity (DRTA) strategy and those were taught reading text without DRTA strategy. In other word, the using of DRTA strategy in teaching reading was effective to improve the students'
reading comprehension ability at the eighth grade of MTs Ma'arif Bakung Udanawu Blitar on academic year 2017/2018.

In this research, the researcher used statistical test using computation Independent Sample T-Test by SPSS 16.0 version. It is used to know the effectiveness of using DRTA strategy on students' reading comprehension ability These subject were referred to as independent because they are independently from the different subjects. The result as follow:

Table 4.16 Group Statistics of Two Groups
Group Statistics

| Posttest | N | Mean | Std. <br> Deviation | Std. Error <br> Mean |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Scores Experimental <br> group | 40 | 71.3750 | 10.80049 | 1.70771 |
| Control group | 40 | 61.5000 | 15.02988 | 2.37643 |

Based on the table 4.16, the data presented the performance scores of the members of two groups which the students who were taught reading text without using directed reading thinking activity (DRTA) strategy and those were taught reading text by using directed reading thinking activity (DRTA) strategy. Output independent sample statistics shows that there are mean scores differences between the control group and the experimental group. The mean score of experimental group is 71.37 and the mean score of control group is 61.50 . The member of students $(\mathrm{N})$ in the control group and in the experimental group are 40 . The standard deviation of experimental group is 10.800 and the error mean 1.707. On the control group, the standard deviation is 15.029 and the error mean is 2.376 .

## B. Hypothesis Testing

The hypotheses testing of this research are as follow:

1. If alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted and the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected. It means that there is different score on students' reading comprehension ability who was taught without and using story pyramid strategy. The different is significant.
2. If significance value is higher than 0.05 , the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is rejected and the null hypothesis (Ho) is accepted. It means that there is no different score on students' reading comprehension ability who was taught without and using story pyramid strategy. The different is not significant.

To know whether the significant value is higher than 0.05 , the researcher analyzed the data by using SPSS 16.0.In addition, in interpreting significance value, if it is higher than 0.05 ( $\mathrm{Sig}>0.05$ ), Ho is accepted while if it is lower than 0.05 ( Sig < 0.05 ) Ho is rejected. In other words, Ho is rejected if $\mathrm{Sig}<$ 0.05

Table 4.17 The Result of Analyzing Independent Sample T Test

| Independent Samples Test |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Levene's <br> Test for <br> Equality of <br> Variances |  | t-test for Equality of Means |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | F | Sig. | T | df | Sig. (2tailed) | Mean <br> Difference | Std. Error <br> Differenc <br> e | 95\% Confidence Interval of the Difference |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lower | Upper |
| Score Equal variances assumed | 4.796 | . 032 | 3.374 | 78 | . 001 | 9.87500 | 2.92638 | 4.04902 | 15.70098 |
| Equal variances not assumed |  |  | 3.374 | 70.799 | . 001 | 9.87500 | 2.92638 | 4.03968 | 15.71032 |

On the table 4.17 shows the result of output independent sample T test. The result of SPSS the significance value $<0.05(0.001<0.05)$, so (Ho) is rejected and (Ha) is accepted. This means that (Ha) which states that there is significant different ability on student' reading comprehension ability of second grade at MTs Ma'arif Bakung Udanawu Blitar between who are taught reading without using DRTA strategy and those who are taught by using DRTA strategy is accepted. Whereas (Ho) which states that there is no significant different ability on student' reading comprehension ability of second grade at MTs Ma'arif Bakung Udanawu Blitar between who are taught reading without using DRTA strategy and those who are taught by using DRTA strategy is rejected.

## C. Discussion

In this part, the writer presents about the data analysis on the research that has been presented in the previous sub chapter. The discussion intended to know the students improvement on students reading comprehension by using Directed Reading Thinking Activity (DRTA) strategy.

Regarding on the result of data analysis, it was found that DRTA Strategy is effective to teach reading comprehension ability. The previous researcher also had proved that DRTA Strategy can be effective and improve students' comprehension in reading text. For the first research had been conducted by Aulia Rahman and Akhyak (2013) entitled " The Effectiveness of Directed Reading Thinking Activity Strategy in Reading Comprehension of Narrative text at the First Semester Student of STAIN Tulungagung". The second research had been conducted by Rinawati (2014) entitled "Keefektifan Strategi Directed Reading-Thinking-Activity And Student Question (DRTA+SQ) Terhadap Pembelajaran Membaca Cerpen Siswa Kelas VII SMP Negeri7 Yogyakarta ". From the results of research that, conducted by Aulia Rahman and Ahkyak, Rinawati and the researcher, those shown that DRTA strategy is effective in teaching and learning reading purposed to improve students' reading comprehension

Based on the analysis obtained from the students' post-test control the mean score is 61.50 . While the mean score of the students' pos-test experiment class is 71.37. And the result, it indicates that after giving treatment by using DRTA strategy the students have better ability and the
writer has known in the application of treatment the students' attention be focused in learning, and the students easy to understand the lesson. It is related with Wiesendanger (2001: 36) state that Directed Reading Thinking Activity requires students to be active participant in their reading. DRTA works for both good and poor readers to increase their knowledge based processing, DRTA is also useful for introducing new material with basal text.

Based on the result above, the writer concludes that the eight grade students of MTs Ma'arif Bakung Udanawu Blitar have good response in reading comprehension ability after the application of DRTA strategy. Therefore, the teacher can apply classroom questioning strategy in teaching English especially in reading comprehension.

