

# The Effect of Learning Model Drta (*Directed Reading Thinking Activity*) Toward Students' Reading Comprehension Ability

## Seeing from Their Reading Interest

Samsu Somadayo, St.Y. Slamet, Joko Nurkamto, Sarwiji Suwandi

1. University Eleven March Surakarta. Jln. IR No. Sutami Sutami. 36 A Kentingan.
  2. 2. Graduate Jl. Ir. No. Sutami. 36 A Kentingan. Surakarta, 57126, Tel. / Fax. (0271) 632450
- \*E-mail: villasyam@yahoo.co.id

### Abstract

This study aims at discovering whether or not there is any differences of students' reading comprehension skills for: (1) those who take learning model DRTA, PQRST, and DRA models, (2) those who have high, moderate, and low interest in reading, and whether (3) there is any interaction of learning models and reading interest toward reading comprehension skills. This study was conducted at the Junior High School Ternate. The number of samples is 79 people. The results of this study found that: First, there is a difference between the reading comprehension skills of students who take learning model DRTA, PQRST, and model DRA. Model DRTA yield better result compared with the DRA model and PQRST model. Secondly, there are differences in reading comprehension skills of students who have high, moderate, and low reading interest. Students who have high reading interest show better understanding than students who have moderate and low reading interest. Third, there is an interaction of learning models and reading interest toward reading comprehension skills

**Keywords:** reading comprehension, modeling, reading interest.

### 1. Introduction

Hudgson (1980) states that reading is a process that is carried and used by the reader to get the message that the author trying to convey through words in written language. A process that requires the reader to understand the written word is an integral and visible in a glance, and the meaning of these words can be known. If this can be met then the implicit and explicit messages can be understood, so that the reading has been done well. A person who is reading means he is doing something in the form of communication with oneself through the written symbol. The meaning of the reading passages does not lie only on written material but also lies in the mind of the reader itself. Thus the meaning of the reading can vary depending on readers and their different experiences that they had at the time of reading and they use them to interpret the written word.

In line with the above opinion, Godman (1988) says that reading is an activity of picking meaning or understanding and it is not just of a row of explicit words (reading the lines), it also involves the meaning behind the rows contained in the row (reading between the lines), and even the meaning lies behind the row of that line (reading beyond the lines). According to him, reading is an active process and is no longer a passive process, reading is an active process rather than a passive process means that a reader must actively try to grasp what he reads, he should not just accept it. Thus, the actual reading is translating password or symbols presented in the writing form in terms of certain symbols and interpret it.

### 2. Reading Comprehension

Reading comprehension is one of the Bahasa Indonesia skills that must be developed at school. This is because the reading comprehension has become something important and indispensable for students because students' success largely depends on their ability to read. If students' reading comprehension is lacking, it is possible to fail in learning or at least students will have difficulty in making progress. On the other hand, if the student has the ability to read with a good understanding, of course, they would have a better chance to succeed in learning.

Reading comprehension ability in this context refers to the ability of students to grasp the information or ideas presented by the authors through readings so he can interpret ideas that they have discovered. Similarly, Nutall (1982) states that the purpose of reading comprehension is part of the process of reading comprehension. That is characterized by the process when the readers get the messages and meaning of the text they have read. Furthermore, the message or the meaning conveyed can be in the forms of information, knowledge, and even happy or sad expression messages.

Similarly, Syafi'ie (1999) states that reading comprehension is essentially a process of building understanding of

a written discourse. This process occurs in a way to match or connect schemata of knowledge and experience that have been previously owned with the content of information of the discourse in order to build a good understanding of the discourse that has been read. Smith (1982) suggests that reading comprehension is an activity or activities undertaken by the reader to connect new information with old information in order to gain new knowledge. In addition, it is also done to link information and gain new knowledge. The activities carried out by the reader in understanding the literature can be classified into literal comprehension, interpretive comprehension, critical comprehension and creative comprehension.

Turner (1988) reveals that a reader can be said to have good understanding on the reading material being read if the reader can (1) recognize the words or sentences in reading and know its meaning, (2) connect the meaning of the experience that has gotten before with the meaning in the reading, (3) understand the whole meaning contextually, and (4) make a judgment on the content of reading material based on his reading experience. Furthermore, Brown (1984) states that the main principle of good readers are readers who actively participate in the reading process. They have clear goals and monitor their reading goal of reading texts that they read. Good readers use comprehension strategy to put them in ease when constructing meaning. This strategy involves the activity to make reviews, create their own questions, make connections, visualize, know how words shape meaning, monitor, summarize, and evaluate.

From some opinions on the above, it can be concluded that the principles of reading comprehension is that reading is a complex thought process that involves understanding words, sentences written by the author, interpreting the author's concepts, and summing it up in a good way.

### 3. Reading Interest

Vera Ginter (2009) defines reading as forms of behavior that is directed to do the reading as a strong level of pleasure in doing the reading because it is fun and delivering score. Further interest in reading is a fixed characteristic of the learning process through a life time (life-long learning) that contribute to the development, such as memecahkan issues, understand the character of others, creating a sense of security, good interpersonal relations and a growing appreciation of the daily activities.

In contrast, Sinambela (1993) defines reading as a positive attitude and a sense of attachment to the child to the activity of reading and interested in reading books. Aspect of reading include reading pleasure, the frequency of reading and awareness of the benefits of reading. Interest in reading is the force that encourages children to observe, to feel interested and excited to read the activities that they want to do reading activities with their own. Aspect of reading include reading pleasure, the frequency of reading and awareness of the benefits of reading.

Court (2010) reveals that reading is a tendency in people to be interested or favor and move him in the process of thinking included in the recount, to interpret the meaning and symbols written with visual motion involving the eyes, mind and memory speaker. In line with Rahayu (1999), it is explained that reading is an attitude and a keen sense of the books that you have on someone who is accompanied by feelings of pleasure and interest to perform activities of reading on their own accord without being told.

According to Lilawati (1988) reading is a strong and deep concern accompanied with a sense of excitement for reading that directs the subject to read them on their own. Sinambela (1993) states that reading is a positive attitude and a sense of interest in the subject toward the activity of reading and his interest in reading books.

From the above opinion, it can be affirmed that reading needs to be invested and grown since the child was a child because the child's interest in reading will not be formed by itself, but it is strongly influenced by the stimulation derived from the child's environment. The family is the earliest and dominant in planting, cultivating and fostering reading interest in children. Parents need to instill awareness of the importance of reading in a child's life, after which a new teacher at the school, peers and community.

### 4. Data Findings

Analysis of the data used to test the hypothesis of the study is an analysis of variance (Anova) dilanjutkan two lines with Scheffe test. After statistical analysis with a computer program (SPSS) version 19, the obtained results were overall hypothesis testing are summarized in the following table.

#### Table 4. 1. Summary Testing Results

4.1. The difference of reading comprehension ability among students taught by DRA, PQRST, and DRTA learning models.

After doing a statistical analysis by implementing univariate Anova two-way analysis of variance, F scores obtained count of 29,269 and significant score of 0.000. is smaller than significant standard  $\alpha = 0.05$ . It can be concluded that there is a difference or effect of the learning model for reading comprehension skills among students taught by DRA, PQRST, and DRTA learning models.

From the results of the analysis, the  $H_0$  (null Hypothesis) stating that "there is no difference between students'

reading comprehension skills taught by DRA, PQRST and DRTA learning models" is rejected and H1 which states "there is differences between students' reading comprehension skills taught by DRA, PQRST and DRTA learning models" is accepted. It means that there is a difference between students' reading comprehension skills taught by DRA, PQRST and DRTA learning models".

Based on the analysis of multiple comparisons with Duncan, it is clear that the ratio of students' reading comprehension who are taught by the DRA, PQRST and DRTA learning model can be put into table as follows:

**Kemampuan Membaca Pemahaman**

Duncan<sup>a,b,c</sup>

Model Pembelajaran	N	Subset		
		1	2	3
DRA	23	53.5652		
PQRST	29		65.5862	
DRTA	27			77.1852
Sig.		1.000	1.000	1.000

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

Based on Type III Sum of Squares

The error term is Mean Square(Error) = 105.210.

- a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 26.087.
- b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.
- c. Alpha = .050.

The data mentioned above concluded that the DRA, PQRST, and DRTA learning mode are all the same on reading comprehension skills is evident from the test results on a subset Duncan DRA Model 1 (a) the average score of 53.5652, PQRST models on a subset of 2 (b) the average score of 65.5862, and model DRTA on subset 3 (c) with the average score of 77.1852. Since the largest average score of reading comprehension ability is in DRTA it can be concluded that the DRTA learning model has advantages over the other two models, namely DRA and PQRST

4.2 . The difference of reading comprehension of students' who has high, moderate, and low reading interest

After doing statistical analysis with univariate Anova two-way analysis of variance, earned score of 9.76 and calculate F significant score of 0.000. Smaller than standard significant  $\alpha = 0.05$ , it can be concluded that there is a difference or effect on reading comprehension ability among students with low reading , moderatr, and high reading interest .

From the results of the analysis, it is showed that Ho stating "there is no difference in the reading comprehension among students with low, moderate, high reading interest, " is rejected and H1 which states "there is difference in the reading comprehension among students with low, moderate, high reading interest "is accepted. This means that there is a difference in the reading comprehension among students with low, moderate, high reading interest.

Based on the analysis of multiple comparisons with Duncan, it is obtained the fact that the ratio of the reading comprehension of students who have low, moderate, and high reading interest can be put into table as follows:

**Kemampuan Membaca Pemahaman**

Duncan<sup>a,b,c</sup>

Minat Baca	N	Subset	
		1	2
Rendah	21	59.1429	
Sedang	28	63.9286	
Tinggi	30		72.8667
Sig.		.099	1.000

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

Based on Type III Sum of Squares

The error term is Mean Square(Error) = 105.210.

- a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 25.714.
- b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.
- c. Alpha = .050.

The data mentioned above concluded that the students who have low reading interest and reading comprehension reading ability was the same, while students who have high reading interest will show better reading comprehension. This is evident from the test results of students who coined Duncan reading low and is at the same subset of the subset 1 (a) the average score of each 59.1429 and 63.9286, while students who have a high interest in reading is the subset 2 (b) the average score of the reading comprehension of 72.8667.

#### 4.3 The interaction between the use of learning model and reading interest in affecting reading comprehension ability

After doing statistical analysis with univariate Anova two-way analysis of variance, a score of 2.637 and  $F_{count}$  significant score of 0.041. It is smaller than significant standard  $\alpha = 0.05$ . Thus, it can be concluded that there is a difference or effect of the interaction between (DRA, PQRST, and DRTA) learning model with reading interest (low, moderate, and high) on the ability of reading comprehension. Descriptive statistical analysis of the results showed that the highest score of reading comprehension skills is in group interaction of DRTA learning model with high reading interest that is equal to 88.5455 and the lowest score in the DRA interaction learning model with a low reading interest is equal to 48.5714.

These results indicate that  $H_0$  stating "there is no difference between students' reading comprehension skills in group interaction of (DRA, PQRST, DRTA) learning model with reading interest (low, moderate, and high)" is rejected and  $H_1$  which states "there is difference between students' reading comprehension skills in group interaction of (DRA, PQRST, DRTA) learning model with reading interest (low, moderate, and high)" is, accepted. This means that there is a difference between students' reading comprehension skills in group interaction of (DRA, PQRST, DRTA) learning model with reading interest (low, moderate, and high)".

Based on the analysis of multiple comparisons with Duncan, it is obtained the fact that the ratio of students' reading comprehension skills in group interaction of (DRA, PQRST, DRTA) learning model with reading interest (low, moderate, and high) can be put in a table as follows:

**Kemampuan Membaca Pemahaman**

Duncan <sup>a,b</sup>		Subset for alpha = .05				
Interaksi Model Pembelajaran dengan Minat Baca	N	1	2	3	4	5
Model Pembelajaran DRA ; Minat Baca Rendah	7	48.5714				
Model Pembelajaran DRA ; Minat Baca Sedang	8	51.5000	51.5000			
Model Pembelajaran DRA ; Minat Baca Tinggi	8		60.0000	60.0000		
Model Pembelajaran PQRST ; Minat Baca Rendah	6			64.3333	64.3333	
Model Pembelajaran DRTA ; Minat Baca Rendah	8			64.5000	64.5000	
Model Pembelajaran PQRST ; Minat Baca Sedang	12			65.3333	65.3333	
Model Pembelajaran PQRST ; Minat Baca Tinggi	11			66.5455	66.5455	
Model Pembelajaran DRTA ; Minat Baca Sedang	8				74.2500	
Model Pembelajaran DRTA ; Minat Baca Tinggi	11					88.5455
Sig.		.561	.094	.253	.081	1.000

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 8.375.

b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

- In subset 1: students who are taught by DRA learning model with low reading interest (48.5714) have the same result of reading comprehension as students who have moderate reading interest (51.500), while the result obtained from DRA learning model with a high reading interest obtained (60,000).
- In subset 2: students who are taught by DRA learning model with moderate reading interest (51.500) has the same reading comprehension ability with those taught by DRA learning model with a high reading interest (60,000).
- In subset 3: students who are taught by DRA learning model with a high reading interest (60,000) have a reading comprehension similar to PQRST learning model with low reading (64.333), DRTA learning model with low reading (64.500), PQRST learning model with moderate reading (65.333), PQRST learning model with a high reading interest(66.5455).

- d. In the subset 4: students who are taught by PQRST learning model with low reading (64.333), has similar reading comprehension ability model DRTA with low reading interest (64.500), PQRST learning model with moderate reading (65.333), a model of learning PQRST with a high reading interest (66.5455), DRTA model of learning by reading with moderate reading interest (74.250).
- e. In the subset 5: only students who are taught by DRTA learning model with a high reading interest obtained results (88.5455), so students learn by learning models DRTA is in the category of high reading ability, their reading comprehension is very significant. In this lesson the students have a chance to understand what is learned, not just receive information only. Additionally, students can develop the ability to think in this lesson. Active involvement, either individually or in groups to make more students understand the material being studied reading so the reading comprehension of students categorized as high reading interest taught by using DRTA model perform better.

## 5. Conclusion

Based on the data display and the findings of research and discussion which has been described previously, then the final conclusion can be described as follows. First, the ability of reading comprehension on a group of students who are taught by DRTA learning model is better compared to the group of students who are taught using PQRST and DRA learning model. Thus, there is a significant difference in the reading comprehension between students who are taught by the learning model DRTA, PQRST DRA learning model. Meanwhile, the difference in reading comprehension between students who are taught by DRA learning model with students who are taught by PQRST models are not very significant.

Second, the group of students who have high reading interest and taught by DRTA learning model yields a better reading comprehension compared to the group of students who have high reading interest taught by PQRST and DRA learning model. However, the difference of comprehension of a group of students who have high reading interest taught by DRA learning model and students who are taught by PQRST learning models are not very significant. Then, there are differences in students' reading comprehension skills is significant for those students who have low reading interest and those who have high reading interest. Thus, students who have high reading interest is assumed to have higher reading comprehension than that students who are put into those who have low reading interest.

Third, there is an influence of the interaction model of learning to students' reading comprehension skills. It is based on the comparison of the average reading comprehension skills among students taught by DRA, PQRST, and DRTA learning model which is done by comparing the average reader comprehension skills among students who have low, moderate, and high reading interest

## Reference

- Al Odwan Talal A. Hameed, 2012. *The Effect of the Directed Reading Thinking Activity through Cooperative Learning on English Secondary Stage Students' Reading Comprehension in Jordan*. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science. Vol. 2 No. 16 (Abstr).
- Alexander, J. E. 1988. *Teaching Reading*. Boston: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Almasi, J. (2003). *Teaching Strategic Processes In Reading*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Anderson, J. 1996. *Efficient Reading: A Practical Guide*. Sydney: McGrawHill Book Co.
- Anderson, Paul S. 1984. *Language Skills in Elementary Education*. New York: McMillan Publishing, Inc.
- Ary, Donald, Yakob, Lusy Cheser, dan Rozavich, Asghar. 1985. *Introduction to Research in Education*. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.
- Bataineh, R. F 2011. *Preservice Childhood Education Teachers' Perceptions of Instructional Practices for Developing Young Children's Interest in Reading*. Journal of Research In Childhood Education. (April-June 2011):Vol. 2 (page 1).
- Billmeyer, R., & Barton, M.L. (1998). *Teaching Reading in The Content Areas: If not me, then who?* Aurora, CO: McREL.
- Buckkhari A. 2008. *The Effect of Reading Habit and Social Economic Conditions on Students' Prestige in Learning Indonesian Language at Elementary School*. Pacific Journal. Maret 2008. Vol. 2.pp.1.
- Burns, Paulo C. Roe, B. D dan Ross, E. P. 1996. *Teaching Reading In The Elementary Schools*. Dallas Geneva, Llionis Hopewell: New Jersey Houghton Mifflin Boston.
- Chaplin. J. P. 2000. *Kamus Lengkap Psikologi*. Terjemahan Kartini Kartono. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Cleary, L. M. dan Linn, M.D. 1993. *Linguistics for Teachers*. New York: McGrawHil.
- Cox, C. dan Zarrillo, J. 1993. *Teaching Reading With Children Literatur*. New. York: Macmillian.
- Crawley, S. J dan Mountain, L. 1995. *Strategies for Guiding Content Reading*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.



- Davies. 1995. *Introducing reading*. Middlesex: Penguin Group. I. Cambridge University Press.
- Djaali. 2009. *Psikologi Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Djamara. S.B, 2008. *Psikologi Belajar*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta
- Eanes, R. 1997. *Content Area Literacy: Teaching for Today and Tomorrow*. Bonn: dermar Publishers, ITP An International Thomson Publishing Company.
- Ebel, R. L. 1982 *Essentials of Educational Measurement*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J. : Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Fairbairn, Gavin J. and Susan Fairbairn. 2001. *Reading At University: A Guide for Students*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Farida Rahim. 2005. *Pengajaran Membaca di Sekolah Dasar*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Farris, 1993. *Buku Satu: Pedomanan Penilaian Ranah Afektif*, Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.
- Gagne, Robert M. 1985. *The Conditions of Learning*. New York: CBS College Publishing.
- Garrison, Karl.C.1985. *Psychology of Adolescence*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, I
- Gilbert, S. 1980. *Principles of Educational Measurement and Evaluation*. California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc.
- Goodman, K. 1988. *The Reading Process*. New York: Combridge University.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 1986. *The psicolinguistic Nature of Reading Process*. Detroit: Waine State University Press.
- Goodman, Y. M. 1991. *How Children Construct Literacy. Piagetian Perspective*. Newark, DE: Internasional Reading Assosiation.
- Gunning, T. G. 1992. *Creating Reading for All Children*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Guntur Tarigan. 1990. *Membaca Sebagai Suatu Keterampilan Berbahasa*. Bandung: Angkasa.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 1993. *Mengembangkan Minat dan Kebiasaan Membaca Pada Anak*. Bandung: Angkasa.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 1993. *Strategi Pengajaran dan Pembelajaran Bahasa*. Bandung: Angkasa.
- Hameed Al Odwan, 2012. *The Effect of the Directed Reading Thinking Activity (DRTA) through Cooperative Learning on English Secondary Stage Students' Reading Comprehension*. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Vol. 2 No. 16 (Agustus 2012).
- Harjasujana, Ahmad S. 1986. *Buku Materi Pokok Keterampilan Membaca*. Jakarta: Karunika, Universitas Terbuka.
- Harras. K. 1998. *Materi Pokok Membaca I*. Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Bagian Proyek Penataran Guru SLTP Setara D-III.
- Harris, A.J. dan Sipay, E. R. 1980. *How to Increase Reading Ability: A Guide to Developmental and remedial Methods*. New York: Longman.
- Harris, L. dan Smith, C.B. 1986. *Reading Instruction, Diagnostic teaching in the Classroom*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Hasmmann, R. 2010. *Sustainability, Learning, An Introduction to the Concept and its Motivational Spects*. Journal sustainability. Diunduh 29 Januari 2012. (Halaman 15).
- Hurlock E.B, 1991. *Perkembangan Anak*, Jilid 2 edisi Keenam. Jakarta: Erlangga
- Hurlock E.B, 1993. *Psikologi Perkembangan*. Edisi ke-5, Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Imam Syafi'ie. 2001. *Lungge Arts (Kemahiran Berbahasa)*. Makalah disampaikan pada Program Pascasarjana Juli 2001. Malang: Universitas Negeri Malang press.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 1994. *Pengajaran Membaca Terpadu*. Bahan Kursus Pendalaman. Materi Guru inti PKB Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia. Jakarta: Debdikbud.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 1993. *Terampil Berbahasa Indonesia I*. Jakarta: Gheneral Bhakti Pratama.
- J. Daniel. 2007. "Relationships Between Computer Use, Instructional Strategies, and Interest in Reading for Students in Hong Kong and the United States": *International Journal of Instructional Media*. Education, Religion and Humanities. Vol. 13.(3).pp.1-2.
- Johnson, Elaine B. 2002. *Contextual Teaching and Learning*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin.
- Kartika, E. 2004. *Memacu Minat Membaca Siswa Sekolah Dasar*. Htt: /www bpk Penabur. Or. It/jurnal diakses tanggal 15 Oktober 2007.(halaman 10).
- Kartini Kartono 1980. *Teori Kepribadian*, Bandung: Alumni.
- Katherine M. 1990. *Reading for Understanding: Towardan R&D Program in Reading Comrehension*. RAND Publisher.

- Katherine A. Dougherty Stahl 2008. *The Effects of Three Instructional Methods on the Reading Comprehension*. Journal of Literacy Research. New York University.
- Kemmis, Stephen dan Taggart, Robin. 1988. *The Action Research Planner*. Victoria: Deakin University.
- Khalek, 2006. *The Effects of the Directed Reading-Thinking Activity on EFL Students' Referential and Inferential Comprehension*. Journal of Research in Childhood Education. 25. 177. (Abstr).
- Klein, M.L. S. Peterson dan L. Simington, 1991. *Teaching Reading In The Elementary Grades*. USA; Allyn and Bacon.
- Kolker, Robert. 1983. *Film, Form, and Culture*. Second Ed. New York: Mc Graw Hill.
- Laili Etika Rahmawati, 2009. *Pengaruh Strategi KWL dan DRA terhadap Kemampuan Membaca Intensif*. Tesis. UNS. Surakarta.
- Lilawati, 1988. *Hubungan Antara Tingkat Pendidikan Orang Tua, Stimulasi Membacadari Orang Tua dan Inteligensi dengan Minat Membaca*. Tesis. Yogyakarta : Fakultas Psikologi. Universitas Gadjah Mada.
- McLaughlin, M., & Allen, M. B. (2002). *Guided comprehension a teaching model for grades 3-8*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Meichati, S. 1987. *Motivasi Pembaca*. Yogyakarta : Universitas Gadjah Mada.
- Moh. Nasir. 2005. *Metode Penelitian*. Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1998. *Metode Penelitian*. Jakarta: Karunia ESA.
- Muhtar, R. 1997. *Kemampuan Membaca Pemahaman Siswa Kelas II SMA Negeri Kota Administratif Bau-Bau Kabupaten Buton*. Tesis tidak diterbitkan. Malang: IKIP Malang.
- Munandar, S.C. Utami. 1985. *Mengembangkan Bakat dan Kreativitas Anak Sekolah: Petunjuk bagi Para Guru dan Orang Tua*. Jakarta: Gramedia Widiasarana Indonesia.
- Nunan, D. 1991. *Language Teaching Methodology: A Textbook for Teachers*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Nurhadi. 2004. *Kurikulum 2004 (Pertanyaan dan Jawaban)*. Jakarta: Grasindo
- \_\_\_\_\_, 1991. *Bagaimana Meningkatkan Kemampuan Membaca*. Bandung: Sinar Baru.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 1990. *Membaca Cepat dan Efektif (Teori dan Latihan)* Bandung: Sinar Baru.
- Nutall, C. 1982. *Teaching Reading Skills in a Foreign Language*. London: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Oktaviana. S. 2007. *Hubungan Minat Karir Dengan Penentuan Pilihan Karir Pada Remaja*. Tesis. Malang: Tidak diterbitkan.
- Pearson, P. D. and Gallgher, M. 1983. *The Instruction of Reading Comprehension*. Contemporary Educational Psychology . Vol. 8. (halam 117).
- Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional Nomor 41 Tahun 2007 tentang Standar Proses untuk Satuan Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah*.
- Peter, G. Cole, dan Chan Lorna. 1990. *Methods and Strategies for Special Educations*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Peterson dan Simington, 1991. *Teaching Reading in The Elementary Grades*. USA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Pinnell, G. S. & Fountas, I.C. 1998. *Word Matters; Teaching Phonics and Spelling in the Reading/Writing Classroom*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Pintrich, R. Schunk, 2002 *Motivation in Education: Theory, Research, and Applications*. Merrill-Prentice Hall: Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA.
- Rahayu. L, 2009. *Meningkatkan Minat Membaca pada Anak yang Mengalami Kesulitan Membaca Melalui Permainan Konstruktif*. Tesis. UMM Malang. Tidak diterbitkan.
- Reilly, Robert R., and Ernes L. Lewis. 1983. *Educational Psychology Applications for Classrom Learning and Instruction*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co. Inc.
- Richardson, J. S. & Morgan, R.F. (1997). *Reading to Learn in The Content Areas*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Rieg, Sue A. 2007. *Classroom Assessment Strategies: What do Students At-Risk and Teachers Perceive as Effective and Useful?*. Journal of Instructional Psychology. (halaman 16).
- Rosenblatt, L. (1993). *Literature as exploration*. New York: Modern Language Association of America.
- Sinambela, N. L. 1993. *Hubungan Minat Membaca dengan Kreativitas*. Yogyakarta : Fakultas Psikologi Universitas Gadjah Mada.
- Sitepu, BP. 1998. *Pengembangan Minat Baca di Sekolah*. Buletin Pusat Perbukuan. November Nomor 04. Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. Jakarta.

- Slameto, 2005. *Belajar dan Faktor yang Mempengaruhi*. Jakarta: Penerbit Rineka Cipta.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 1991. *Belajar dan faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhi*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Smith, C., 1987. *Teaching in Secondary School Content Subjects: A Book of Thinking Process*. New York: Holt, and Winston.
- Smith, F. 1985. *Reading*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 1982. *Understanding Reading*. New York Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Stauffer, R. G. 1996. *Directing Reading Maturity As a Cognitive Process*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Tampubolon, D. P1990. *Kemampuan Membaca: Teknik Membaca Efektif dan Efisien*. Bandung: Angkasa.
- Turner, Thomas, N. 1988. *Comprehension Reading For Meaning*. Dalam Aleksander. J. Estill. 1988. *Teacing Reading*. Boston: scott, Foresman And Company.
- Vacca, J. A. Vacca, R. T., 1999. *Content Area Reading: Literacy and Learning Across the Curriculum*. Bostonb: Addison- Wesley Educational Publishers.
- Vera Ginting, 2009. Strengthening the School Environment and Facilities to Read the Basic Reading Skills and Reading Interests Indonesian Students. *Journal Education Language*.(page1).
- Wainwright, G. 2001. *Speed Reading Better Recalling*. Terjemahan oleh Heru Sutrisno. 2006. Jakarta: Gramedia.

## Attachment

Tabel 4. 1. Table 1. Summary Testing Results

Source	Type III Sum Of Squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig
Model	354927.331a	9	394436.370	374.836	.000
Model	6158.775	2	3079.387	29.269	.000
Minat	2053.618	2	1026.809	9.760	.000
Model	1109.948	4	277.487	2.639	.041
Eror	7364.669	70	105.210		
Total	362292.000	79			

a. Rsquared = 9.80 (Ajusted R Squared =.977)

**Samsu Somadayo** was born in the Village District Orimakurunga Kayoa South Halmahera of North Maluku on date March, 6 1982. Primary and secondary education has gone through in the South Halmahera. The End Primary School in 1994. Junior High School in 1997 and completed high school in 2000. Education S1 (bachelor) he traveled in the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education (Guidance and Counseling) State University Study Program Khairun Ternate Indonesian Language and Literature. Education that he completed in 2004. S2 education he traveled in graduate Universita Malang in 2006-2008 While still a student, he was active in student organizations at the majors (HMJ) Indonesian Language and Literature and a member of the Student Senate FKIP State University Khairun Ternate. Organizations that follow are extra Indonesian Islamic Students Movement (PMII) branch Ternate. His career as a lecturer began in October 2004 as a professor of language and literature at the State University of Indonesia Khairun Ternate until now. In July 2010, he had the opportunity to attend educational doctoral program in education Indonesian Language and Literature at the University Eleven March.



This academic article was published by The International Institute for Science, Technology and Education (IISTE). The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open Access Publishing service based in the U.S. and Europe. The aim of the institute is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the publisher can be found in the IISTE's homepage:

<http://www.iiste.org>

## CALL FOR PAPERS

The IISTE is currently hosting more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals and collaborating with academic institutions around the world. There's no deadline for submission. **Prospective authors of IISTE journals can find the submission instruction on the following page:** <http://www.iiste.org/Journals/>

The IISTE editorial team promises to review and publish all the qualified submissions in a **fast** manner. All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Printed version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

## IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digital Library, NewJour, Google Scholar

