The Use of Small Group Discussion with Directed Activities Related to Texts (DARTs) Technique in Reading Comprehension

Dian Rachmawati
University of Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa, e-mail: drdian@gmail.com
R. Alpha Amirrachman
University of Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa, e-mail:
alpha.amirrachman@untirta.ac.id
Dina Rachmawati
University of Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa, e-mail: dina@untirta.ac.id

Abstract

The objective of this study was to find out the effect of the use of small group discussion with DARTs technique in improving students' reading comprehension. Quantitative research was employed by applying a quasi-experimental design. The population of this study was the tenth-grade students of SMK YP Fatahillah 1 Kramatwatu. 62 students were chosen as the sample which was divided into two groups. The groups were put into experimental group and control group. The reading test was used as the instrument of this research (pre-test and post-test). The data were analyzed by using normality test, test of homogeneity and hypothesis test (t-test). Data analysis revealed that the calculated t was higher than the value of t-table from 0.05 level of significance and degree freedom (df) 60 of two-tailed test. That was $7.921 \geq 2.000$. It means that the null hypothesis (H_O) was rejected and alternative hypothesis $(H)_a$ was accepted. It indicated that there was an effect of the use of small group discussion with DARTs technique towards students' reading comprehension. This study concludes that small group discussion with DARTs technique can be implemented by the English teacher to help students to improve their reading comprehension.

Keyword: *Effect, DARTs, Reading Comprehension, Small Group Discussion*

INTRODUCTION

Reading is important for students in learning English because it helps them to get information from comprehending a text. In an educational setting, reading is inferred to be the main course for acquiring new information and obtaining access to substitute explanations and interpretations (Celce-Murcia, 2001). It is very essential considering it can build up students' general language skills in English; helping students to think in English, enlarging students' English vocabulary, improving their

writing, moreover reading is also can be a great way to attain about new ideas, facts and experiences (Mickulecky & Jeffries, 2004). It can be inferred that reading is important as a basic tool for students to learn and gain new information.

In the context of teaching and learning process, based on the researcher's teaching practice experience in Vocational High School (SMK) YP Fatahillah 1 Kramatwatu it is found that students had reading problem. They had some difficulties in comprehending English text such as finding the meaning of certain words, finding out the main ideas and got detailed information from the English text. In this case, a particular teaching technique is needed to improve students' reading comprehension.

Furthermore, there are lots of teaching techniques in teaching reading, such as jigsaw, brain storming, think pair and share (TPS), and one of them is small group discussion. It is a learning technique by forming a group to pursue the objectives of learning which can make the students interact with their friends in solving the problem, communicating actively, building team work and participating in taking decision (Djamarah, 2006). Thus, it means that small group discussion can affecting the students to study enthusiastically in teaching and learning process.

Related to small group discussion technique in teaching reading, a lot of studies have been done, for example Sari (2016), Rizki (2017) and Indah (2018). Those studies revealed the use of small group discussion technique improved students' reading comprehension. However, those studies only focus on small group discussion technique with conventional way, where the students divided into small group to discuss the topic and present it in front of the class. Furthermore, those studies used pre-experimental design with one group pretest-posttest design as the research design, and the population of the studies was students on tenth and eleventh grade in senior high school (SMA).

Considering this study interested to use Directed Activities Related to Texts (DARTs) as additional technique in teaching reading using small group discussion technique. Furthermore, quasi experimental with non-equivalent design used as the research design and was conducted in SMK YP Fatahillah 1 Kramatwatu on tenth grade. It was intended to find out how is the use of small group discussion with DARTs technique towards students' reading comprehension because it can make students collaborate with the text in order to improve their reading comprehension and make them critical readers.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study intended to find out the use of small group discussion with DARTs technique towards student's reading comprehension. Thus, quantitative design particularly quasi-experimental non-equivalent (pre-test and post-test) control group design was employed in this study. Quantitative is the investigator identifies a research problem based on trends in the field or on the need to provide an explanation for why something takes place (Creswell, 2012). In quasi-experiments, the investigator uses control and experimental groups however does no longer randomly assign participants to the groups, for example, they may be intact groups available to the researcher (Creswell, 2012). In this design, a popular approach to quasi-experiments, the experimental Group A and the control Group B are selected without random assignment, both groups take a pre-test and post-test but only the experimental group receives the treatment (Creswell, 2012). Thus, the researcher was not randomly assigned participants to groups because the class was already formed, the design as follows:

Figure 1: Non-equivalent (Pre-test and Post-test)
Control Group Design (Creswell, 2012)

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{Group A } T1 \text{ X } T2 \\ \hline \text{Group B } T1 - T2 \end{array}$$

Notes:
Group A: experimental group
Group B: control group
T1   : pre-test
T2   : post-test
X   : treatment in experimental group (small group discussion technique with DARTs method)
       : treatment in control group (conventional method)

Based on the table above, the researcher used two classes. The classes were divided into two groups. The first class was A group as the experimental class and the second class was B group as the control class. The pre-test was given to both of the classes before the treatment. The researcher only taught the students in experimental class by using small group discussion with DARTs technique. Meanwhile, the conventional method was used in control class. After two meetings, post-test was given to both classes to know if there was any significance different score in students' reading comprehension especially in narrative text using small group discussion with DARTs technique.

This research was conducted in SMK YP Fatahillah 1 Kramatwatu located in Jl. Griya Serdang Indah No. 229 Serdang, Kramatwatu, regency of Serang and the participants were two classes as experimental group and control group. Each class consists of 31 students.

Data of research was collected by conducting tests as the instrument of this research. The tests were consisted of pre-test and post-test. The purpose was to know if there was any significance different score before and after the treatment was given.

Pre-test was conducted before the treatment. The pre-test was given to the students both of experimental and control class which consisted of 35 multiple choices items about legend story related to narrative text. The score was given by the researcher based on students' correct answers.

Figure 2: Scoring Calculation (Brown, 2004)

$$Score = \frac{Students'\ correct\ answer}{Total\ number\ of\ item} X\ 100$$

Post-test was conducted after the treatment. The post-test was given to the students both of experimental and control group which consisted of 35 multiple choices items about legend story related to narrative text. The score was given by the researcher also based on students' correct answers with the same scoring calculation of pre-test. The pre-test and post-test test items was formulated based on the following table.

Table 1: Rubrics of Reading Comprehension Assessment (Narrative Text)

Reading Comprehension Assesment	Text 1	Text 2	Text 3	Text 4	Text 5	Text 6	Text 7
Identify legend story	1	8	15				
Analyze character, setting, and social functions of legend story.	2, 3, 4	9, 10, 11	16, 17, 18				
Linguistics features	5, 6, 7	12, 13, 14	19, 20, 21				
				22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27	28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33		
The structure of narrative text						34	35

To get validity of the test, researcher used content validity which measure the content of the test based on the program. Content validity is useful when the possibilities of the tests are well known and easily identifiable (Creswell, 2012). It means content validity can be done by asking help from the expert of the English teacher in that school to analyze whether the concept of the test is valid or not. This technique was done by proposing a test which based on the curriculum.

Table 2: Core Competence and Main Competence
in Curriculum 2013

Core Competence	Basic Competence
3. Understanding, applying, analyzing factual, conceptual, procedural knowledge based on curiosity about science, technology, art, culture, and humanities with human, national, state, and civilization insights related to the causes of phenomena and events, and applying procedural knowledge to specific fields of study according to their talents and interests to solve problems.	3.9. Analyzing social functions, text structure, and linguistic elements in simple narrative texts in the form of folk legends, according to the context of their use.
4. Processing, reasoning, and serving in the realm of concrete and abstract domains related to the development of what they learn in school independently, and are able to use methods according to scientific principles.	4.15. Understanding the meaning of spoken and written narrative texts in the form of simple legends.

In order to get the reliability in this research, the researcher used test-retest reliability. The test–retest reliability procedure examines the extent to which scores from one sample are stable over time from one test administration to another (Creswell, 2012). To determine this form of reliability, the researcher administers the test at two different times to the same participants at a sufficient time interval.

The researcher used Pearson's Product Moment Correlation formula to know the reliability of test as follows:

Figure 3: Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Formula

$$r = \frac{\sum xy}{\sqrt{(\sum x^2)(\sum y)^2}}$$

Notes:

r : Pearson correlation coefficient

x: Score in the first variable

y: Score in the second variable

∑xy: The sum of the product of two paired score

The criteria of reliability as follows:

Table 3: Pearson Product Moment Correlation (Pearson's r)

< 0.2	= very weak relationship
0.2 – 0.4	= weak relationship
0.4 – 0.6	= moderate relationship
0.6 – 0.8	= strong relationship
> 0.8	= very strong relationship

The data were analyzed by the researcher using normality of test, homogeneity of test, and hypothesis test. Normality test was used to determine whether a data is set well modeled by a normal distribution or not. The aim was to know if the data was distributed normally. To measure the normality, the researcher used Kolmogorov-Smirnov test with significance level 0.05 (5%). The criteria to know if the data is normal or not are as follows:

a. Ho: If the significance value ≥ K-S table, the data distribution is not normal.

b. Ha: If the significance value ≤ K-S table, the data distribution is normal.

Homogeneity test was used to determine data variation, whether the data has a homogeneous variance or not. The researcher used Homogeneity of Variances Test with the level of significance value is 0.05 (5%). The criteria as follow:

a. If Fcount ≥ Ftable, then the data distribution is not homogeneous

b. If Fcount ≤ Ftable, then the data distribution is homogeneous

Hypothesis test was used to analyze the significant differences between post-test means score of experimental and control groups by using t-test (two tailed t-test).The alpha level will be setted at 0.05 as follows:

Figure 4: T-test (Two Tailed T-test) Formula (Gay & Mills, 2011)

$$T_{count} = \frac{M_x - M_y}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\sum X^2 + \sum Y^2}{N_X + N_Y - 2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{N_X} + \frac{1}{N_Y}\right)}}$$

Notes:

T_count   : T-test

M_x   : Mean score of experimental group (X)

M_y   : Mean of control group (Y)
N_x   : Number of students in experimental group
N_y   : Number of students in control group
ΣX2   : The sum of quadrate deviation of experimental group
ΣY2   : The sum of quadrate deviation of control group

The criteria of the testing as follows:
If $tcount \geq ttable$ = H_O refused, H_a accepted
If $tcount \leq ttable.$ = H_O accepted⟦,H⟧_a refused.

FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION

Findings

    The objective of this study was to find out whether there was effect of the use small group discussion with DARTs technique in improving students' reading comprehension. The hypothesis test of this research showed that ttable with the level of significant 0.05 and freedom degree (df) 60 of two-tailed test was 2.000 and the value of tcount was 7.921. The computation showed that tcount was higher than ttable or or 7.921 ≥ 2.000. It means that the null hypothesis (H_O) was rejected and alternative hypothesis ⟦(H⟧_a) was accepted. Therefore, there was an effect of use small group discussion with DARTs technique in improving students' reading comprehension. As illustrated in the following t-calculation

$$t_{count} = \frac{M_x - M_y}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\sum X^2 + \sum Y^2}{N_X + N_Y - 2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{N_X} + \frac{1}{N_Y}\right)}}$$

$$t_{count} = \frac{27.93 - 7.10}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{5921.79 + 993.81}{31 + 31 - 2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{31} + \frac{1}{31}\right)}}$$

$$t_{count} = \frac{20.83}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{6915.6}{60}\right)\left(\frac{2}{31}\right)}}$$

$$t_{count} = \frac{20.83}{\sqrt{(115.26)(0.06)}}$$

$$t_{count} = \frac{20.83}{\sqrt{(115.26)(0.06)}}$$

$$t_{count} = \frac{20.83}{2.62975} = \mathbf{7.921}$$

    For further data of discussion or description is presented in the following descriptive statistic table. The data analysis showed that calculated as follows

Table 4: Descriptive Statistic Table

No.	Result	Pre-test		Post-test	
		E	C	E	C
1	Mean	50,14	53,36	78,06	60,46
2	Median	40,00	60,00	85,71	65,71
3	Min. Score	17,14	17,14	20,00	20,00
4	Max. Score	82,86	85,71	100,00	97,14
5	Standard Deviation	20,28	22,31	18,22	22,64

To determine content validity in this research, validity sheet was compared to 2013 Curriculum (K13) of tenth grade of vocational high school. This research was analyzed by expert of English Teacher whether the content of the test was valid or not. Thus, the validity did not need a trial and statistic analysis. The parameter of the validity of the test shown by the following table:

Table 5: Content Validity

Basic Competence	3.9 Analyzing social functions, text structure, and linguistic elements in simple narrative texts in the form of folk legends, according to the context of their use. 4.16 Understanding the meaning of spoken and written narrative texts in the form of simple legend story.
Indicator	• Students should be able to explain simple folk legend. • Students should be able to sort the structure of narrative text • Students should be able to know the language features of narrative text • Students should be able to analyze the character, setting, and moral value in the simple legend story.
Technique	Small group discussion with DARTs technique
Media	Presentation (slide) and Video Learning
Instrument of Test	**Pre-test** The test was consisted of 35 multiple choice items about legend story related to narrative text. **Post-test** The test was consisted of 35 multiple choice items about legend story related to narrative text.
Time Allocation	6 X 45 Minutes

To find the reliability of the test, researcher used test-retest reliability. To determine this form of reliability, the researcher administered the test at two different times to the same participants at a sufficient time interval.

Table 6: Test-retest Reliability

SUBJECT	r	Criteria
Control Group	0.96837	Very Strong Relationship
Experimental Group	0.74724	Strong Relationship

Based on the table above, the pearson product moment correlation coefficient of experimental class and control class were interpreted by using Pearson's r table and it showed that the test were reliable and could be used as a research instrument.

The pre-test scores were gotten from the students' score before the researcher gave the treatment in experimental group. The same pre-test was conducted in both of control group and experimental group. X TMI 8 as control group consisted of 31 students and X TMI 6 as experimental group consisted of 31 students.

Table 7: Result of Pre-test

Specification	Control Group	Experimental Group
Mean	53.36	50.14
Maximum Score	85.71	82.86
Minimum Score	17.14	17.14

The table showed that the control group had higher maximum score than experimental group. Meanwhile, the minimum score between control group and experimental group were same. The result control group mean score and experimental group mean score were different. The mean of experimental group was lower than control group or $50.14 \leq 53.36$.

The post test scores were gotten from students' score after the researcher gave the treatment in experimental group. Control group and experimental group got the same post-test.

Table 8: Result of Post-test

Specification	Control Group	Experimental Group
Mean	60.46	78.06
Maximum Score	97.14	100.00
Minimum Score	20.00	20.00

The table showed that the experimental group had higher maximum score than control group. Meanwhile, the minimum score between control group and experimental group were same. The result of control group mean score and experimental group mean score were

different. The mean score of experimental group was higher than the mean score of control group or $100.00 \geq 97.14$.

To know if the data was distributed normally, the researcher used *Kolmogorov-Smirnov* test to measure the normality. The test was normally distributed if the significance value ≤ K-S table. The test of normality focus on pre-test and post-test of control group and experimental group.

Table 9: Normality of Pre-Test in Control Group

Auxilary Table		if Dcount ≤ K-S table (0,05,31-1) so it was normally distributed			
M	53.36	D1 Max	0.2002	K-S table	0.240
Standard Deviation (s)	22.68	D2 Max	0.2186	(0,05-n-1)	
		Dcount (Largest of D)	0.2186	decision	NORMAL

Based on the result of normality of pre-test in control group above, the value of Dcount was 0.2186. Meanwhile, the value of K-S table was 0.240 with the level of significance 0.05 (5%). It can be concluded that the value of Dcount was lower than K-S table or 0.2186 ≤ 0.240 and the pre-test of control group was normally distributed.

Table 10: Normality of Pre-Test in Experimental Group

Auxilary Table		if Dcount ≤ K-S table (0,05,31-1) so it was normally distributed			
M	50.14	D1 Max	0.1290	K-S table	0.240
Standard Deviation (s)	20.61	D2 Max	0.2225	(0,05-n-1)	
		Dcount (Largest of D)	0.2225	decision	NORMAL

Based on the result of normality pre-test in experimental group above, the value of Dcount was 0.2225. Meanwhile, the value of K-S table was 0.240 with the level of significance 0.05 (5%). It can be concluded that the value of Dcount was lower than K-S table or 0.2225 ≤ 0.240 and the pre-test of experimental group was normally distributed.

Table 11: Normality of Post-Test in Control Group

Auxilary Table		if Dcount ≤ K-S table (0.05.31-1) so it was normally distributed			
M	60.46	D1 Max	0.1647	K-S table	0.240
Standard Deviation (s)	23.01	D2 Max	0.1332	(0.05-n-1)	
		Dcount (Largest of D)	0.1647	decision	NORMAL

Based on the result of normality of pre-test in control group above, the value of Dcount was 0.1647. Meanwhile, the value of K-S table was 0.240 with the level of significance 0.05 (5%). It can be concluded that the value of Dcount was lower than K-S table or 0.1647 ≤ 0.240 and the pre-test of control group was normally distributed.

Table 12: Normality of Post-Test in Experimental Group

Auxilary Table		if Dcount ≤ K-S table (0.05.31-1) so it was normally distributed			
M	78,06	D1 Max	0,1752	K-S table (0.05-n-1)	0.240
Standard Deviation (s)	18,52	D2 Max	0,1190		
		Dcount (Largest of D)	0,1752	decision	NORMAL

Based on the result of normality of pre-test in experimental group above, the value of Dcount was 0.1752. Meanwhile, the value of K-S table was 0.240 with the level of significance 0.05 (5%). It can be concluded that the value of Dcount was lower than K-S table or 0.1752 ≤ 0.240 and the pre-test of experimental group was normally distributed.

Homogeneity test was used in order to find out the homogeneity or similarity between control group and experimental group. The researcher used F_{test} formula, the result of data was homogenous if the value of F_{count} was lower than F_{table} or $F_{count} \leq F_{table}$.

Table 13: Variance Homogeneity of Pre-Test

Instrument	Group	Sample (N)	Standard Deviation (S)	F_{count}	F_{table}
Pre-test	Control	31	22.68	1.004	4.196
Pre-test	Experimental	31	20.61		

Based on the result of homogeneity variance of pre-test in control group and experimental group, it was calculated $F_{count} \leq F_{table}$ or 1.1004 ≤ 4.196. It can be concluded that the data of pre-test in control group and experimental group was homogenous.

Table 14: Variance Homogeneity of Post-Test

Instrument	Group	Sample (N)	Standard Deviation (S)	F_{count}	F_{table}
Post-test	Control	31	23.01	1.2424	4.196
Post-test	Experimental	31	18.52		

Based on the result of homogeneity variance of post-test in control group and experimental group, it was calculated $F_{count} \leq F_{table}$ or 1.2424 ≤ 4.196. It can be concluded that the data of post-test in control group and experimental group was homogenous.

The researcher used two tailed t-test formula and compared t_{count} with t_{table} at a given level of significance 0.05 and degree freedome (df) 60 of two-tailed test was 2.000, to prove the hypothesis "there is an effect of the use of small group discussion with DARTs technique in improving students' reading comprehension".

Table 15: Hypothesis Testing (Two Tailed T-test)

Group	N	Mean	Sum of Quadtrate Deviation	t_{count}	t_{table}
Experimental	31	27.93	5921.79	7.921	2.000
Control	31	7.10	993.81		

Based on the computation, it was obtained that t_{count} was higher than t_{table} (7.921 ≥ 2.000). It could be concluded that the null hypothesis (H_o) was rejected and the alternative hypothesis (H_a) was accepted. In addition, there was an effect of the use of small group discussionx with DARTs technique in improving students' reading comprehension.

Interpretation

Based on the research methodology, the researcher conducted quasi-experimental non-equivalent pre-test and post-test group research design. This study was held on April 27th until May 28th 2020, located in SMK YP Fatahillah 1 Kramatwatu. The researcher took two classes as the samples. The classes were X TMI 6 as the experimental group consisting of 31 students who were taught by using small group discussion with DARTs technique and X TMI 8 as the control group consisting 31 students who were taught by using conventional method.

The researcher used test as the instrument to know if there was any significance different score in students reading comprehension especially in narrative text using small group discussion with DARTs technique. The test divided into pre-test and post-test. The test were conducted to get the data of students' reading comprehension.

In this research, the first step was administering pre-test in experimental group on 27th April 2020, meanwhile in control group was on 1th May 2020 by giving reading test. There are some technique that can be used to test reading skills, those are; multiple choices, true/false and completion (Isnawati, 2012). Thus, the multiple choices was chosen to test students' reading comprehension which consisted of 35 items about narrative text (legend story). The time allocation was 90 minutes. Pre-test was given to the 62 students of experimental and control group to measure their ability before being given a treatment. The test was given to know students' basic knowledge before they got treatment.

After getting the result of pre-test, the two groups were given a different treatment. The first meeting for giving treatment in experimental group was conducted on May 4th 2020 and the second meeting was on May 11th 2020. The experimental group got a treatment by using small group discussion with DARTs technique. Meanwhile, the control group was taught by conventional method where the students divided into small group to discuss and review the topic. The last step, the researcher was administering post-test on May 25th 2020 by giving reading test. The form of post-test is the same multiple choices items of pre-test which consisted of 35 questions about narrative text (legend story) with the time allocation was 90 minutes. Post-test was given to 62 students of experimental and control group to measure their ability after being given a treatment. The post-test was conducted in the last meeting and only one meeting.

Due to the pandemic Covid-19, teaching and learning process in the school was closed. Teachers and students were prohibited to conduct teaching and learning process in the class. So, the data was collected and the treatment was given by the researcher through online learning. Online learning concern more than just the presentation and delivery of materials using the Web: the learner and the learning process should be the focus of online learning. The Web can be used as the media to deliver instruction to inaccessible audience; it is an innovative approach in online instruction (Khan, 1977). In this case, WhatsApp is chosen as the media to conduct teaching and learning process. It is chosen because the students were familiar with the application and it was so easy for the researcher to deliver material and form a group for the treatment using small group discussion with DARTs technique, where the researcher should divided students into small group to make the teaching and learning process more effective. It is a learning technique by forming a group to pursue the objectives of learning which can make the students interact with their friends in solving the problem, communicating actively, building team work and participating in taking decision (Djamarah, 2006). So, the students were divided into small group which consist of six until seven students to discuss the material with their teammates. Meanwhile, Google Form was used by the researcher to collect the data.

After getting all of the test results, the researcher calculated and analyzed the data. This research was intended to find out the effect of the use small group discussion with DARTs technique in improving students' reading comprehension. The research question is to know the effect of small group discussion with DARTs technique in reading comprehension. Based on the formula, the result of statistic calculation indicated that the value of ttable with the level of significant 0.05 and freedom degree (df) 60 of two-tailed test is 2.000 and the value of tcount is 7.921. The computation showed that tcount was higher than ttable or 7.921 ≥ 2.000,

so the alternative hypothesis〖 (H〗_a) is accepted and the null hypothesis is rejected.

Based on the explanation about the result of the table, it can be concluded that using small group discussion with DARTs technique in teaching reading was succeed in increasing students' score in reading comprehension. From the data above, students' score can be increased after the use of DARTs. Moreover, it can be said that using DARTs affected students' achievement in reading score.

Therefore, by using DARTs is significant in teaching reading compared to the use of conventional method. It can be inferred that there is significant difference between students' reading score who were taught by using DARTs and who were taught without using DARTs. The effect of the use small group discussion with DARTs technique towards students' reading comprehension can be seen from the score of experimental class students which increased after DARTs was applied in the class.

In addition, DARTs encouraged students to read text in more detail and develop the text more than just getting the text understanding. Students enjoyed the class; they become more focus in how the texts were organized and try to find out information also the meaning of certain words from the texts with the help of their teammates.

This study confirm the definition and the advantages of DARTs which was stated by Vester (2008:1), "DARTs is an activity which make students collaborate with the text; it can be conducted by individual or groups" and "The advantages of DARTs are improving students' reading comprehension, the students focus on how texts are constructed, and improving students' cognitive in learning".

From explanation above, the researcher assumed that there was an effect of using small group discussion with DARTs technique in improving students' reading comprehension. It was indicated by the students' significant difference between students' reading comprehension from the experimental group that received treatment and the control group that did not receive treatment. Students in experimental group got a better score in reading comprehension then students' from the control group, both students in experimental and control group showed that there was an improvement of the score after treatment; the score from experimental group was higher than the control group. Therefore, it is believed that the small group discussion with DARTs technique can be an option for teachers to improve students' reading comprehension.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Based on the analysis of the data, the hypothesis, and the discussion in the previous chapter was revealed that there was an effect of using small group discussion technique with DARTs method in improving students' reading comprehension.

This statement is supported by the result of the scores of the students in experimental group which mostly increased from the pre-test and post-test after the treatment. It can be proven by the increasing of students' pre-test and post-test mean scores. The mean score before the treatment is 50.14, while the score after given treatment is 78.06. In addition, the result of t-count is 7.921. Then, the researcher consults the critical value on the t-table using the 5% (0.05) alpha level significance and the degree freedom is 2.000. It shows that the t-count is higher than t-table (7.921 ≥ 2.000). It can be concluded that there was an effect of using small group discussion technique with DARTs method in improving students' reading comprehension.

Meanwhile, for the suggestions, based on the research observation by using small group discussion technique with DART method is appropriate and applicable in teaching reading. English teacher should make a creative and effective strategy in teaching reading. Therefore, the teacher can try to use small group discussion technique with DARTs method as a proper method for the classroom activities especially in teaching reading. The reason is that because through small group discussion technique with DART method can make the students become more active to share their opinion about the text and also makes the students engaged with the text. The students can solve their problem like finding out the meaning of certain words in English, finding out the main idea and got information from English text through small group discussion technique with DARTs method.

The researcher hopes for the further researcher to conduct a research which related to use small group discussion technique with DARTs method in teaching reading can be more detail and conduct the research in different field by using qualitative research design or classroom action research to know whether the use of small group discussion technique in reading comprehension is even more effective or not for teaching reading.

In addition, there was some obstacles in conducting this study. Due to the pandemic Covid-19, teaching and learning process in the school was closed. Teachers and students were prohibited to conduct teaching and learning process in the class. Thus, the researcher prepared another strategy to conduct treatment and collect the data. It was done through

online learning. In this case, the further researcher must be prepared in facing any obstacles that occur when doing the research.

REFERENCES

Celce-Murcia, M. 2001. Teaching English as Second or Foreign Language (3rd ed.). USA: Thomson Learning Inc.

Creswell. 2012. Reseach Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches. California: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Djamarah, S. 2006. Strategi Belajar Mengajar. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Gay, R. L., & Mills, E. J. 2011. Educational Research: Competencies (10th ed.).

Interacting with Texts-Directed Activities related to Texts (DARTs) (2003). Available at http://TeachingEnglishBritishCouncilBBC.htm. (Accessed 21 July 2020).

Isnawati, I. 2012. English Instructional Evaluation 1. State Islamic College of Tulungagung.

Khan, B. 1977. Web-based instruction: What is it and why is it? In B. H. Khan (Ed.), Web-based instruction . Englewood Cliffs: NJ: Educational Technology Publications. .