

Using Cooperative Discussion Questioning (Coop-Dis-Q) Strategy toward Narrative Reading to the Tenth Grade Students of MA Al-Fatah Palembang

Mirrah Salsabila^{1*}, KMS Badaruddin¹, ST Zailia¹

¹Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Fatah Palembang

*Corresponding Email: mirrahbadar@gmail.com

Abstract:

The objectives of this study were to find out whether or not there was a significant difference in reading comprehension achievement between the tenth grade students of MA Al-Fatah Palembang who are taught by using Coop-Dis-Q strategy and those who are not, and to find out whether or not there was a significant improvement before and after the treatments on students' narrative reading comprehension achievement taught by using Coop-Dis-Q strategy at the tenth grade of MA Al-Fatah Palembang. The sample was 70 students. In collecting the data, the test was given twice to experimental and control groups, as a pretest and posttest. The data were analyzed by using independent sample t-test and paired sample t-test in SPSS 20 program. The finding showed that the p-output (sig.(2-tailed)) was 0.004 lower than 0.05 and the t-value 2.990 was higher than t-table 1.667. Therefore it could be stated that the null hypothesis (Ho) was rejected and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) was accepted. It

means that narrative reading comprehension by using Coop-Dis-Q strategy had a significant improvement on the students' reading comprehension achievement.

Keywords:

Reading comprehension;
Coop-Dis-Q strategy;
Narrative text

Received: 28 June 2022

Revised: 03 July 2022

Accepted: 04 July 2022

INTRODUCTION

Reading is one of skills in English. Alyousef (2005) states that reading can be seen as an “interactive” process between a reader and a text which leads to automaticity or (reading fluency). According to Hibbard and Wagner (2013), reading is a complex behavior including decoding words, developing fluency, and improving comprehension. Perfetti (2001) defines reading skill as an individuals’ standing on some reading assessment. Skilled readers are those whose score above some standard on this assessment; readers of low skill are those whose score below some standard. In addition, reading has been emphasized in the holy Qur’an as follows:

“Certainly did Allah confer (great) favor upon the believers when He sent among them a Messenger from themselves, reciting to them His verses and purifying them and teaching them the Book and wisdom, although they had been before in manifest error (Al-imran: 164). The verse above explains that Allah had sent among His believers a Messenger of Allah SWT (the prophet Muhammad SAW), the prophet had recited to them the Qurán, and he also had taught the Qurán and Hadisth”.

Reading has an important role in English. According to Anderson (2003), reading is an essential skill for learners of English. For most of learners, it is the most important skill to master in order to ensure success in learning. With strengthened reading skills, learners of English tend to make greater progress in other areas of language learning. In addition, Abdullah, Sabapathy, Theethappan, and Hassan (2012) state that reading is the most integral part in language learning. It enables students of a higher learning to open the window to the outside world as readers with strengthened reading skills will be able to progress and attain greater development in all academic areas.

In Indonesia, the teachers have to teach English on the basis of national curriculum called KTSP 2006. In basic competencies of learning English at the tenth grade students of senior high school level, the learners enable to respond the meaning and rhetorical steps in essay by using a variety of language accurately in the context of everyday life in the text form: recount, narrative, and procedure. Narrative text is one of texts in reading. The researcher found out that the students of MA Al-Fatah have lack ability to answer the items of narrative reading text. It was proved that out from 70 students there were only 33 students who can reach kkm level (≥ 75). Therefore, the reseacher assumed that the students had difficulties in learning

narrative text. For this reason the researcher will focus on the study in narrative reading text.

Based on the researchers' preliminary study on October 24th, 2015 at MA Al-Fatah Palembang, the researcher did informal interview with the teacher related to some information acquired on students' learning problem that happened when the teacher of English teaches narrative reading text. The researcher also did informal interview with the five students of MA Al-Fatah, and the researcher gave a questionnaire about narrative texts to the twenty of the tenth grade students in MA Al-Fatah. The result showed that the students had problems in comprehending an English text, especially in narrative texts.

The problems of the tenth grade students in MA Al-Fatah included, 1) the students had difficulty in comprehending the content of narrative text, 2) the students had difficulty in understanding the meaning of narrative text, 3) the students had difficulty in answering the questions of narrative text, and 4) the students had difficulty in expressing their thought.

Based on the problems, the teachers need a new concept and appropriate strategy in teaching reading. There are a new strategy and concept in reading comprehension, developed by Gauthier (2001) of the University of Houston. The strategy is Cooperative Discussion and Questioning (Coop-Dis-Q) strategy. Gauthier (2001) mentions that Coop-Dis-Q strategy is developed by taking all three elements (cooperative, discussion, and questioning) and incorporating them into one strategy. In addition, according to Rubenstein (2003), Coop-Dis-Q can assist students of various grades and reading capacities. Ravese (2006) also states that Coop-Dis-Q or cooperative, discussion, and questioning can be used with a fiction or non-fiction text.

Based on the description above, researcher would like to conduct a research study entitled "*Using Cooperative Discussion Questioning (Coop-Dis-Q) Strategy toward Narrative Reading to the Tenth Grade Students of MA Al-Fatah Palembang.*"

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Concept of Teaching Reading Comprehension

Teaching is a process in transferring the knowledge. Harmer (2007) defines teaching as "transmissions" of knowledge from teacher to students. According to Brown (2007):

"Teaching is guiding and facilitating learning, enabling the learners to learn, setting conditions for learning, the teacher's understanding of how the learner learns will determine his or her philosophy of education, teaching style, approach, methods and techniques. Moreover, teaching may be defined as showing or helping someone to

learn how to do something, giving instructions, guiding in the study of something, providing with knowledge, causing to know or understand.”

According to Pang, Muaka, Bernhardt, and Kamil (2003), reading is about understanding written texts. It is a complex activity that involves both perception and thought. Reading consists of two related processes: word recognition and comprehension. Duffy (2009) mentions that the main thing in reading is to develop students who read. Saricoban (2002) states that reading is not only a receptive skill, but also an active one in that it primarily includes the cognitive abilities such as predicting and guessing. In addition, Snow and Chair (2002) mention that the reading activity involves one or more purposes or tasks, some operations to process the text, and the outcomes of performing the activity, all of which occur within some specific context.

Reading is an important skill in English. According to Kamil, Bernhardt, Muaka, and Pang (2003), learning to read is an important educational goal. For both children and adults, the ability to read opens up new worlds and opportunities. Based on research by Hollingsworth, Sherman and Zaugra (2007), 70% of student thought reading is important. Richards and Renandya (2002) state that many foreign language students often have reading as one of their most important goals.

Reading is not just decoding from a foreign language to a mother tongue. Some people think it is a process of transferring letters, from print pages to sounds. However, reading is more complex than this. Reading involves recognizing and comprehending words and sentence patterns (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007). According to Harmer (2001), there are two methods of understanding the content of reading in English, both methods of reading are *bottom-up* and *top-down*. *Bottom-up* method is a way of reading is done by first recognize the various signs of linguistics, such as letter, morphemes, syllable, word, phrase, dicourse markers, and the use of the mechanism of the process of linguistic data that will be used as cues. *Top-down* method is a process of reading, which focuses on an overview and understands the text content in general or as a whole.

Richards and Renandya (2002) define reading for comprehension as the primary purpose for reading (though this is sometimes overlooked when students are asked to read overly difficult texts); raising student awareness of main ideas in a text and exploring the organization of a text are essential for good comprehension. Wooley (2011) states that reading comprehension is a process of making meaning from text. The goal, therefore, is to gain an overall understanding of what is described in the text rather than to obtain meaning from isolated words or sentences. According to Duffy (2009), reading

comprehension depends on prior knowledge or knowledge about the world. Prior knowledge is expressed with words. Pardo (2004) also mentions that comprehension is a complex process that has been understood and explained in a number of ways.

Furthermore, according to Ghelani, Sidhu, Jain and Tannock (2004), reading comprehension is multifaceted and requires the synchrony of a number of reading related processes in order to derive meaning from text. Snow and Chair (2002) begin its thinking by defining the term reading comprehension as the process of simultaneously extracting and constructing meaning through interaction and involvement with written language. It consists of three elements: the reader, the text, and the activity or purpose for reading.

The Concept of Coop-Dis-Q Strategy

Based on Hollingsworth, Sherman, and Zaugra (2007), reading comprehension is a concern for the teacher researchers. Cooperative, Discussion, Questioning (Coop-Dis-Q) strategy is a new instructional strategy for reading comprehension. Gauthier (2001) states that a new instructional technique, Cooperative Discussion and Questioning (Coop- Dis-Q) is developed by taking all three elements (cooperative, discussion and questioning) and incorporating them into one strategy. The premise is that the strength of each will augment the benefits of the other two, creating a synergistic instructional effect.

In accordance with Demirel (2012), Cooperative Discussion and Questioning (Coop-Dis-Q) whose main area is interested in reading comprehension and developing instructional strategies for readers. Coop-Dis-Q reading comprehension strategies are processed step by step. The reason behind it that Coop-Dis-Q is a reading comprehension strategy which is intended to process learning together, discussion and questioning one by one. Bender and Larkin (2009) explain that Coop-Dis-Q strategy is a strategy that incorporates three different strategies into one strategy where each strategy supporting and enhancing the effectiveness of the other while increasing reading comprehension.

Ravese (2006) states that Coop-Dis-Q or cooperative discussion and questioning can be used with a fiction or non-fiction text. Coop-Dis-Q needs students to take active roles in their group and assume responsibility for decision making at several levels (Gauthier, 2001). In Coop-Dis-Q strategy, there are three strategies –cooperative, discussion, and questioning. Based on Gauthier’s perception (2001), the three strategies are as follow:

Cooperative Learning

Cooperative learning is a concept that can serve as an umbrella over several specific instructional avenues. As such, it leaves a wide range of possibilities for implementation. A myriad of strategies fit neatly into this range and can be used to help students communicate with one another socially and academically. All in all, the premise of cooperative learning is that much more is gained by working in a group than by working individually on academic tasks. The areas of discussion and questioning, which are discussed next, offer propitious opportunities for confluence with cooperative learning. According to Takallou and Veisi (2012), cooperative learning technique is one of the group works considered as an effective technique in improving students' ability in reading.

Discussion

By laying the groundwork for discussion as an integral component of learning, the teacher conveys a respect for students' thoughts and opinions. When such a mindset is established, the likelihood of students' full participation in classroom activities increases. Gahagan (2007) states that through cooperative learning students can work out problems they are having together instead of alone. This may lead to an increase in comprehension through discussion. Discussion promotes interpersonal communication and provides students with a platform for social interactions. Omatseye (2007) also mentions that a discussion class can be most complete, effective and interactive, if at the end of discussion, a separate session is set aside to summarise and evaluate content and topic discussed. This could be done in the same class session or separate period(s)

Questioning

Instructional questions serve a formative role, as they guide the student by providing choices that can be accepted or rejected along the path of making meaning. Evaluative questions have traditionally served a summative role, assessing the amount and type of comprehension the student has acquired. Sets of questions that contain a representative mixture of instructional/ evaluative and efferent/aesthetic items have a greater chance of developing students' comprehension in a multidimensional way. Along with discussion, questioning serves as a supportive means to crystallize the intent of cooperative learning. When students work together, communicate their thoughts, and seek answers to different questions, reading comprehension has a fertile setting in which to occur.

The Concept of Narrative Text

According to Snow and Chair (2002), good comprehenders could be engaged in many different types of text. Narrative is one of reading texts that should be mastered by students because it is always used in our daily life. Fetzer (2006) defines narrative text as a story that entertains and/or informs the reader, while carrying a message resulting in a theme (a universal idea that crosses over time and culture), and/or a moral (a lesson learned from the story). Zahoor and Janjua (2013) also mention that studying narratives is significant as narrative form is an inherent tendency of human mind to construct meanings.

According to Cihodariu (2012), narratives are the most important means of fixing the meaning of events and of the social and cultural construction of reality. Kenan (2005) states that newspaper reports, history books, novels, films, comic strips, pantomime, dance, gossip, psychoanalytic sessions are only some of the narratives which permeate our lives. Abbott (2002) says:

“When we think of narrative, usually think of its art, however modest. We think of it as novel or sagas or folk or tales or, at the least, as anecdotes. We speak of a gift for telling stories. But as true as it is that narrative can be an art and that art thrives on narrative, narrative is also something we all engage in, artists and non-artists alike. We make narrative many times a day, every day of our life. And we start doing so almost from the moment we begin to putting words together. As soon as we follow a subject with a verb, there is a good chance we are engaged in narrative discourse”.

National Literacy Trust (2013) mentions that the essential purpose of narrative is to tell a story, but the detailed purpose may vary according to genre. For example, the purpose of a myth is often to explain a natural phenomenon and a legend is often intended to pass on cultural traditions or beliefs. In narrative text, there are orientation, complication, resolution and reorientation. Sarwo (2003) states that in orientation the students need to know the scene and the participants. Then, in complication, the students should find the problems occur in the story. For the resolution, the students will find how the problems are solved. Last, reorientation refers to the conclusion of a story. According to Coffman and Reed (2010), narrative has been described as having several common components including a setting, plot (series episodes based on goals, attempts, outcomes), resolution or story ending. The terms and rules of application are often referred to as the story grammar of narrative.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Based on the problems and the objectives, the method of this research was an experimental method. Fraenkel, Wallen, and Hyun (2012) state that a quasi experimental design does not include the use of a random assignment, the research who employs is design relies instead on the other techniques for controlling or at least reducing threats to the internal validity.

In this research, the researcher used the pre-test post test non equivalent groups design. This design is often used quasi experimental group in educational research (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison 2007). The design of the pre-test post-test non equivalent is as follows:

Treatment	O₁	X	O₂
Control	O₃		O₄

Where :

- : Dash line indicates that the experimental and control group have not been equated by randomization
- O₁ : The pretest of the experimental group
- O₂ : The posttest of the experimental group
- O₃ : The pretest of the control group
- O₄ : The posttest of control group
- X : Treatment in the experimental group taught by using Coop-Dis-Q strategy

Population and Sample

A target population (or the *sampling frame*) is a group of individuals (or a group of organizations) with some common defining characteristic that the researcher can identify and study. In this research, the target population was the tenth grade students of MA Al-Fatah Palembang. The total of population was 104 students that consist of three classes. There are two classes of science that consist of 70 students, and one class of social that consists of 34 students.

The sample of this research used convenience sampling technique. The researcher determined the class of sample by using teacher recommendation. The teacher recommended to take X MIA 1 class and X MIA 2 class as sample. Based on their results of pretest test, the higher score is for control group and the lower score is for experimental group. Therefore the control group is X MIA 1, and the experimental group is X MIA 2. The number of students of X MIA 1 class was 35 students and X MIA 2 class was 35 students. Therefore,

the total number of sample was 70 students. Finally, it is considered as the specific needs of the strategy used that help students with struggle readers.

Result of the Research

Validity of Each Questions Item

Validity of each question item test was used to indicate whether the test items of each question are valid or not. In doing this research, the researcher did the try out of the instrument firstly. The tryout of the test was held on Tuesday, 14th of January 2016 at 10.00 p.m-11.30 p.m. The instruments of the test were tested to 28 students to the tenth grade students of MA Muhammadiyah 1 Palembang. The result of the test was analyzed by using SPSS 20. To know whether the instruments of each questions are valid or not, the score of significance (r-output) was compared to the score of r-table product moment. If the result of the test shows that r_{count} is higher than r_{tabel} (with $N = 28$) 0.374 with sample (N) is 28 students, it means that the item is valid. In this case, there were 60 multiple choice items given to the students. It was found that there were 42 test items from 60 test items provided by the researcher which could be used as the instrument since the scores of significance were higher than 0.374. The result indicated that 18 items were invalid and 42 items were valid. In making easy when scoring, the researcher took 40 question items to be the instrument of pretest and posttest.

Content Validity

A content validity is very important since it is an accurate measure of what it is supposed to measure. In order to judge the test whether or not a test has content validity, the researcher checked the syllabus from school and then matched them into test specification.

Reliability Test

In this study, for measuring the reliability, the researcher gave try out firstly with the students and then the score of realibility test calculated by SPSS 20 software using split-half procedure with spearman-brown formula in internal consistency realibility because this method is suitable for multiple choice items. To measure the reliability test using split half method, it was found that the p-output of Gutman Split-half Coefficient is 0.730 from the score. It can be stated that the reliablity of reading test items is reliable since the p-output is higher than r-table (0.374) with sample (N) is 28 students.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

FINDING

Normality

Normality test is used to measure whether the obtained data are normal or not and to measure students' pretest and posttest score in control group and experimental group. In measuring the normality test, the researcher used one sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test in SPSS 20. The result showed that the pretest in control and experimental groups were 0.523 and 0.588. Then, in posttest in control and experimental groups were 0.538 and 0.636. It can be concluded that the data were considered normal since they are higher than 0.05.

Homogeneity Test

Homogeneity is used to measure the obtained scores whether it is homogeneous or not, and to measure student's pretest scores and posttest scores in control group and experimental groups. The score was categorized homogeneous when the p-output is higher than the mean significant difference at 0.05 levels. *Levene Statistics* in SPSS 20 is used in measuring homogeneity test. The result showed that the pretest scores in control and experimental group was 0.073, and the posttest scores in control and experimental group was 0.349 it can be concluded that the data was homogeneous since the score was higher than 0.05.

DISCUSSION

In measuring the significant improvement, the paired sample t-test was used for testing the students' pretest to posttest scores in experimental groups. It was found that the p-output is 0.000 with $df=34$ (1.690), and t-value = 11.109, It can be stated that there is a significant improvement from students' pretest to posttest scores in experimental group taught using Coop-Dis-Q strategy since p-output is lower than 0.05. It can be stated that the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis (H_a) is accepted. In measuring the significant difference, the independent sample t-test was used for testing student's posttest scores in control and experimental groups. It was found that the p-output was 0.004 and the t-value was 2.990. Since the p-output was lower than 0.05 level and the t-value (2.990) was higher than critical value of t-table ($df=68=1.672$). It can be stated that there is a significant different from students' posttest to posttest scores in control and experimental group. It can be stated that the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis (H_a) is accepted. It can be stated that there was a

significant difference on students' reading comprehension score taught by using Coop-Dis-Q strategy and those who are not at MA Al-Fatah Palembang.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings and interpretation in the previous chapter, some conclusions are made. First, there was a significant improvement on students' narrative reading comprehension achievement taught by using Cooperative Discussion and Questioning (Coop-Dis-Q) strategy. From the table analysis of the students who were taught by using Coop-Dis-Q strategy, it showed that the p-output was 0.000 and t-obtained was 11.109. Since the p-output was lower than 0.05 level and t-obtained was higher than t-table ($Df = 68 = 1.672$). Therefore, H_0 (the null hypothesis) was rejected and H_a (the alternative hypothesis) was accepted.

Second, there was a significant difference on students' narrative reading comprehension achievement between the students who are taught by using Cooperative Discussion and Questioning (Coop-Dis-Q) strategy and those who are not. From the table analysis, it was found that the p-output is 0.004 with $df=34$ (1.699), and t-value = 2.990. It can be stated that there was significant difference between students who were taught by using Cooperative, Discussion, and Questioning (Coop-Dis-Q) strategy and teacher's method.

In the last, the result of the study showed that the students who were taught by using Cooperative, Discussion, and Questioning (Coop-Dis-Q) strategy got higher score than the teacher's method. From the table analysis, the p-output was 0.000 with $df=34$ (1.699), and t-value= 11.109. Since p-output is lower than 0.05 and the t-value was higher than t-table $df=34$ (1.690). It can be stated that the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted (H_a). It can be concluded there was a significant difference on students' narrative reading achievement between those who are taught by using Coop-Dis-Q strategy and those who are not.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Acknowledgements of people, grants, funds, etc should be placed in a separate section not numbered at the very end of the paper. (Times New Roman, 12-point, 1.0 Spacing).

REFERENCES

- Abbott, M. L. (2006). ESL reading strategies: Differences in Arabic and Mandarin speaker test performance. *Language Learning*, 56(4), 633-670. doi: 10.1111/j.14679922.2006.00391.x
- Abbott, H. P. (2002). *The Cambridge introduction to narrative*. Cambridge University Press.
- Abdullah, S., Sabapathy, E., Theethappan, R., & Hasan, N. S . I. (2012). Reading for pleasure as a means of improving reading comprehension skills. *Asian Social Science*, 8(13), 233-238. Retrieved from <http://www.ccsenet.org>
- Alyousef, H. S. (2005). Teaching reading comprehension to ESL/EFL learners. *The Reading Matrix*, 5(2), 143-154. Retrieved from <http://www.Readingmatrix.com>
- Anderson, J. N. (2003). Scrolling, clicking, and reading English: Online reading strategies in a second/foreign language. *The Reading Matrix*, 3(3), 1-33. Retrieved from <http://www.readingmatrix.com>
- Bean, J. C. (2001). *Engaging ideas: The professor's guide to integrating writing, critical thinking, and active learning in the classroom*. Jossey-Bass.
- Bender, W. N., & Larkin, M. J. (2009). *Reading strategies for elementary students with learning difficulties*. Corwin.
- Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices*. Pearson Education Inc.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (4th ed.). Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.
- Caldwell, J. S. (2008). *Reading assessment: A primer for teacher and coaches* (2th ed.). The Guilford Press.
- Cihodariu, M. (2012). Anthropology and sociology. *Journal of Comparative Research*, 3(2), 27-43. Retrieved from <http://compaso.eu>
- Coffman, G. A., & Reed, M. D. (2010). The true story of narrative text: From theory to practice. *The Reading Professor*, 32(1), 5-11. Retrieved from <http://www.emporia.edu/>
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research method in education* (6th ed.). Routledge.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research* (4th ed.). Pearson Education Inc.
- Demirel, O., & Epcacan, C. (2012). The effects of reading comprehension strategies on cognitive and affective learning outcomes. *Learning strategies; Reading comprehension: Self efficacy belief: Attitude scale*, 2(1), 71-106. Retrieved from <http://kalemacademy.com>
- Duffy, G. G. (2009). *Explaining reading* (2th ed.). The Guilford Press.

- Fetzer, N. (2013). *Writing curriculum*. Nancy Fetzer's Literacy Connections.
- Fielding, M. (2006). *Effective communication in organizations* (3th ed.). Berne Convention.
- Flynn, D. (2003). *Students guide to SPSS*. Retrieved from Barnard College-Columbia University website: https://barnard.edu/sites/default/files/inline/student_user_guide_for_spss.pdf
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th ed.). McGraw Hill Inc.
- Gahagan, S. (2007). *Using various strategies to increase reading comprehension* (Magister's Thesis). New York University, New York, USA.
- Gauthier, L. R. (2001). Coop-Dis-Q: A reading comprehension strategy. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 39(4), 217-220. Retrieved from <http://isc.sagepub.com>
- Ghelani, K., Sidhu, R., Jain, U., & Tannock, R. (2004). Reading comprehension and reading related abilities in adolescents. *Dyslexia*, 10, 364–384. doi: 10.1002/dys.285
- Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language teaching* (3rd ed.). Longman.
- Herman. (2014). *The effect of using coop – dis – q strategy on reading comprehension of narrative text of the second year students at Islamic Senior Boarding School Al- kautsar Pekanbaru* (Undergraduate's Thesis). Suska state Islamic University, Riau, Indonesia.
- Hibbard, K. M., & Wagner, E. A. (2013). *Assessing and teaching reading comprehension and writing*, 3–5. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Hollingshead, C., & Ostrander, R. (2006). How can I help my students who struggle with reading comprehension? *Journal of Adventist Education*. Retrieved from <http://circle.adventist.org>
- Hollingsworth, A., Sherman, J., & Zaugra, C. (2007). *Increasing reading comprehension in first and second graders through cooperative learning* (Field-Based Master's Program). Saint Xavier University, Chicago, USA.
- Huck, S. W. (2012). *Reading statistics and research* (6th ed.). Pearson Education Inc.
- Kenan, S. R. (2005). *Narrative fiction* (2th ed.). Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- National Literacy Trust. (2015). *A guide to text types*. Retrieved from <http://www.literacytrust.org.uk/>
- Omatseye, B. O. J. (2007). The discussion teaching method: An interactive strategy in tertiary learning. *Education*, 128(1), 87-94. Retrieved from <https://www.questia.com>

- Pang, E. S., Muaka, A., Bernhardt, E. B., & Kamil, M. L. (2003). *Teaching reading*. SADAG.
- Pardo, L. S. (2004). What every teacher needs to know about comprehension. *International Reading Association*, 58(3), 272-280. Doi:10.1598/RT.583.5
- Perffeti, C. A. (2001). *Reading Skill* (Doctoral Dissertation). University of Pittsburgh, New York, USA.
- Ravese, K. A. (2006). *Incorporating structured activities during silent reading in the sixth grade classroom* (Magister's Thesis). Moravian College, Pennsylvania, USA.
- Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in language teaching* (2th ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Rubenstein, R. (2003). *Cooperative discussion and questioning (Coop-Dis-Q)*. Retrieved from <http://www.adhdld.com/>
- Saricoban, A. (2002). Reading strategies of successful readers through the three phase approach. *The Reading Matrix*, 2(3), 1-16. Retrieved from <http://www.readingmatrix.com>
- Sarwo. (2013). *Analysis on the students' problems in comprehending narrative texts* (Undergraduate's Thesis). Tanjungpura University, Pontianak, Indonesia.
- Snow, C., & Chair. (2002). *Reading for understanding: Toward a research and development program in reading comprehension*. RAND.
- Takallou, F., & Veisi, S. (2012). Implementing cooperative learning in a reading class. *Report and Opinion*, 5(1), 16-23. Retrieved from <http://www.Sciencepub.net/report>
- Utami. (2014). *The effect of using cooperative-discussion-questioning (coop-dis-q) strategy toward students' reading comprehension at senior high school (a study at the eleventh grade students of social program sma n 16)* (Undergraduate's Thesis). STKIP PGRI, Sumatera Barat, Indonesia.
- Woolley, G. (2011). *Reading comprehension: Assisting children with learning difficulties*. Springer Science+Business Media B.V.
- Zahoor, M., & Janjua, F. (2013). Narrative comprehension and story grammar. *Academic research in business and social science*, 3(9), 604-618. Retrieved from <http://download.portalgaruda.org/>.