INCREASING READING COMPREHENSION AND SUMMARY WRITING ACHIEVEMENTS BY USING RAP STRATEGY WITH 100 FAMOUS STORIES APPLICATION

Mitra Afriadeni
Department of English Education, Universitas Sriwijaya, Palembang, Indonesia
E-mail: mitraamin93@gmail.com

Eryansyah
Department of English Education, Universitas Sriwijaya, Palembang, Indonesia
E-mail: eryansyah@gmail.com

Rita Inderawati (Corresponding author)
Department of English Education, Universitas Sriwijaya, Palembang, Indonesia
E-mail: rita_inderawati@fkip.unsri.ac.id

Abstract: This study aimed to investigate the students' writing achievement between before and after the students were taught by using RAP strategy with 100 Famous Stories application. It involved 68 students as pasrticipants and used quasi experimental research method. The result of this study were analyzed by using paired sample t-test and independent sample t-test with the SPPS Version 22.The result of the study for the experimental group showed that the significance level of p was <0.05. The critical value of t-table was lower than t-obtained (22.333>2.036) for reading and (9.162>2.036) for writing. In other words, there was a significance difference in reading comprehension and writing achievement before and after the treatments in experimental group. Furthermore, the result of the independent t-test showed that the critical value of t-table was lower than t-obtained (5.936>1.997) for reading and (7.852>1.997) for summary writing, that is to say there was a significance difference in reading comprehension and writing summary acheievement of the eleventh grade students of SMA Srijaya Negara who were taught by using RAP Strategy with 100 Famous Stories Application and those who were not. It concludes that RAP strategy with 100 famous stories application could improve the students' reading comprehension and writing achievements.
Keywords: *reading comprehension, writing achievement, RAP strategy*

INTRODUCTION
Reading and writing skills are like two blades of a sword since both are very closely related. A person will not be able to write a good work if the process of reading does not go well. People who fond of reading will get new insight and develop their intelligence so that they will be able to deal with the future challenge (Putro & Lee, 2017). In social life, reading skill is also a central factor for the student's future (Ridwan, 2021; Azizah, Inderawati &Vianty, 2021). Learning to read is one of the most important strategies students can accomplish as the foundation for all academic endeavors. The key areas of reading like who read, how we read, what we read as well as where we read have to base on the reading purposes (Pyrhonen, 2018; Kumbara, et al., 2021).

A great number of students without sufficient vocabulary knowledge or effective learning strategies mostly face reading comprehension difficulties ((Surayatika, 2018; Azizah, et al., 2021). Noor & Rashid, 2018). Unfortunately, most students in Indonesia still have a problem in reading. The reading ability of students in Indonesia is still low (Sudarmawan, 2021). Based on the result of EF EPI (EF English Proficiency Index) in 2017, Indonesia has ranked 39th out of 80 countries with a score was 52.15. The result is not better than other South East Asia Countries such as Singapore in 5th rank, Malaysia is in the 13th, the Philippines in 15th, and Vietnam in 34th. Then, the result of EF EPI (2019) shows that Indonesian English proficiency was in the rank 61st out of 100 countries with the score of 50.06. In other words, the Indonesian students' proficiency was still low. The result study of PISA 2018 that released by OECD which showed Indonesian students' reading comprehension that

only reached average score 371, with the average score of OECD is 487 (OECD, 2019). This study judges 600.000 of 15 years old children from 79 countries every three years. This study compare math comprehension, reading and science performance of a student. In reading comprehension category, Indonesia is located in 74, the sixth from the bottom.

Beside reading, writing is another skill that can not be neglected in learning English. In an academic context, writing has become the most important skill that students must be mastered (Inderawati & Hayati, 2011; Tseng, 2019). In addition, Nasser (2018) puts forward that it is necessary to enhance student's skills in writing since it is an important tool in their educational progress. Consequently, it is necessary to master writing skills because it can help people be well-prepared when finding a job or attending English courses. With those benefits, writing is very important for every students. By mastering writing, students can explore their thoughts and ideas in written form. Writing also considered as a means of communication. It tends to involve a thinking process from human being. When we write, we do not only keep our purpose of writing in our mind, but we also have to think about how to organize them in composition (Fajri, et al., 2015; Sulistyowati and Rahmawati, 2019).

Writing is widely recognized as the most difficult but least liked of the four English skills since writing is a complex activity, despite the fact that it plays a critical role in language development (Setyowati and Latief, 2017). Seensangworn (2017) discovered that both English major and non-English major students experienced the same problems when writing in English. These problems are classified into four categories: (1) contents and ideas, (2) organizational pattern, (3) the development of ideas, and (4) language use. However, writing skill is the most crucial in learning English as a foreign language for many students, especially in Indonesia (Maysuroh, 2017). Hussain (2019) states that the biggest challenge for students is writing, because in writing there are demands of structure, style and vocabulary. Students' difficulties in writing will have an impact on their writing results. Which means, if students have poor writing skills, they will find it difficult to produce good writing.

Based on the facts about reading and writing, the writer did a preliminary interview with the English teacher in SMA Srijaya Negara Palembang. The result of the interview showed that the students had difficulties in comprehending a text such as grasping the meaning of the text, understanding the content, and finding the idea from the text. Likewise, the students also had difficulties in writing. It was not easy for them to find the appropriate words to begin their writing because they had a limited vocabulary and could not determine the main idea or the important parts of the passage. It is in line with the result of the study which was conducted by Wardhani, Inderawati and Vianty (2019) who found that there were some problems in writing activity faced by eleventh-grade students of SMA Negeri 1 Tanjung Batu. They mentioned the problems were the students' lack of vocabulary and they did not have enough prior knowledge about writing in English. In order to find out the students' reading comprehension, the writer were given two tests, they were a preliminary test and IRI. The result of a preliminary test showed that only 14 students were getting the passing grade score, which was 67. In other words, (53%) got problems in comprehending the text. The result of IRI (Independent Reading Inventory) by Stark (1981) shows there were in level 3. The data showed that 7 students (14%) were in Level 1, 11 students (22%) in Level 2, 25 students (50%) in Level 3, 6 students (12%) in Level 4, and 1 student (2%) in Level 5.

Based on the explanation, the teaching media and strategies are needed by the teachers in teaching and learning process (Inderawati, 2017). In this case, this study to improve reading comprehension and writing achievement using a strategy and technology. The strategy used was RAP strategy which is consists of three steps. RAP stood for: R: Read a Paragraph. A: Ask yourself what is the main idea and two details. P: Put the main idea into your own words (Surayatika, 2018). RAP strategy was a tool to improve reading comprehension where emphasize the reader or the student to read carefully, asking, and putting the summary to make the students more easier to gain the information, knowledge, new vocabulary in the whole of the text (Surayatika, 2018, Zahra & Fitrawati, 2017). It means the RAP can improve the students' reading comprehension and help them remember what they read. The strategy requires students to engage in reading materials through questioning and paraphrasing to increase their comprehension of the material (Chinijani, 2017, Que, 2020, Hagaman & Reid, 2018; Kemp, 2017).

In brief, the RAP strategy is a reading strategy that can be used easily by the teacher in reading class. It is a simple strategy that can adapt or be adapted in many different functions and activities. It can be used in different levels of education (Leidig et al., 2018; Mentari et al., 2018). The results of the study are that RAP strategies conducted by Sudarmawan (2018) showed that RAP strategy can help students to improve memory about the main ideas and details of specific texts, interactive reading strategies that offer many benefits for students. In addition, Ilther (2017) did a research on the use of paraphrasing strategy to improve the reading comprehension of primary school students at frustration level reading. The result of his research showed that the paraphrasing strategy training gave positive influence towards students' reading comprehension.

The roles of technology support the teaching and learning process in this digital era to help the students to be autonomous learners (Inderawati, 2017; Inderawati, et al., 2018; Inderawati, et al., 2019b; Apriani, et al., 2021). According to Anggraeni (2018), the educational system needs to apply the core of industry 4.0 to get a synergy for achieving the goals in the globalization era. Education 4.0 allows the learners to grow with knowledge and skill for the entire life, not just to know how to read and write which enables individuals to be able to in a society (Hariharasudan & Kot, 2018). Sopian, Inderawati, and Petrus (2019) state that in education, technology plays an important role in learning activities.

Several studies reveal that technology gives positive impact on enhancing teaching and learning and learning environment (Bagdasarov et al., 2017; McKnight et al., 2016; Ghazizadeh, 2017; Inderawati, et al., 2018; Inderawati, et al., 2019a; Inderawati, et al., 2019b; Zahra, et al., 2019; Rhahima, et al., 2021). Bal (2018) cites that the 21st Century students are not limited to the knowledge of life, even in the classroom setting, where there are now various forms of technology. It can make teaching and learning more effective and efficient. The teacher can bring a mobile phone, laptop, or notebook to support the teaching process in the classroom. Inderawati, et.al (2019) mentioned that the the benefits of mobile phone not only as a tool of communication and to get information, but also as a media in learning English.

Through the statement, mobile learning could be used as a tool in teaching English. In this study, the use of the application was 100 Famous Stories. It was used for helping students to improve their literacy. This application is an interactive storytelling audio application bundled with beautifully rendered famous and popular audio stories. These classic stories are bundled with narrations, background music, and text to read. Using this application could make students change their perception of learning English, instead of using thick storybooks. This application also captures stories for many decades. This application provides a video about children's stories with English subtitle, therefore the students will not get bored to learn English by using this application. Based on the description above, I investigated the students' writing achievement between before and after the students taught by using RAP strategy with 100 Famous Stories application.

METHOD
The study used a quasi-experimental design with a pretest-posttest nonequivalent control group design. Wallen and Fraenkel (1991) state that a quasi-experimental design study is conducted when random assignment is not possible.

In this study, the group was divided into two groups, the experimental group, and the control group. To find out the students' reading comprehension and writing achievement, a pretest was given to the groups. After the pretest, the experimental group was taught by using the RAP strategy with 100 Famous Stories applications, while the control group was not taught with that strategy, they were taught by their teacher as usual. The treatment was conducted for 20 meetings. At the end of the treatment, the post-test (the same test as the pre-test) was given to both groups.

The population was all the eleventh-grade students of SMA Srijaya Negara in the academic 2019/2020. The number of the population was 235 students. The sampling technique used was purposive sampling. The number of the sample was 68 students. They were selected purposively by considering the following criteria that the students were taught by the same teacher, the total number of the students in each class was similar, and they were in the same social studies major.

The data were obtained from the reading comprehension test and summary writing tests. For reading test, there were 50 multiple choice items that include five options (A, B, C, D, E). The questions covered six aspects of reading comprehension. They were main idea, detail,

sequence, inference, cause and effect, and vocabulary To check the readability of the texts, the writer used the Flesch-Kincaid grade level. To know the students reading level, the teacher gave IRI test. The result showed the students were in level 3. For summary writing test, the students were assigned to write a summary narrative text. The scoring system is based on the rubric for summary writing text by Frey at. al (2003). The rubric consists of 4 categories. They are lengths, paraphrasing, focus and conventions. Each aspect gave score 4 in which the students have good summary writing, their score will be 16.

To find out the progress in the pretest and posttest and verify the hypotheses, the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 22 was used to analyze the data. The paired sample t-test was used to find out whether there was a significant difference in students' reading comprehension and writing summary achievement from the result of pre-test and post-test. To find out whether or not there was a significant difference in students' reading comprehension and writing summary achievement between the experimental group and the control group, the Independent t-test was used.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
The data obtained from pre-test and post-test were classified into two groups: (1) the result of pre-test and post-test of reading comprehension test and writing test of the experimental group, (2) the result of pre-test and post-test of reading test and writing test of the control group (3) the result of normality and homogeneity of the test (4) the result of paired sample t-test and independent

sample t-test of reading and writing (5) the result of paired sample t-test and independent sample t-test of reading aspects and writing aspects.

Reading comprehension test of experimental group
Based on the result obtained in the experimental group, the lowest score of the pretest was 32, the highest score was 76, and the mean score was 53.09. The lowest score in the posttest was 44, the highest score was 84, and the mean score was 73.09. Table 1 shows the score distribution of the post-test of the experimental group.

Table 1 indicates that in the pretest, none of the student (0%), was in a very good category, two students (6.1 %) were in a good category, fifteen students (45.4 %) were in an average category, nine students (27.3%) were in a poor category, and seven students (21.2 %) were in very poor category. Meanwhile, in the post-test, none of the student (0%) was in a very good category, four students (12.1 %) were in good category, nineteen students (57.6 %) were in an average category, ten students (30.3%) were in a poor category and none of the student (0 %) was in a very poor category (0 %).

Writing summary test of experimental group
Based on the result obtained in the experimental group, the lowest score of the pretest was 8, the highest score was 15, and the mean score was 10.36. The lowest score in the posttest was 11, the highest score was 16, and the mean score was 13.18. The score distribution of the experimental group is shown in Table 2.

Table 1. *The distribution of reading comprehension test of experimental group*

Score Interval	Category	Pretest		Posttest	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
86-100	Very Good	0	0%	0	0%
71-85	Good	2	6.1%	4	12.1%
56-70	Average	15	45.4%	19	57.6%
41-45	Poor	9	27.3%	10	30.3%
<40	Very Poor	7	21.2%	0	0%
	Total	33	100%	33	100%

Table 2. *The distribution of writing summary test of experimental group*

Score Interval	Category	Pretest		Posttest	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
17-20	Very Good	0	0%	0	0%
13-16	Good	6	18.2%	24	72.7%
9-12	Average	24	72.7%	9	18.1%
5-8	Poor	3	9.1%	0	0%
0-4	Very Poor	0	0%	0	0%
	Total	33	100%	33	100%

Table 2 indicates that in the pretest none of the student (0%) was in very good category, six students (18.2 %) were in good category, twenty four students (72.7%) were in average category, three students (9.1%) were in very poor category, and none of the student (0%) was in very poor category. Meanwhile, in the post-test none of the student (0%) was in very poor category, twenty four students (72.7 %) were in good category, nine students (18.1 %) were in average category, and none student (0%) was in very poor category and very poor category.

Reading comprehension test of the control group
Based on the result obtained in the experimental group, the lowest score of the pretest was 36, the highest score was 72, and the mean score was 55.63. The lowest score in the posttest was 32, the highest score was 80, and the mean score was 59.03. Table 3 shows the score distribution of post-test in the experimental group and control group.

Table 3 indicates that in the pretest, none of the student (0%) was in very good, four students (12.1%) were in good category, sixteen students (48.5 %) were in average category, eight students (24.2%) were in poor category, five students (15.2%) were in very poor category. Meanwhile, in the post-test, none of the student (0%) was in very good category, five students (15.2 %) were in good category, nineteen students (57.6%) were in average category, eight students (24.2%) were in poor category, and one student (3.0%) was in very poor category.

Writing summary test of the control group
Based on the result obtained in the control group, the lowest score of the pretest was 8, the highest score was 14, and the mean score was 9.75. The lowest score in the posttest was 8, the highest score was 14, and the mean score was 10.24. The score distribution of the experimental group is shown in Table 4.

Table 3. *The distribution of reading comprehension test of control group*

Score Interval	Category	Pretest		Posttest	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
86-100	Very Good	0	0%	0	0%
71-85	Good	4	12.1%	5	15.2%
56-70	Average	16	48.5%	19	57.6%
41-45	Poor	8	24.2%	8	24.2%
<40	Very Poor	5	15.2%	1	3.0%
	Total	33	100%	33	100%

Table 4. *The distribution of writing summary test of control group*

Score Interval	Category	Pretest		Posttest	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
17-20	Very Good	0	0%	0	0%
13-16	Good	0	0%	4	12.1%
9-12	Average	27	81.8%	23	69.7%
5-8	Poor	6	18.2%	6	18.2%
0-4	Very Poor	0	0%	0	0%
	Total	33	100%	33	100%

Table 4 shows that in the pretest none of the student (0%) was in very good category and good category, twenty seven students (81.8%) were in average category, six students (18.2%) were in very poor category, and none of the student (0%) was in very poor category. Meanwhile, in the post-test none of the student (0%) was in very very good category, four students (12.1%) were in good category, twenty three students (69.7 %) were in average category, six students (18.2%) were in poor category, and none student (0%) was in very poor category.

Normality test and homogenity test

Normality test was done to know whether or not the data had a normal distribution. In analyzing the normality of the pre-test and post-test, the writer used one sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. If the p-value is higher than 0.05, the distribution of sample in the population is normal. The results of the normality test can be seen in table 5.

The result of normality test using Kolmogorov-Smirnov shows that of pretest and posttest of the experimental group and control group the p-value was higher than 0.05, it can be concluded that the pretest and posttest of reading and writing were considered normal.

The homogenity data determined from Levine Statistic. If the p-value is higher than 0.05, the data are considered homogenous. Table 6 shows the homogeneity of the test.

Based on the result of the homogeneity of pretest and posttest in reading and writing were above 0.05. It can be concluded that the homogenity distributions were considered normal because the significance level was higher than 0.05.

The result of paired sample t-test
The result of paired sample t-test of reading
Paired sample t-test was used to see the progress of the students' scores of pre-test and post-test in the experiemental group and control group. Table 7 shows the results of paired sample t-test

between pre-test and post-test in the experimental group and control group.

In the experimental group, the mean score of the pretest was 53.09 while the mean score of posttest was 73.93. The standard deviation of pretest was 11.759 and post-test was 11.152. The standard error mean of pre-test was 2.047 and posttest was 1.478. The T-obtained both pretest and poststest in the experimental group was 22.333. The degree of freedom (df) was 32, at the critical value of the t-table of 2.036. The critical value of the t-table was lower than t-obtained (22.333>2.036). It could be stated that there was a significance difference in reading comprehension achievement before and after the treatment in the experimental group. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H_O) was rejected and the research hypothesis (H_1) was accepted.

Table 5. *The results of normality test*

	Group	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]		
		Statistic	Df	Sig.
Reading	PreExp	.133	33	.147
	PostExp	.126	33	.200
	PreCon	.131	33	.166
	PostCon	.148	33	.065
Writing	PreExp	.139	33	.105
	PostExp	.125	33	.200
	PreCon	.139	33	105
	PostCon	.127	33	.193

Table 6. *The results of homogeneity test*

	Variables	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]	
		Statistic	Sig.
Reading Comprehension	Pretest and posttest (exp group)	3.625	.061
	Pretest and posttest (con group)	2.827	.085
	Posttest (exp group and con group)	0.484	.489
Summary Writing	Pretest and posttest (exp group)	0.211	.648
	Pretest and posttest (con group)	0.006	.937
	Posttest (exp group and con group)	0.044	.835

Table 7. *The result of paired sample t-test of reading*

Group	Test	Mean	df	Standard Deviation	Std.error Mean	t	sig
Exp Group	Pretest	53.09		11.759	2.047	22.333	0.000
	Posttest	73.93	32	8.492	1.478		
Con Group	Pretest	55.64		11.152	1.941	4.138	0.003
	Posttest	59.04	32	11.663	2.030		

In the control group, the mean score of pretest was 55.64 while the mean score of posttest was 59.04. The standard deviation of pre-test was 11.152 and posttest was 11.663. The standard

error mean of pretest was 1.941 and posttest was 2030. The t-obtained was 4.138. Since the value of t-obtained exceeded the critical value of t-table, (4.138>2.036) the p value<0.05, it can be stated

there was an improvement in reading achievement in the control group.

The result of paired sample t-test of writing summary

Paired sample t-test was used to see the progress of the students' scores of pre-test and post-test in the experimental group and the control group. Table 8 shows the results of paired sample t-test between pre-test and post-test in the experimental group and control group.

Based on the table, in the experimental group, the mean score of pretest was 10.36 while the mean score of post-test was 13.18. The standard deviation of pre-test was 1.954 and posttest was 1.374. The standard error mean of pretest was .340 and post-test was .239. The degree of freedom (df) was 32, at the critical value of the t-table was 2.036. The t-obtained was 9.162. The critical value of the t-table was lower than t-obtained (9.162>2.036). It could be stated that there was a significance difference in writing achievement before and after the treatment in the experimental group. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H_O) was rejected and the research hypothesis (H_1) was accepted.

In the control group, the mean score of pretest was 9.75 while the mean score of post-test was 10.24. The standard deviation of pretest was 1.562 and posttest was 1.654. The standard error mean of pre-test was .272 and posttest was .288. The degree of freedom (df) was 32, at the critical value of the t-table was 2.036. The t-obtained was 4.138. Since the value of t-obtained was exceeded the critical value of the t-table, (4.532>2.036), it means that there was an improvement in summary writing achievement in the control group.

The result of independent sample t-test of reading comprehension and writing summary
Independent t-test was used to compare the gain of the mean score to make sure whether or not there was a significant difference in reading comprehension achievement and summary writing achievement between the experimental group and the control group.

Based on the analysis of the independent sample t-test of the post test in the experimental group and the control group for reading comprehension (table 13) showed that the degree of freedom (df) was 64, at the critical value of the t-table was 1.997. The t-obtained was 5.936. The critical value of the t-table was lower than t-obtained (5.936>1.997). The result of the independent sample t-test of the post test in the experimental group and the control group for summary writing showed that the t-obtained was 7.852. The critical value of the t-table was lower than t-obtained (7.852>1.997). It could be stated that there was a significance difference in reading comprehension and writing summary achievement of the eleventh grade students of SMA Srijaya Negara who were taught by using RAP Strategy with 100 Famous Stories Application and those who were not. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H_O) was rejected and the research hypothesis (H_1) was accepted.

Table 8. *The result of paired sample t-test of writing*

Group	Test	Mean	df	Standard Deviation	Std.error Mean	t	Sig
Exp Group	Pretest	10.36	32	1.954	.340	9.162	0.000
	Posttest	13.18		1.374	.239		
Con Group	Pretest	9.75	32	1.562	.272	4.532	0.000
	Posttest	10.24		1.654	.288		

Table 9. *The statistical analysis on the experimental group and control group for reading comprehension and summary writing by using independent sample t-test*

Group	Group	Mean	df	Mean diff.	T	sig
Reading Comprehesnion	Experimental	73.94	64	14,90	5.936	0.000
	Control	59.03				
Writing Summary	Experimental	13.18	64	2.939	7.852	0.000
	Control	10.24				

The results of paired sample t-test and independent sample t-test of reading comprehension aspects
The analysis of reading comprehension in each aspect was done by using paired sample t-test and independent sample t-test. Table 10 shows that the result of paired sample t-test of the experimental group showed that there was a significant difference between pretest and posttest (t-value=22.333, Sig= 0.000) in reading. The result also showed that the aspects of reading skills significantly improved. Meanwhile, for the

control group, there was also improvement in reading comprehension achievement. It could be seen from the score the mean difference = 3.39, t-value= 2.138, Sig=0.040). However, the students in the control group did not make significant improvement in aspects of reading.

For summary writing, the result of paired sample t-test of the experimental group showed that there was a significant difference between pretest and posttest (t-value=10.935, Sig= 0.000). The result also showed that the aspects of writing skills significantly improved. Meanwhile, for the

control group, there was an improvement in writing summary achievement. It could be seen from the score the mean difference =0.48 t-value= 4.532, Sig=0.000). However, for aspects of writing, the group did make significant improvement in aspects of convention (t-value= 2.125, Sig 0.041). It means, whether the students in control group were not taught by using RAP staretgy with 100 famous stories application, there was also significant improvement in reading comprehension and summary writing.

Table 10. *Statistical analysis of reading comprehension and writing summary aspects for both groups by using paired sample t-test and independent t-test*

Variable And Sub Variables	Experimental		Mean Diff of Pre-Post	T-obtained and Sig.	Conrol		Mean Diff of Pre-Post	T-obtained and Sig.	Independent	
	Pre	Post			Pre	Post			Pre	Post
RCA (Total)	53.09	73.94	20,84	22.333 0.000	55.64	59.03	3.39	2.138 0.040	14.90	5.936 0.000
Main Idea	9.33	13.82	4.48	6.946 0.000	8.00	8.61	0.60	1.000 0.325	3.03	4.287 0.000
Detail	8.73	12.12	3.39	5.600 0.000	11.03	11.27	0.24	0.466 0.645	1.33	2.731 0.003
Inference	8.24	11.39	3.15	4.713 0.000	8.48	8.73	0.24	0.442 0.662	2.66	4.320 0.000
Sequence	8.12	11.64	3.51	6.824 0.000	9.58	10.55	0.97	1.677 0.103	3.27	4.323 0.000
Cause/effect	9.09	12.36	3.27	6.866 0.000	9.45	10.18	0.72	1.030 0.311	2.18	3.090 0.000
Vocabulary	9.58	12.61	3.03	5.496 0.000	9.09	9.82	0.72	1.234 0.226	3.35	3.352 0.001
Wri (Total)	10.00	13.18	3.18	10.935 0.000	9.76	10.24	0.48	4.532 0.000	2.93	7.852 0.000
Lengths	2.48	2.94	0.45	3.035 0.005	2.33	2.39	0.61	0.352 0.727	0.54	2.964 0.000
Accuracy	2.23	2.61	0.37	3.990 0.000	2.24	2.32	0.76	0.796 0.432	0.28	2.917 0.000
Paraphrase	144	2.42	0.98	10.000 0.000	1.56	1.45	0.10	1.191 0.243	0.97	9.006 0.000
Focus	1.68	2.53	0.84	9.069 0.000	1.62	1.77	0.15	1.971 0.057	0.75	6.959 0.000
Convention	2.17	2.68	0.51	3.676 0.000	2.00	2.30	0.30	2.125 0.041	0.37	2.833 0.005

Mobile technology use in education facilitates teaching and learning, especially in foreign language teaching (Aziz et al., 2018; Inderawati, et al., 2018; Apriani, et al., 2021). Unlike traditional teaching and learning methods, mobile-assisted language learning with the latest technology endorses the informal learning process outside the classroom, allowing students learn autonomously (Persson & Nouri, 2018). The appeal factor for learning through smartphones, and particularly through apps, would be the ease and flexibility offered by mobile learning. The use of this application which combines with RAP strategy can encourage students to improve attention and enthusiasm in learning English. When they applied RAP strategy which consists of 3 steps: reading, asking a question, and paraphrase. In RAP strategy, the students will read the text carefully, try to ask a question which can assist them in determining the main idea and supporting detail in each paragraph, and paraphrase the text which helps them to remember information which is done to read and understand the content of the text.

Based on the statistic analysis, the result of the students' score of post-test in the experimental group increased. The results of this study showed that there was significant improvement in the students' reading comprehension and summary writing achievement before the treatment using RAP strategy with 100 Famous Stories Application that before the treatment was given, the mean score of pretest in the experimental group in reading was 53.09 and after the tratment the mean score of the posttest was 73.93. The score of pretest in summary writing was 10.36 and posttest was 13.18. It can be concluded that RAP strategy with 100 Famous Stories Application was applicable to improve student's reading comprehension and summary writing. The reading comprehension achievements of the students in the experiemental group were better improvement than the students in the control group. It could be seen from the score of posttest of the students. Additionally, the results of paired sample t-test and independent sample t-test showed that there was a significant difference in all aspects of reading comprehension achievements. Based on the reading comprehension's aspects (main idea, detail, sequence, inference, cause and effect, and vocabulary) showed that six aspects of reading comprehension achievement were developed significantly by using the RAP strategy with 100 Famous Stories Application. This finding was relevant to the study of Wardhani, et al. (2019) that GIGI Application used in their research through tales could enhance the students' achievement on Literacy. Moreover, Rhahima, et al. (2021) found that electronic reading book was needed by vocational students to learn their local culture. The result showed that the main idea got score 4.48 as mean difference, detail got a score 3.03 as mean difference, inference got a score 3.15 as mean difference, sequence got score a 3.51 as mean difference, cause and effect got a score 3.27 as mean difference, and vocabulary got a score 3.39 as mean difference. The result showed that the main idea (mean difference) gave the most contribution to reading comprehension achievement. It is line with Sudarmawan (2018) states that RAP strategy can help students to improve memory about the main ideas and details of specific texts.

The summary writing achievements of the students in the experiemental group were better improvement than the students in the control group. It could be seen from the score of posttest of the students. In addition, the result of t-test of paired sample t-test of experimental group also showed that six aspects of summary writing achievement were also developed significantly by using RAP strategy with 100 Famous Stories Application. From five aspects of summary wiring (lengths, accuracy, paraphrase, focus, and convention), lengths got score 0.45 as mean difference, accuracy got score 0.37 as mean difference, paraphrase got score 0.98 as mean difference, focus got score 0.84 as mean difference, convention got score 0.51 as mean difference. From the result of five aspects of summary writing, paraphrase got the highest contribution as mean difference. Paraphrasing is the most effective way in writing a thesis to avoid plagiarism because in writing. It involves changing a text so that it is quite different from the source but the meaning still pertains the original (Kaharudin, 2020). The research by Ramadhani (2019) found that the availability of paraphrase could be a means of avoiding plagiarism. The research was done by Waningyun, Suwandi, & Setyawan (2018) also revealed that the paraphrasing technique could: 1) improve short story writing skills by 70% for pre-cycle, 76 percent for the first cycle, and 80 percent for the second cycle; 2) increase the percentage of students passing the minimum score by 52 percent for pre-cycle, 74 percent for the first cycle, and 80 percent for the second cycle; and 3) improve the percentage of students passing the minimum score by 52 percent for pre-cycle, 76 percent for the first cycle, and 80 percent for the second cycle.

The result of independent sample t-test of reading comprehension and summary writing achievements showed that there was a significant difference in posttest in the experimental group and the control group. It could be seen from the score of the students in experimental group after the treatment given was better than the score of the students' score in the control group who did not give any treatment. Based on the analysis of the independent sample t-test of the post test in experimental group and control group for reading comprehension showed that the degree of freedom (df) was 64, at the critical value of the t-table was 1.997. The t-obtained was 5.936. The critical value of the t-table was lower than the t-obtained (5.936>1.997). The result of the independent sample t-test of the post test in experimental group and control group for summary writing showed that the t-obtained was 7.852. The critical value of t-table was lower than t-obtained (7.852>1.997).

In conclusion, RAP strategy with 100 Famous Stories Application very helps the students to become more active and independent reader. It is one of the good strategies that could improve students' reading comprehension and summary writing achievements.

CONCLUSION

Based on the result of the study and the interpretation presented in the previous chapter, it can be concluded that there was a significant improvement in the students' reading and summary writing. There were also significant differences in students' reading comprehension score and summary writing achievement who were taught by using the RAP strategy and those who were not. It can be seen from the mean score of posttest in the experimental group who had higher score than the mean score of posttest in the control group. Finally, the result of t-test showed that there was also a significant difference in each aspect of reading comprehension and writing summary between the students who were taught by using the RAP strategy and those who were not. It can be concluded that the RAP strategy could help the students of SMA Srijaya Negara to improve their reading comprehension and summary writing.

REFERENCES

Anggraeni, C. W. (2018). Promoting education 4.0 in English for survival class: What are the challenges?. *Journal of English Language, Literature, and Teaching, 2*(1), 12-24.

Apriani, E., Syafryadin, S., Inderawati, R., Arianti, A., Wati, S., Hakim, I. N., & Noermanzah, N. (2021). Implementing e-learning training toward english virtual lecturers: the process, perspectives, challenges and solutions. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, *16*(04), 240–255. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v16i04.14125

Aziz, A., Hassan, M., Dzakiria, H., & Mahmood, Q. (2018). Growing trends of using mobile in English language learning. *Mediterranean Journal Of Social Sciences, 9*(4), 235-239.

Azizah, N., Inderawati, R., & Vianty, M. (2021). Developing descriptive reading materials in EFL classes by utilizing the local culture. *Studies in English Language and Education*, *8*(2), 596-621.

Bagdasarov, Z., Luo, Y. & Wu, W. (2017). The influence of tablet-based technology on the development of communication and critical thinking skills: An interdisciplinary study. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education, 49*, 55-72.

Bal, M. (2018). Reading and writing experiences of middle school students in the digital age: wattpad sample. *International Journal of Education & Literacy Studies, 6*(2), 89-100.

Chinijani, M. E. (2017). The effect of RAP paraphrasing strategy on improving Irian EFL learners' reading comprehension. *International Research Journal, 3*(6), 786-794.

Fajri, H, M., Inderawati, R., & Mirizon, S. (2015). The implementation of peer editing technique to improve writing achievement. *The Journal of English Literacy Education: The Teaching and Learning of English as a Foreign Language*, 2(2), 48-57.

Frey, N., Fisher, D., & Hernandez, T. (2003). What's the gist? summary writing for struggling adolescent writers. *Voices from the Middle Journal, 1*(2), 43-49.

Ghazizadeh, T. (2017). The effect of blended learning on efl learners' reading proficiency. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 8*(3), 606-614.

Hagaman, J. L., & Reid, R. (2018). The effects of the paraphrasing strategy on the reading comprehension of middle school students at risk for failure in reading. *Remedial & Special Education, 29*(4), 22-29.

Hariharasudan & Kot, S. (2018). A scoping review on digital English and education 4.0 for industry 4.0. *Social Science, 2*(27), 1-13.

Hussain, S. S. (2019). Strategiesfor teaching academic writing to Saudi L2 learners. *English Language Teaching, 12*(12), 1-11.

Inderawati, R. (2017). The dynamics of EFL teaching in Indonesia: Be innovative teachers through social media. *English Language Teaching and Research 1*(1), 29-37.

Inderawati, R., & Hayati, R. (2011). Short-term training model of academic writing to high school teachers. *US-China Foreign Language, 9*(8), 517-523.

Inderawati, R., Agusta, O. & Sitinjak, M. (2018). The potential effect of developed reader response strategy-based mobile reading for students' establishing character and comprehension achievement. *Indonesian Journal of Informatics Education, 2*(2), 117-126.

Inderawati, R., Petrus, I., & Jaya, H. P. (2019). Exploring and identifying technology-based dynamic learning through social media in academic writing. *English Community Journal*, 3(1), 317–324.

Inderawati, R., Sofendi, Purnomo, M. E., Vianty, M., & Suhendi, D. (2019). Students' engagement in utilizing technology for learning support. *English Franca: Academic Journal of English Language and Education, 3*(2), 181-195.

Kuimova. (2018). Positive effects of mobile learning on foreign language learning. *TEM Journal, 7*(4), 837-841.

Kumbara, L. H., Inderawati, R., & Eryansyah, E. (2021). Developing Sekayu local culture-based descriptive texts. *Eralingua: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Asing dan Sastra, 5*(1), 120-133

Leidig, T., Grunke, M., Urton, M., Knaak, T., &Hisgen, S. (2018). The effects of the RAP strategy used in a peer-tutoring setting to foster reading comprehension in high-risk fourth graders. *Contemporary Journal 16*(2), 231-253.

lter, I. (2017). Improving the reading comprehension of primary -school students at frustration-level reading through the paraphrasing strategy training: *A multiple-probe design study Education and Science, 10* (1), 147- 161.

Maysuroh. S. (2017). Students' English writing process and problems: A case study at Hamzanwadi University. *Voices of English Language Education Society*, *1*(1), 1-10.

Nasser, S. M. (2018). Iraqi EFL students' difficulties in writing composition: An experimental study at University of Baghdad. *International Journal of English Linguistics, 9*(1), 178-184.

Nor, N. M., & Rashid, R. A. (2018). A review of theoretical perspectives on language learning and acquisition. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences, 39*(1), 161-167.

OECD. (2019). PISA 2018 insights and interpretations. OECD Publishing, 64. Retrieved from https://www.oecd.org/pisa/PISA 2018 Insights and Interpretations FINAL PDF.pdf

Persson, V., & Nouri, J. (2018). A systematic review of second language learning with mobile technologies. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning, 13*(02), 188-210.

Putro, N. H. P. S., & Lee, J. (2017). Reading interest in a digital age. *Reading Psychology, 38*(8), 778–807.

Pyrhonen, H. (2018). Reading today: Comparative literature and culture. London: UCL Press.

Que, D. S. (2020). Using RAP (Read, Ask, Put) Strategy to improve students' ability in reading comprehension at class VIII2 of SMP Negeri 2. *MATAI International Journal of Language Education 1*(1), 22-36.

Rhahima, A., Inderawati, R., & Eryansyah. (2021). Students' Needs Analysis for the Development of Electronic Descriptive Reading Materials for Hotel Accommodation Program in VHS. *Eralingua: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Asing dan Sastra, 5*(2), 470-482

Ridwan, I. (2021). Teaching reading practice amid covid-19 pandemic era: Indonesian pre-service English teachers' experiences. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai, 5*(3), 7369-7378.

Seensangworn, P. (2017). Writing problems and writing strategies of English major and non-English major students in a Thai university. *Manutsat Paritat: Journal of Humanities, 39*(1), 113-136.

Setyowati, L., Sukmawa, S., & Latief, M. A. (2017). Solving the students' problems in writing argumentative essay through the provision of planning. *A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching & Literature, 17*(1), 86-102.

Stark Jr., M. J. (1981). A group informal reading inventory: An instrument for other assessment of ESL students' reading performance. Doctoral thesis. Oregon State University.

Sudarmawan , A. K. I. (2021). Using RAP strategy to teach reading comprehension in EFL class I. *Indonesian Journal of Educational Research and Review, 4*(1), 150-155.

Sulistyorini, D., & Rahmawati, I. (2019). The use of instagram in improving students' skill of writing procedure texts. *Language and Literature International Conference (ELLiC), 3*(1), 179-185.

Surayatika, D. (2018). The use of RAP strategy in improving reading comprehension of EFL students. *Jurnal Global Ekspert, 7*(1), 33-38.

Tseng, C. C. (2019). Senior high school teachers' beliefs about EFL writing instruction. *Taiwan Journal of TESOL, 16*(1), 1–39.

Urun, M.F. (2016). Integration of technology into language teaching: A comprative review study. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 7*(1), 76-87.

Wallen, N. E., & Fraenkel, J. R. (1991). *Educational research: A guide to the process.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Waningyun, P. P., Suwandi, S., & Setyawan, B. (2018). Pembelajaran menulis teks cerpen melalui teknik parafrase lagu populer di sekolah menengah atas. Scholaria: *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Kebudayaan, 8*(2), 180–188.

Wardhani, O, K., Inderawati, R.,Vianty, M. (2019). Using Literature-based Approach with Tales with GIGI Application to Improve Literacy Achievement of the Eleventh Graders of SMA Negeri 1 Tanjung Batu. Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Literature: Literature as a Source of Wisdom.

Zahra, F. & Fitrawati. (2017). Teaching reading comprehension by using metacognitive strategy: Read, ask, paraphrase (RAP) at senior high school. *Journal of English Language Teaching, 6*(1), 25-32.

Zahra, W., Inderawati, R., & Petrus, I. (2019). The use of ICT in authentic assessment of the students' productive skills. *English Review: Journal of English Education, 8*(1), 81-90.

Mitra Afriadeni, Eryansyah, Rita Inderawati

Increasing reading comprehension and summary writing achievements by using rap strategy with 100 famous stories application