

THE EFFECT OF THREE STAGE FISHBOWL DECISION STRATEGY IN COMPREHENDING NARRATIVE TEXTS BY THE SECOND YEAR STUDENTS OF SMAN 2 KUANTAN HILIR

Sonika Andriana. Erni. M.Syarfi

E-mail: sonea_cha@yahoo.co.id/+6282283535802

E-mail: Erni_66@yahoo.com/+6281268997856 . Syarfi_M@gmail.com/+628127609223

English Study Program
Language Education and Art Department
Teachers Training and Education Faculty
Riau University

Abstract: *The aim of this experimental research was to know the effectiveness of the Three Stage Fishbowl Decision Strategy in comprehending such a reading text as narrative texts. The subject of this research were 46 second year students of SMAN 2 Kuantan Hilir, it consisted of two classes; Experimental class and control class. In this research, the data were collected through two ways: Pre-test and Post-test. The findings showed that the application of three stage fishbowl decision strategy can affect the students in comprehending narrative texts. At the pre-test, the average score of students in experimental class and control class was 58.61 and 58.78. At the post-test, the average score of experimental class and control class was 75.13 and 61.39. It showed us that the post-test of experimental class was higher than control class. Based on the result of the research, English teacher are suggested to use three stage fishbowl decision strategy to affect the students in comprehending narrative texts.*

Keywords: *Three Stage Fishbowl Decision Strategy, Comprehending, Narrative texts*

THE EFFECT OF THREE STAGE FISHBOWL DECISION STRATEGY IN COMPREHENDING NARRATIVE TEXTS BY THE SECOND YEAR STUDENTS OF SMAN 2 KUANTAN HILIR

Sonika Andriana. Erni. M.syarfi

E-mail: sonea_cha@yahoo.co.id/+6282283535802

E-mail: Erni_66@yahoo.com/+6281268997856 . Syarfi_M@gmail.com/+628127609223

Program Studi Bahasa Inggris

Jurusan Bahasa dan Seni

Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan

Universitas Riau

Abstrak: Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui keefektifan dari model pembelajaran *three stage fishbowl decision strategy* dalam memahami teks bacaan seperti teks *naratif*. Adapun subjek dari penelitian ini adalah 46 orang kelas 2 SMAN 2 Kuantan Hilir, yang terdiri dari kelas *experimental* dan kelas *control*. Data dikumpulkan melalui *pre-test* dan *post-test*. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa *three stage fishbowl decision strategy* bisa mempengaruhi siswa dalam memahami teks *naratif*. Nilai rata-rata pada kelas *experimental* dan kelas *control* pada *pre-test* adalah 58,61 dan 58,78. Pada *post-test*, nilai rata-rata kelas *experimental* dan kelas *control* adalah 75,13 dan 61,39. Ini menunjukkan bahwa nilai rata-rata kelas *experimental* lebih tinggi daripada kelas *kontrol*. Berdasarkan hasil penelitian ini, Guru-guru bahasa Inggris disarankan untuk menerapkan *three stage fishbowl decision strategy* untuk mempengaruhi siswa dalam memahami teks *naratif*.

Kata Kunci: *Strategi three stage fishbowl decision, memahami, teks naratif*

INTRODUCTION

Language is a tool for communication, which is used to interact or talk each other. Wherever human being are, they need language. To make communication run well, human being must have a good language. Language is the important one in the world to share any information. English is known as a international language that has a important role in many aspects of human being life.

According to Curriculum 2013 there are four language skills (Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing) that have been insisted in teaching English as basic competency in English skill achievement. Curriculum as a source or plan that designs learning material that is used in teaching and learning activities in school.

Based on Curriculum 2013, there are five types of the text that should be taught by the teacher to the second year students in senior high school, such as; report, narrative, spoof, analytical exposition and hortatory exposition text.

Based on the information that has been given by English teacher of SMAN 2 Kuantan Hilir who explained that only some students that could reach the minimum standard of achievement (KKM). The minimum standard of achievement was 75, but it's only 40% of the students could achieve the minimum standard of achievement, while 60% of the students failed. The students got some difficulties to give idea and response about the narrative text, for example; when the teacher asked them about social function and generic structure of the narrative text. Their anxiety and motivation in reading narrative text was low therefore they have difficulties in comprehending the text. Furthermore, the teacher told that the students also lack of vocabulary that made them lazy to read a text in English.

The writer assumed that these problems might be influenced by several factors. The first factors might come from the teacher because the teacher might not very good in teaching the students about narrative text and then the teacher might not apply some strategies in teaching reading effectively. Furthermore, it is possible that the teacher do not know about the criteria of the students, so that they get difficulties to make the students understand about the text.

The second factors might come from the students because they might not have any motivation in learning English especially in learning reading text, therefore they could not catch the point about the text. Additionally, they might be bored in the classroom when the teacher explains about the material. Furthermore, teaching reading demands the students to comprehend the text and master the vocabulary, especially in narrative text, so that the students might be able to identify generic structure, social function, and moral value of the text. Besides, they have to discuss and share the story to their friends in their group discussion to get more understanding in reading text.

The teacher should have a special strategy to affect the students in comprehending narrative text. Therefore, the writer hopes this strategy would motivate the students to learn especially reading text, enjoy the reading class and also master the vocabulary. In addition the students also enhance their ideas and knowledge.

By using three stage fishbowl decision strategy, it is possible to make the students comprehend the narrative text effectively. Three stage fishbowl decision is a strategy which have a three stage in discussion which a portion of the group forms a discussion circle and the remaining participant form a listening circle around the group discussion. Furthermore, the students will discuss the material about narrative text. After they understand about the text, they will share in their group discussion in the

form of presentation. In addition, at the end of the discussion they will conclude the text together in group. This strategy was developed by Melvin Silberman in his book 101 active learning.

According to the problems that students have on comprehending reading text, the writer interested in conducting a research entitled "THE EFFECT OF THREE STAGES FISHBOWL DECISION ON COMPREHENDING NARRATIVE TEXT OF THE SECOND YEAR STUDENTS OF SMAN 2 KUANTAN HILIR"

Snowball Throwing Strategy

Three stage fishbowl decision was one kind of active learning. According to Dr Lynette Mitchell in her journal (2002:1) active learning is students' participation in learning and teaching process, where students themselves engage with and create their own learning experience. This learning, engages the students in the learning process. The students are required to do learning activities and think about what they are doing. In addition, the students not only receive the information from the teacher, but also they have to find the information by themselves.

There are so many kinds of active learning that influence the students on comprehending reading text, especially narrative text. In this study the writer uses Three-stage Fishbowl Decision strategy. This strategy encourages the students to more active in group discussion and share what they have found out.

According to Silberman (2009) *three-stage fishbowl decision* is a strategy which has a three stage in discussion which a portion of the group forms a discussion circle and the remaining participant form a listening circle around the group discussion. Discussion through *fishbowl* is a discussion to make a decision that the chairs are managed a half of circle (like a bowl or arched a half of circle) with 2 or 3 chairs are empty that look towards the participants discussion. The remaining participants form a listening circle around the discussion group, as if they look a fish in the bowl (fishbowl). When the group discussion convey the result of discussion, the remaining participants form a listening circle that want to give a comments or questions can sit on the empty chair and leave the chair after talking (Saputro,2011).

METHODOLOGY

This was an experimental research. It consisted of two classes, they were; experimental class and control class. Experimental class was taught by using three stage fishbowl decision strategy while control class without using the strategy. The research was done in SMAN 2 Kuantan Hilir. The time for carrying out the research was from August until September 2014 in Kuantan Singingi Regency.

Subjects of the Research

The subject of this research were 46 second year students of SMAN 2 Kuantan Hilir, There were 23 students in experimental class and 23 students in control class.

Instruments and Data Collections

The procedure of data collection technique will be carried out as in the following:

1. Pre-test
At the beginning of the research, every participant both experimental class and control class were taken pre-test in order to find out if they were the same level at the starting point.
2. Treatment
In the treatment, teaching English through three stage fishbowl decision strategy will be carried out for the experimental class while control class through conventional way.
3. Post-test
Experimental class and control class at the end of the research were administered with the same test. It was aimed to see if there was a significant difference between two classes.

Technique of Analysis Data

1. Quantitative Data
 - a. To analyze the individual score of the students, the researcher presented the data

$$M = \frac{X}{N} \times 100\%$$

Where:

M= Individual score

X= Number of correct answer

N= Number of items

(Harris, 1986:87)

Table.4 the Level of Ability

The level of ability	Test Score
Good to Excellent	80-100
Average to good	60-79
Poor to average	50-59
Poor	0-49

(Harris: 1986: 79)

To know the students' mean score, the writer used this following formula

$$X = \frac{\sum x}{N}$$

X = the mean score of the test

$\sum x$ = total of the students' score

N = number of students

(LR.Gay:2009)

Try out

To find out whether test item is qualified as good instrument in the research or not, the researcher have to measure students' reading comprehension skill, previously try out test must be held. The instrument to be tried out was the composition test. The result of test was used to find out the validity and reliability.

1. Validity of try out test

Heaton states that validity is the extent to which it measures what is supposed to measure and nothing else. The result was consulted to critical score for r-product moment. If the obtained coefficient of correlation was higher than the critical score for r-product moment, it meant that a paragraph was valid at 5% alpha level significance.

To calculate the validity, the researcher used the formula as follows:

$$r_{xy} = \frac{N \sum XY - \sum X (\sum Y)}{\sqrt{N \sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2} \sqrt{N \sum Y^2 - (\sum Y)^2}}$$

Where:

r_{xy} = coefficient of correlation between X and Y

N = the number of students

$\sum X$ = total score of test item

$\sum Y$ = total score

$\sum XY$ = the sum of multiplication X times Y

2 Reliability of try out test

Reliability refers to the stability or the consistency of the test scores. Heaton states that reliability is a necessary characteristic of any good test; for it to be valid at all, a test must first be reliable as a measuring instrument. In this study, the reliability of the test was measured by comparing the obtained score with r-score product moment. Thus, if they obtained score was higher than the table r-score, it could be said that the test was reliable. To calculate the reliability of the test, the writer used the formula as follows:

$$r_{ii} = \frac{k}{k-1} \left(1 - \frac{\sigma_b^2}{\sigma_t^2} \right)$$

Where:

r_{ii} = index reliability

k = number of items

σ_b^2 = items variance

σ_t^2 = total variance

3. Item difficulty of try out test

Heaton states that "the index of difficulty of an item simply shows how easy or difficult the particular item proved in the test". If a teacher knows deeply about item difficulty in making a test, he can make his test easy, medium, or difficult.

To know the item difficulty, the writer used the formula:

$$FV = \frac{R}{N}$$

Where:

FV= Difficulty level

R = The number of correct answer

N = The number of students

Criteria:

$0.00 \leq P < 0.30$ is difficult

$0.30 \leq P < 0.70$ is medium

$0.70 \leq P < 1.00$ is easy

To find the result of standard deviation of each group, the following formula is used,

$$S = \frac{\sqrt{X^2 - \frac{(\sum X)^2}{N}}}{N-1}$$

Where:

X^2 = Total Square of students' score

$\sum X$ = The mean score

S = Standard deviation

N = Number of the students

1 = Constant number

(Hatch and Lazaraton, 1991: 185)

In order to know the increase of the students' ability, the writer would compare the average score of pre-test and post-test in the t-test formula.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{b. } t\text{-test} &= \frac{\overline{Xe} - \overline{Xc}}{S(\overline{Xe} - \overline{Xc})} \\ \text{c. } & \end{aligned}$$

Where, t-test = The value which statistical significant of the mean difference will be judge

\overline{Xe} = Mean score of experimental class

\overline{Xc} = Mean score of control class

$S(\overline{Xe} - \overline{Xc})$ = Standard error of post-test in experimental class and control class

(Hatch and Faraday, 1982:105 in Soemarni)

After finding out t-score, the final step was to figure out the degree of freedom of two groups. The degree of freedom was used to determine whether the t-score is a significant value.

$$D.f=(N_x-1)+(N_y-1)$$

Where, df= the degree of freedom of two groups

N= the number of individual in the two groups

1 = Constant number

(Graham hole, 2009:7)

If the value of t-calculated is bigger than the value of t-table, the alternative hypothesis is accepted. Conversely, if the value of t-calculated is smaller than the value of the t-table, the null hypothesis is accepted.

FINDING AND ANALYSIS DISCUSSION

Try out test were conducted in class XI₃. They were given a try out by sing the instrument that will be used in experimental class and control class. The following is the interpretation of the try out test to find out the validity and reliability of the instrument.

a. Validity of Try Out Test

The reading test consists of twenty five item numbers. From the try out test that was conducted, it was obtained that all reading item numbers were valid. For example, the item analysis of relevance was obtained (xy r) 0.32 for $\alpha = 5 \%$ with N = 25. It would be obtained 0.3008. Since the result of the instruments validity was higher than the critical score, it was considered that the instruments were valid. The complete computation and the sample of computation are as below.

The computation of item validity:

$$r_{xy} = \frac{N \sum XY - \sum X (\sum Y)}{\sqrt{N \sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2} \sqrt{N \sum Y^2 - (\sum Y)^2}}$$

Where: N = 25 $\sum X = 20$ $\sum X^2 = 20$ $\sum Y = 448$ $\sum Y^2 = 8166$ $\sum XY = 366$

$$r_{xy} = \frac{25 \cdot 366 - 20 (448)}{\sqrt{25 (20) - (20^2)} \sqrt{25 (8166) - (448^2)}}$$

$$= 0.32$$

Because of xy r > table r, so item number 1 is valid.

b. Reliability of Try Out Test

After validity items had been done, the next analysis was to test the reliability of instrument. It was done to find out whether a test had higher critical score and gave the stability or consistency of the test scores or not. From the computation of reliability of the try out instruments, it was obtained 0.61, for $\alpha 5 \%$ with N = 25. It was obtained

0.3008. It could be concluded that the instruments that were used in this research was reliable. The complete analysis and the computation as follow:

$$r_{ii} = \frac{k}{k-1} \left(1 - \frac{\sigma_b^2}{\sigma_t^2} \right)$$

$$\sigma_t^2 = \frac{Y^2 - \frac{(Y)^2}{N}}{N}$$

$$= \frac{7802 - \frac{436^2}{25}}{25}$$

$$= 7.926$$

$$p = \frac{JB}{JA} = \frac{20}{25} = 0.8$$

$$q = \frac{JS}{JA} = \frac{5}{25} = 0.2$$

$$pq = 3.129$$

Index reliability:

$$r_{ii} = \frac{k}{k-1} \left(1 - \frac{\sigma_b^2}{\sigma_t^2} \right)$$

$$= \frac{25}{25-1} \left(1 - \frac{3.129}{7.926} \right)$$

$$= 0.61$$

The result shows that 0.61 is more than 0.3008; it meant that the items of Instrument were valid.

c. Difficulty level of Try Out Test

From the computation of difficulty level of the twenty five items analysis of reading, it was found that the difficulty level was easy. So, it could be concluded that the final total items analysis for the instruments were categorized satisfactory. The sample of computation is as follow.

$$FV = \frac{R}{N}$$

$$= \frac{20}{25} = 0.8$$

Criteria:

$0.00 \leq P < 0.30$ is difficult

$0.30 \leq P < 0.70$ is medium

$0.70 \leq P < 1.00$ is easy

The result obtained $FV = 0.8$

Because of the result is between 0.70 – 1.00, so the item number is easy.

The Result of Pre-Test and Post-Test

The students' ability of pre-test in experimental class

Score	Level	Frequency(F)	Percentages
80-100	Good to Excellent	2	8.7 %
60-79	Average to Good	5	21.7 %
50-59	Poor to Average	9	39.2 %
0-49	Poor	7	30.4 %

From the table.6 it could be pointed out that there were 2 students or 8.7 % who able to reach good to excellent level, were 5 students or 21.7 % who able to reach average to good, were 9 students or 39.2 % who able to reach poor to average level, and then were 11 students or 47.82 % in poor level.

Table.8

The students' ability of post-test in Experimental Class

Score	Level	Frequency(F)	Percentages
80-100	Good to Excellent	7	30.43 %
60-79	Average to Good	15	65.22 %
50-59	Poor to Average	1	4.35 %
0-49	Poor	1	4.35 %

From the table.8 it showed that the level of the students' reading comprehension in post-test was better than pre-test. It mean that there was an improvement that the students could achieve and an effect or influence after using three stage fishbowl decision strategy in teaching reading. At the end of the treatment, the researcher conducted the post-test; the number of the students who got good to excellent level was 7 or 30.43 %. The number of the students who got average to good was 15 or 65.22 %. Then, the number of the students who got poor to average and poor level was 1 or 4.35%.

The students' ability of pre-test in control class

Score	Level	Frequency(F)	Percentages
80-100	Good to Excellent	1	4.347 %
60-79	Average to Good	7	30.435 %
50-59	Poor to Average	8	34.783 %
0-49	Poor	7	30.435 %

According to the table above, it could be pointed out that 1 student was able to reach good to excellent level or 4.347 %. Furthermore, there were 7 students or 30.435 % who able to reach average to good level, 8 students or 34.783 % were in poor to average level, and 6 students were in poor level or 30.435 %.

The students' ability of post-test in control class

Score	Level	Frequency(F)	Percentages
80-100	Good to Excellent	3	13.04 %
60-79	Average to Good	7	30.44 %
50-59	Poor to Average	8	34.78 %
0-49	Poor	5	21.74%

Based on the table aboved, It could be seen that the level of students' ability in control class in post-test was worse than pre-test that the students could achieve. At the end of the lesson, the researcher conducted post-test. The number of the students who got good to excellent level was 3 or 13.04%. The number of the students who got

average to good level was 7 or 30.44 %.Then, there were 8 students or 34.78% who got poor to average level. While the number who got poor level were 5 or 21.74%.

A. The discussion of the test result

Table.13

Score	Experimental Class				Control Class			
	Pre-test		Post-test		Pre-test		Post-test	
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
80-100	2	8.7 %	6	26.08 %	1	4.347 %	3	13.04 %
60-79	5	21.7 %	15	65.22 %	7	30.435 %	7	30.44 %
50-59	9	39.2 %	1	4.35 %	8	34.783 %	8	34.78 %
0-49	7	30.4 %	1	4.35 %	7	30.435 %	5	21.74 %

The base score of the student in reading were dominated by poor to average level, with the average score 58.61 (experimental class) and 58.78 (control class). In post-test there were significant result between experimental and control class. In experimental class, the result of the test were dominated by average to good level (with the score average 75.13), while control class were dominated by poor to average level (with the score average 61.39).

Furthermore, in order to find out whether or not there was a significant difference of three stage fishbowl decision in teaching reading of two classes of the students, the calculated data was taken from the score of the students in post-test, it was given after treatment. The researcher calculated the result of standard deviation of each class (see appendix). The difference of students' score (mean) and standard deviation of both experimental and control class were shown in following table.

Table.14

	Experimental Class		Control class	
	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test
Mean (M)	58.61	75.13	58.78	61.39
Standard Deviation(SD)	12.036	9.86	11.67	12.79

From the table.14, it could be seen that there was a difference of the mean score and standard deviation between experimental class and control class. To know the effectiveness between the students' reading comprehension by using three stage fishbowl decision strategy.

T-test obtained of the students' score was 4.041. Furthermore, the degree of freedom (df) obtained was 44.

$$D.f = (N_x - 1) + (N_y - 1)$$

$$= (23 - 1) + (23 - 1)$$

$$= 22 + 22$$

$$= 44$$

Based on the score t-test (4.041) with the degree of freedom (df: 44), it was higher than t-table at the 5 % (0.05) grade of significance= 2.021.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the research findings, it can be concluded that the three stage fishbowl decision strategy was effective for the student in comprehending such a reading text as narrative texts. It can be seen from the average score of two classes, which have a significant difference score in post-test. In pre-test, the average score of experimental class and control class was 58.61 and 58.78 while in post-test the average score of experimental class was higher than control class , 75.13 while control class 61.39. Furthermore, According to result of t-test of post test in this research, it was found that t-calculated was 4.041 and t-table was 2.021. It showed that-calculated was higher than t-table. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. Conversely, alternative hypothesis was accepted.

SUGGESTIONS

Based on the research findings, the researcher would like to give some suggestions as in the following:

1. It may be better for teacher to use three stage fishbowl decision in teaching reading comprehension because it will encourage the students' understanding and affect their comprehension in learning English reading text.
2. The teacher who are going to use three stage fishbowl decision may need to enhance their ability in teaching in order to make classroom comfort and joyful.
3. The teacher may need to select an appropriate media, in order to make the lesson understandable and interesting.
4. The students should pay more attention when the teacher is explaining the lesson, In order that the students can catch the idea about the teacher explanation.

REFERENCES

- Arends, R.I. 2007. *Learning to Teach*. The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc
- Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.2008.*Developing English Competencies*.Pusat Kurikulum, Balitbang Depdiknas.Jakarta.
- Elizabeth an et al. 2003. *Teaching Reading Educational Practices Series*. Chichago.
- Gay, L.R, Mills, G.E and Airasian, P.2009.*Educational Research Competencies for Analysis and Application*.Pearson Education, Inc. New Jersey.
- Gerald Duffy. G. 2009. *Explaining Reading*. The Guilford Press. New York.

- Harmer, J. 1998. *How to teach English*. Addison Wesley Longman Limited. Malaysia.
- Harris, A.J and Sipay, E. R. 1975. *How To Increase Reading Ability*. Longman. Newyork and London
- Hatch, E and Lazaraton, A. 1991. *The Research Manual Design and Statistics for Applied Linguistics*. A Division of Wadsworth. Inc. Boston.
- Heaton, J B. 1988. *Writing English Language Test : A practical Guide or teaching English as a Second language*. Longman Group Limited. UK
- Hole, G. 2009. *Research Skills*. Retrieved on 25 february 2014.
<http://www.curtin.edu.au/curtin/dept/smec/iae>. Retrieved on 23rd february 2014
- Hidayah, I. 2011. *Improving Students' Reading comprehension of Narrative Text at the Second Year o SMA Negerri 1 Tapung Throug OARWET Method*. Unpublished FKIP University of Riau. Pekanbaru
- Indriani, L. 2012. *Peningkatan Keaktifan dan Prestasi Belajar Matematika Siswa Melalui Metode Three Stage Fishbowl Decision Pada Pokok Bahasan Keliling dan Luas Segitiga Kelas VII SMP Negeri 4 Jatisrono*.
http://etd.eprints.ums.ac.id/19497/26/Naskah_Publikasi_Ilmiyah.pdf. Retrieved on 20th february 2014
- Mitchel, L. 2002. *Active Learning and Reflection*. <http://hca.itsn.ac.uk/> Retrieved on 20th february 2014
- Mun, F.G et al. 2008. *Creative English Workbook*. Erlangga. Jakarta.
- Nuttal Christine. 1982. *Teaching Reading Skill in a Foreign Language*. Heineman Press. London
- Saputro, S. 2011. *Strategi Pembelajaran 1*. <http://www.scribd.com/doc/65486019/Strategi-Pembelajaran-1>. Retrieved 20th February 2014
- Silberman, M. 2009. *Active learning*. Pustaka Insan Madani. Yogyakarta.
- Soemarni, 2007. *The Effect of Porpe Method in Increasing Reading Comprehension of the Second Year Students at SLTPN 4 Sabak Auh, Siak*.
- Srinagesh, K. 2006. *The Principles of Experimental Research*. Elsevier Inc. UK
- Taylor, D.B. 2007. *Fostering Engaging and Active Discussions in Middle School Classrooms*. [literacyuncc.pbworks.com/f/Fostering%20Engaging%20\(BT\).pdf](http://literacyuncc.pbworks.com/f/Fostering%20Engaging%20(BT).pdf) Retrieved 22th February 2014
- Thomas, S, and Steinberg, M. 2006. *Alligator in the Fishbowl: A Modelling Strategy for Student-Led Writing Response Group*. Retrieved on 22th February 2014.
- Wiener, Harvey, S. 1991. *Reading Skill Handbook*. Houghton Mifflin Company. USA
- Wirryachitra. 1990. *The Reading Process: The Teacher and the Learners*. Iowa W.M.C Brownsn Company.