

USING ONE STAY TWO STRAYS TOWARD STUDENTS' READING COMPREHENSION AND PARTICIPATION OF NARRATIVE TEXT

ERIPUDDIN

University of Pasir Pangaraian

eri_upp@yahoo.co.id

ABSTRACT

The purposes of this research were to find out effect of OSTS strategy on students reading comprehension and students' participation. There are four hypotheses formulated, First, There is no significant difference on the students' reading comprehension pre-test mean score between experimental group and control group. Second, there is no significant difference on the students' reading comprehension post-test mean score between experimental group and control group. Third, there is no significant different on the students' reading comprehension pre-test and post-test mean score of the experimental group. Fourth, there is no significant different on the students' participation in teaching and learning reading comprehension of experimental group before and after using one stay two strays strategy. The population was the grade X SMAN 2 Rambah Hilir. There are 4 classes. By using cluster random sampling, it was found that X C as try out class, X B as experimental class and X A as the control. This research was conducted by using quasi experiment. The researcher used test as the instrument and analyzed by using T-test. The result shows that one stay two strays could improve students' reading comprehension and participation.

Key words : One stay two strays, Reading comprehension, participation and Narrative text

INTRODUCTION

Reading is one of the four skills that should be taught in English teaching learning process. It can improve the reader's knowledge and give a lot of help to improve listening, speaking and writing. Hammer (1998: 68) states that reading has become an assential skill. He adds that reading is useful for other purposes too; any exposure to English (provides students understand it more or lesss) is good thing for language. It means that reading skill is the important one to gain information and knowledge from any reading text.

Based on the researcher's observation and interview at SMAN 2

Rambah Hilir, reading comprehension is one problem in teaching reading while teaching reading in senior high school is the important part in English curriculum. It is stated that in reading competence, the students are expected to understand the meaning of interpersonal and transactional written texts in the form of recount, narrative, procedure, descriptive, news item, report, analytical exposition, hortatory exposition, spoof, explanation, discussion, and review in daily life contexts and to access knowledge (BSNP: 2001).

At SMAN 2 Rambah Hilir, the researcher saw that the teacher only

used two kinds of strategies in the classroom namely grammar-translation and discussion. In learning process, the teacher usually asked the students to read texts and to find out the meaning of the difficult of words in texts and translate them. In addition, this strategy spent much time because when the students got the difficult words in the text, they saw the dictionary. Then the students should answer the comprehension questions which are provided with texts. So, it was caused that the student did not focus to read the text and answer the question.

The next problem was students' reading comprehension and their participation in learning reading. The researcher observed that the students' reading comprehension ability still needs a lot of improvement. The students lack of vocabulary. The materials that was used in learning English also contribute to the problem. The vocabulary level that was used is quite high for their level. It was caused the students got the difficulties to find the topics, main ideas and others component of reading.

Besides reading skills, the students also have problem in their participation. The student's did not give response if they did not understand about the text. They did not ask if they found the difficult text. They did not share information what they got from the text. Most of them said that reading is a boring activity. Based on the information from the students, they did not like reading because of there were many difficult words in reading and the teacher only asked the students saw the dictionary and translated them. It was made they feel boring when the teacher asked them to read an English text.

Eventhought grammar translation method was designed to teach reading, but the use of GTM is not

effective in reading comprehension which was supported the result of the test, and the average score was only 6,7 while the minimum criteria achievement is 7,0. It means that the result of English subject at Grade X SMAN 2 Rambah Hilir had not achieved the minimum criteria achievement yet

Based on the data above, The researcher concluded that teaching by GTM is not effective. The application of GTM used did not solve the problem inside the reading text. GTM did not guide the student to comprehend reading text. GTM did not invite the motivation the students more active in the class. In other words, GTM did not appear and support students' participation in learning reading. Therefore, there was a need for the teacher to use the strategy that could overcome the problem in reading comprehension.

Realizing the facts above, it is necessary for language teacher to foster reading on their students. The teacher should use appropriate methods and appropriate strategies which should be interesting to attract students' attention in teaching learning process. The strategy is One Stay Two Stray.

According to Lie (2010: 69) One Stay Two Strays is one of teaching strategies in teaching reading. He added that this strategy gives chance the group to share the result and information to others group. Crawford (2005: 63) states that One Stay Two Strays is one of cooperative learning strategy that designed to help students for get the meaning or information. One Stay- Two Stray strategy hopefully could help the students comprehend the text easier and makes the students express their idea about the text. One Stay- Two Stray strategy is making students more

actively in the learning process and the learning becomes more meaningful. One Stay- Two Strays strategy requires students to work in group, in which they will share their ideas to others and exchange them with other groups, to obtain the best understanding of the text. Therefore, this strategy is very useful for students to increase their reading comprehension in narrative text.

This is cooperative learning. They are seen as an active learning process, because students will learn more through a process of constructing and creating working in pair or a group and sharing knowledge. Nevertheless, individual responsibility is still the key of success in learning English. These learning strategies are believed as being able to give chance to students to be involved in discussion. It has courage critical thinking and is willing to take responsibility of his or her own learning.

Jason (2009: 105) states that the best size for a learning group will vary, but in most situations the recommended number is two or three . So, one stay two strays is a condusive class in learning reading. One stay two stays is a class that designed for learning in a group. One group consists of three students that students individually identify the key points then as pairs; they compare the key points identified and their reactions to them. Finally, each group is required to prepare a composite summary of the whole article .

Based on explanation above, there are two problems that might be investigated in this research. The

formulation of the problem is specified in the form of questions as stated below:

1. Is there any significant difference of students' reading comprehension and participation in narrative text between those who are taught by using One Stay Two Strays and those who are taught without using One Stay Two Strays in narrative text at Grade X SMAN 2 Rambah Hilir?
2. Is there any significant effect of using One Stay Two Strays toward students' reading comprehension and participation in narrative text text at Grade X SMAN 2 Rambah Hilir?

The purpose of this research is to find out the effect of using one stay two strays strategy toward student's reading comprehension and participation of narrative text at SMAN 2 Rambah Hilir. The objectives of this research are :

1. To find out whether there is significant difference of students' reading comprehension and participation of narrative text between those who are taught by using One Stay Two Strays those who are taught without using One Stay Two Strays in narrative text at Grade X SMAN 2 Rambah Hilir.
1. To find out whether there is significant effect of using One Stay Two Strays toward students' reading comprehension and participation of narrative text at Grade X SMAN 2 Rambah Hilir.

METHODS

The design of the research is quasi-experimental. According to Muijs (2004: 27), Quasi-experimental research is especially suited to looking at the effects of an educational intervention, such as a school improvement program, a project to improve a specific element or a professional development program. It is supported by Johnson and Christensen (2008:156) state that quasi-experimental research is research in which the researcher manipulates the

independent variable and is interested in showing cause and effect.

In this research, the researcher manipulated the independent variable as variable X (one stay two strays) then controlled other variable and observed the effect of dependent variables as variable Y (students' participation and students' participation). As Creswell (2008: 314) says that experimental research design can be seen as follows:

| | | |
|-------|---|----------------------------|
| O_1 | X | O_2 (Experimental Class) |
| ----- | | |
| O_3 | | O_4 (Control Class) |

In which:

O_1 and O_3 = Pre-test

O_2 and O_4 = Post-test

X = Treatment by using One Stay Two Strays strategy

The population of this research was the grade X SMAN 2 Rambah Hilir. The first year students in this school was divided into 4 classes. In this research, there were being two groups of participants as sample namely the experimental group and the control group. They was be determined by using cluster random sampling. As Gay (2009:129) states that cluster sampling randomly select groups, not individuals. The researcher got the sample by selecting the intact group as a whole is known as a cluster sampling (Singh, 2006:89). Besides that, the processes are: (1) The four classes selected randomly, the researcher prepares four small pieces of papers which wrote the name of each class and rolled it; (2) He will place the small roller papers into a glass and shook them; (3) He will take only two papers, the first small roller paper is the experimental group (X B) and the second one is the control (X A).

Collecting data is the most important one in research in order to support the research. The researcher applied a kind of data collection technique in order to obtain the data. It is as follow:

a. Test

The test was being used to determine the students' participation. The type of the test was multiple choice tests. A multiple choice item required the student to select a correct answer out of a number of options. The test was being given to the experimental class and the control class in order to find out the difference on participation in narrative text of students who was taught by using One Stay Two Strays Strategy and who was not taught by using One Stay Two Strays Strategy and to find out the

effect of using teaching strategy (One Stay Two Strays Strategy) toward participation of the first year students at SMAN 2 Rambah Hilir.

After the students do the test, the researcher took the total score from the result of the participation test. The classification of the students' score was being shown below :

The Classification of Students' Score

| Score | Categories |
|--------|------------|
| 80-100 | Very good |
| 66-79 | Good |
| 56-65 | Enough |
| 40-55 | Less |
| 30-39 | Fail |

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Result

The results of test, either pre-test or post-test (for both students' participation and their participation) were simply arranged in data tabulation. The data calculation is processed by using SPSS 20.00. Here was the detail of data presentation.

The Normality test of participation in Pretest of experimental and control group

The calculation of normality is necessary before testing the hypothesis. It can be seen in data tabulation *appendix 11*. If the distribution was said to be normal, then the distribution of the test in each group was valid. In this research, the researcher used one sample *Kolmogorov-Smirnov* test as follows:

Table III.1 Normality Testing of Participation Pre-Test

| | class | Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a | | | Shapiro-Wilk | | |
|------------|-------|---------------------------------|----|-------|--------------|----|------|
| | | Statistic | Df | Sig. | Statistic | df | Sig. |
| par_Before | ex | ,112 | 26 | ,200* | ,956 | 26 | ,321 |
| | co | ,162 | 29 | ,050 | ,922 | 29 | ,034 |

According to the result of the calculation, the calculated KSZ was 0.200 for participation pre-test in experimental group. This of value was greater than 0.05. Considering Sig. was greater than 0.05. It can be concluded that the data of the participation pre-test in experimental distribution are normal. Meanwhile KSZ was 0.050 for

participation pre-test in control group. This value was greater than or equal to 0.05. it can be said that the participation pre-test in control distribution are normal.

Normality test of participation in Post test of experimental and control group

The calculation of normality is necessary before testing the hypothesis. This test is a prerequisite analysis in order to used the right formula. It can be seen

in data tabulation *appendix 12*. If the distribution was said to be normal, then the distribution of the test in each group was valid. In this research, the researcher use one sample *Kolmogorov-Smirnov* test as follows:

Table III.2 Normality Testing of Participation Post-Test

| Tests of Normality | | | | | | |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|----|------|--------------|----|------|
| | Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a | | | Shapiro-Wilk | | |
| | Statistic | Df | Sig. | Statistic | df | Sig. |
| Posttestex | ,159 | 26 | ,088 | ,919 | 26 | ,042 |
| Posttestcon | ,155 | 29 | ,074 | ,908 | 29 | ,015 |

According to the result of the calculation, the calculated KSZ was 0.000 for participation post-test in experimental group. This of value was greater than 0.05. Considering Sig. was smaller than 0.05. We can conclude that the data of the participation post-test in experimental distribution are normal. Meanwhile KSZ for participation post-test in control group. was greater than 0.05. It can be said that the participation

post-test in control distribution are normal.

The homogeneity test of the students' participation pre-test mean score between experimental group and control group.

Homogeneity test is used to see whether the data are homogeneous or not. Below the result of the homogeneity testing:

Table III.3 Homogeneity Testing of Participation Pre-Test

| | | Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|----------|--------------------------------------|------------------|-----|--------|------|
| P_Before | Based on Mean | ,658 | 1 | 53 | ,421 |
| | Based on Median | ,356 | 1 | 53 | ,553 |
| | Based on Median and with adjusted df | ,356 | 1 | 52,618 | ,553 |
| | Based on trimmed mean | ,675 | 1 | 53 | ,415 |

From the table 3.3 by using *Homogeneity test*, it showed that the sig. was 0.421. Meanwhile α was 0.05. Based on the fact sig. (0.421) was greater than α at 0.05, it can be concluded that data are homogeneous.

The homogeneity test of the students' participation post-test mean score between experimental group and control group.

Homogeneity test is used to see whether the data are homogeneous or not. Below the result of the homogeneity testing:

Table III.4 Test of Homogeneity of Variance

| | | Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|--------|--------------------------------------|------------------|-----|--------|------|
| P_post | Based on Mean | ,001 | 1 | 53 | ,981 |
| | Based on Median | ,001 | 1 | 53 | ,972 |
| | Based on Median and with adjusted df | ,001 | 1 | 52,764 | ,972 |
| | Based on trimmed mean | ,006 | 1 | 53 | ,938 |

From the table 3.4 by using *Homogeneity test*, it showed that the sig. was 0.421. Meanwhile α was 0.05. Based on the fact sig. (0.981) was greater than α at 0.05, it can be concluded that data are homogeneous.

The homogeneity test of the students' participation pretest post-test mean score of experimental group.

Homogeneity test is used to see whether the data are homogeneous or not. Below the result of the homogeneity testing:

III.5 Test of Homogeneity of Variance

| | | Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|---|--------------------------------------|------------------|-----|--------|------|
| C | Based on Mean | 2,782 | 1 | 50 | ,102 |
| | Based on Median | 3,056 | 1 | 50 | ,087 |
| | Based on Median and with adjusted df | 3,056 | 1 | 48,274 | ,087 |
| | Based on trimmed mean | 2,670 | 1 | 50 | ,109 |

From the table 3.5 by using *Homogeneity test*, it showed that the sig. was 0.102. Meanwhile α was 0.05. Based on the fact sig. (0.102) was greater than α at 0.05, it can be concluded that data are homogeneous.

Hypothesis Testing

a. The First Hypothesis

Ho₁: There is no significant difference on the students' participation pre-test mean score between experimental group and control group.

Table III.6 The difference between experimental group and control group in pre test.

| | Class | N | Mean | SD | df | t _t | P |
|------|-------|----|-------|-------|----|----------------|-------|
| _Pre | RC Ex | 26 | 27,27 | 6,239 | 53 | 1,193 | 0,238 |
| | Co | 29 | | | | | |

From the table 3.6 by using independent sample t-test, it showed that the students' participation mean scores was 27,27 and its standard deviation was 6,239. Meanwhile the control groups participation mean score was 29,31 and its standard deviation

was 6,239. The calculated t value = 1.193 at 0.05 significant levels (df = 53) and t table was 2,0211. Based on the fact t value (1.193) was less than t table at level of significance at 0.05 equaled (2,0211), **the first null hypothesis was accepted**. It meant that there was no

significant difference on the students' participation pre-test mean score between experimental group and control group.

b. The Second Hypothesis

H₀₂: There is no significant difference on the students' participation post-test mean score between experimental group and control group.

Table III.7 The difference between experimental group and control group in post test.

| | Class | N | Mean | M | SD | df | t _o | t _t | P |
|-------------|-------|----|-------|---|--------|----|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| RC _Post | Ex | 26 | 27,27 | | 4,4355 | 53 | 7,844 | 2,0211 | 0,000 |
| | Co | 29 | | | | | | | |

From the table 26 by using independent sample t-test, it showed that the students' participation mean scores was 27,27. It showed that the sig. was 0.000. Meanwhile α was 0.05. Based on the fact sig. (0.000) was smaller than α at 0.05, it can be concluded that **the second null hypothesis is rejected**. It can be concluded that there is no significant

difference on the students' participation post-test mean score between experimental group and control group.

c. The Third Hypothesis

H₀₃: There is no significant different on the students' participation pre-test and post-test mean score of the experimental group.

Table III.8 The difference between experimental group in pre test and post test.

| | Class | N | Mean | M | SD | df | t _o | t _t | P |
|-------|-------|----|-------|---|-------|----|----------------|----------------|-------------|
| RC_EX | Pre | 26 | 11,74 | | 6,738 | 53 | 8,877 | 2,0211 | 0,00 |
| | Past | 29 | | | | | | | |

From the table 3.8 by using pair sample t-test, it showed that the students' participation mean scores was 11,74. It showed that the sig. was 0.000. Meanwhile α was 0.05. Based on the fact sig. (0.000) was smaller than α at 0.05, it can be concluded that **the third hypothesis is rejected**. It can be concluded that there is no significant difference on the students' participation pre-test and post-test mean score

between experimental group and control group.

d. The Fourth Hypothesis

H₀₄ : There is no significant different on the students' participation in teaching and learning participation of experimental group before and after using one stay two strays strategy.

Table III.9 The difference between experimental group and control group in post test

| Class | | N | Sig |
|----------------------|--------|----|--------------|
| Particip ation ex | Before | 26 | 0,000 |
| | After | 29 | |

From the table 3.9 by using pair sample T-Test (*Wilcoxon test*), it showed that the sig. was 0.000. Meanwhile α was 0.05. Based on the fact sig. (0.000) was smaller than α at 0.05 **the fourth null hypothesis was rejected**. It can be concluded that there is no significant effect on the students' participation in teaching and learning participation of experimental group before and after Using One Stay Two Strays strategy.

2. Discussion

This research proves that the proposed strategy (One Stay Two Stray) can increase the students' participation in teaching and learning reading and their participation in the experimental group students. Students of experimental group showed their enthusiasm to be engaged in learning activities and their improvement in their

participation in terms of macro skills and micro skills in reading.

One Stay Two Stray could improve the students' participation and their participation ability. Since by using One Stay Two Stray strategy the students were stimulated to read critically and reflectively. It attempts to equip readers with the ability to determine the purposes of reading, the ability to extract, to comprehend, and to assimilate information, the ability to make predictions, to examine reading materials based on the purposes of reading, the ability to pass judgments, and finally the ability to make decisions based upon information gleaned from reading. These foster students' independence when reading. It engages students in an active process where they must use their reasoning abilities and their own ideas. In such a way it will improve their participation and participation.

CONCLUSION

Based on these hypotheses testing results, it can be concluded that the implementation of One Stay Two Stray strategy can improve the students' participation and their participation mainly in narrative texts. It can be seen the result of participation and

participation mean score. The students' participation mean score increased about 42.87% and their participation about 52.75%. So, there was increasing in the students' participation and their participation mean score.

REFERENCES

- Arnstein, Sherry R. (2010). *A Ladder Of Citizen Participation*. Retrieved from <http://www.London.Org/>. Journal of the American Planning Association, on 2 March 2010.
- Bachman, Lyle F. 1990. *Fundamental Consideration in Language*

- Testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barret, T.C .1972. *Taxanomy of Participation: Reading 360 Monograph*. Lexington,MA: Ginn and Co.
- Brown, H. Douglas and Abeywickrama, Priyanvada. 2001. *Language Assessment Principles and Classroom Practices*. New York: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Brown, Linda and Lara, Vicky. 2011. Professional Development Module on Collaborative Learning. *El Paso Community College*. Retrieved from [http://www.Texascollaborative.Org/Collaborative Learning Module .htm](http://www.Texascollaborative.Org/CollaborativeLearningModule.htm) on 25 October 2011.
- Cooper, J. 1996. Group formation in cooperative learning: What the experts say. *Cooperative Learning and College Teaching*. Retrieved on 16th November 2011.
- Cooper, D.J. 2000. *Literacy Helping Children Construct Reading*. The fourth edition. Boston. Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Creswell, Jhon W. 2008. *Educational Research (3rd Ed)*. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Falchikov, Nancy and Blythman, Bargo. 2001. *Learning Together: Peer Tutoring in Higher Education*. New York: Routledgefalmer.
- Fergusson, George A. 1976. *Statistical Analysis in Psychology & Education (4th Ed.)* Tokyo: McGraw-Hill Kogakusha, Ltd.
- Gay, L.R., et al. 2009. *Educational Research*. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Gebhard, J. G. 1993. *Teaching English as A Foreign or Second Language*. Ann Arbor: University Of Michigan Press.
- Harmer, J. 1998. *How to Teach English. An Introduction to the Practice of English Language Teaching*. Harlow: Longman.
- Harris, Albert J. 1980. *How to Increase Reading Ability, A guide to Developmental and Remedial Methods (5th Ed.)*. New York: David McKay Company, Inc.
- Kimmelman, Joan et al. 1984. *Reading and Study Skills: A Rhetorical Approach*. New York: MacMillan publishing company.
- King, Carol and Nancy Stanley. 1990. *Building Skills for TOEFL 2nd Ed*. Longman. London.
- Lewaherilla, August. 2011. *Improving Students Reading Competence Through Two Stay Two Stray Technique (A Classroom Action Research to the Students of Class VIII A of SMP YPPK Biak Numfor in the Academic Year of 2010/2011)*. Unpublished Thesis. Surakarta: English Education Department Graduate Program Sebelas Maret University.
- Nunan, David. 1999. *Second Language Teaching & Learning*. Boston: Heinle&Heinle Publishers.
- Taylor and Bleach. 1984 . *Reading English Words Aloud: Will it help or will it not?. TESOL Journal*:

Volume 4, December 2011
Published by the Asian EFL
Journal Press Asian EFL Journal
Press. Retrieved from

http://www.tesol-journal.com/PDF/V4_1.pdf on
16th November 2011.

