ETDC Indonesian Journal of Research and Educational Review
Volume 1, No. 2, 2022, pp 243-252
e–ISSN 2809-3682
p–ISSN 2809-7505

https://doi.org/10.51574/ijrer.v1i2.377

DESCRIPTIVE WRITING SKILLS UTILIZING A FISHBONE METHOD: A PRACTICAL APPROACH TOWARDS ENGLISH STUDENTS

Ahmad Munawir
Islamic Religion Institute of As'adiyah, Sengkang, Indonesia

Article Info

Article history:

Received Jan 21, 2022
Revised Feb 20, 2022
Accepted Mar 07, 2022

Keywords:

Fishbone Method
Writing skills
Descriptive Text

ABSTRACT

The objectives of this research are to discover the extent to which (1) the use of fishbone can influence the students' descriptive writing skills and (2) to see which of the five aspects of writing is enhanced the most when utilizing fishbone. A quasi-experimental approach was used in this study. The study took place at Public Senior High School, Gowa, South Sulawesi, Indonesia. The sample size for the study was 62 students, whereas the experimental and control classes had 31 students, respectively. The data was obtained using a written test as a pre-test and post-test for both classes, and the test results were analyzed using the SPSS 24.0 program. The results revealed that two components of writing were improved by the application of the fishbone method, namely content, and organization, while the other components were not improved. It refers to the probability value (0.052) being greater than or equal to the significance level (= 0.05). While, the variant score of the five writing components showed that the probability value (0.00) was lower than the significant value (0.05), the mean score of the five writing components indicated that organization was higher than others. That leads to the conclusion that (1) the application of the fishbone method did not improve the students' descriptive writing skills and (2) the highest improvement of the five writing components was organization.

Corresponding Author:

Ahmad Munawir,
Islamic Religion Institute of As'adiyah, Sengkang, Indonesia
Email: ahmadmunawirbugis@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

Writing is becoming increasingly vital in today's world, yet teaching and developing writing skills is complicated and sometimes challenging, requiring mastery of not only grammatical and rhetorical methods, but also intellectual and judgemental elements (Myles, 2002; Bailey, 2014; Borgman & Dockter, 2018). Several mental and bodily processes are carried out at the same time. Furthermore, writing demands students to elaborate the components of writing in terms of content, structure, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics, all of which work together to create a small section of a text that contains at least one sentence and starts on a new line. It usually focuses on a particular incident, description, or thought. However, students frequently face challenges in writing, such as organizing words into paragraphs, conveying their ideas, using language in grammatical sentences, coherences, cohesion, and so on (Farooq et al., 2020; Siddiqui, 2020). For example, they may have a large vocabulary but find it difficult to convey their ideas, which makes it tough for kids to construct a paragraph. Furthermore, one of the most common issues students

experience when they want to begin writing is deciding on a topic or idea. This is usually the first decision a writer must make before beginning to write, whether on a sentence or paragraph level. It is the teacher's obligation to increase their pupils' abilities, particularly their writing skills, so that they can write effortlessly and creatively (Mak & Coniam, 2008; Ahmed, 2019).

In light of the aforementioned issue, the researcher conducted preliminary observations at a public school in Sungguminasa and discovered that first-year pupils have difficulty articulating their ideas and writing phrases and paragraphs. In response to the challenge, the researcher discovered that there are a variety of strategies that may be utilized to increase a student's writing ability, one of which is the fishbone approach. The Fishbone method or usually known as the cause and effect diagram or Ishikawa diagram is a method developed by Kaoru Ishikawa (Bilsel & Lin, 2012; Harrington, 2016; Xu & Dang, 2020), is one of the methods in teaching writing that may support the expected situation.

When it comes to fishbone, it instructs students to create a visual representation that clearly demonstrates the relationship between the topic and the numerous aspects that affect it. The model's shape resembles the skeleton of a fish. The topic to be analyzed is represented by the fishbone, and the factors or categories of factors connected to the topic are represented by the fishbone. It can be a lot of fun for students to write in a creative way (Slameto, 2016; Shinde et al., 2018; Fauziah, 2022).

In light of the foregoing, the following research questions were formulated: (1) Does using fishbone improve students' descriptive writing skills in terms of content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics?; and (2) Which of the five components of writing is most significantly improved by using fishbone? The objectives of this study were to determine the extent to which the fishbone can improve students' descriptive writing skills in terms of content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics, as well as to determine which of the five components of writing is the most significantly improved by using fishbone.

Literature Review

A fishbone method is an analysis tool that allows you to look at effects and the causes that produce or contribute to those effects in a methodical fashion (Reilly et al., 2014; Luo et al., 2018; Fauziah, 2022). A fishbone method is a form of graphic organizer that is used to study the various elements or consequences of a complicated issue while also assisting students in organizing their thoughts in a simple, visual manner (Ghosh, 2014; Turan et al., 2019; Azbaki et al., 2021). A Fishbone Diagram serves multiple basic purposes, including 1) neatly grouping various potential sources of a problem or subject matter; 2) analyzing what really happens in a process; and 3) teaching teams and individuals about current or new processes and procedures. Fishbone diagrams can be used to discover and categorize potential special effect causes. Then break down the core causes and discuss some of the issues that arise. Every student engaging in this technique's activities can contribute by offering feedback or instructions that may be the source of the issues that develop.

Teachers can use the fishbone method to assist students to grasp abstract notions from an English text's core premise (Emilda & Hamzah, 2021; Le Quy, 2021; Alquraishy et al., 2021). When used correctly, this method has several advantages, including 1) assisting students and teachers in identifying root causes and areas with interrelated problems; 2) assisting students in organizing and relating texts in detail so that they can identify the main ideas in the text in the form of information, and 3) assisting students in understanding how the main theme can have diverse and interrelated ideas.

Furthermore, the fishbone method necessitates teachers' participation in the teaching and learning process (Nasir, 2014; Sufeni & Fatimah, 2018; Ardianto & Eviyuliwati, 2020).

The teacher leads students through the stages of action, explains key information from the reading text, feeds students' thoughts and assists them in locating specific information from a sequence of events, and responds to difficult questions made by students. When using the Fishbone technique to improve a process, there are various steps to take. 1) Determine the quality characteristics; 2) Write the quality characteristics on the Fishbone diagram; 3) Write down the primary causal factors; 4) Determine the important items of each factor; and 5) Use questions to discover causal factors in the teaching and learning of reading.

When used in the teaching and learning of English, the fishbone learning approach is effective (Coccia, 2018; Venkatesan & Merlin, 2019; Fauziah, 2022). Many benefits can be obtained from incorporating this technique into the teaching and learning of reading, including 1) a more comfortable classroom environment with an active learning atmosphere; 2) students who are more enthusiastic, active, and confident; 3) students who are more motivated in learning English, particularly in reading English texts; and 4) students who are not easily bored during the teaching and learning of reading because teaching and learning activities are student-centered; and 5) students do their work confidently without being afraid to feel like they made a mistake in doing the task.

Furthermore, according to Puranik & AlOtaiba (2012); Jabbarova (2019), writing is the process of generating an idea and expressing it in written form. Writing as "the expression of language in a textual medium using a set of signs or symbols" (known as a writing system) (Morin et al., 2020; Khair & Misnawati, 2022). Moreover, content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics are the five most important aspects of writing.

Moreover, sensory details are used in descriptive writing to explain how something looks, feels, smells, tastes, and/or sounds (Yaacob & Suriyanti, 2016; Samanian & Roohani, 2018; Akki & Larouz, 2021). In the mind of the reader, a good description generates a mental image of the thing, place, or person. Students should learn descriptive writing so that they may describe, characterize, and provide detailed information about certain objects so that readers can acquire descriptions or paintings of these objects (Holliway, 2004). The material part of descriptive writing must be examined in order to attain the desired purpose. For slow learners, descriptive writing learning material refers to the level of novice writing proficiency, with information in the form of simple broad subjects about something that students are familiar with.

2. METHOD

The study used a quasi-experimental approach with a non-equivalent control group. It was divided into two groups: experimental and control. A pre-test, treatment, and post-test were administered to both the experimental and control groups. The success of the treatment that investigated the use of the fishbone method to improve the students' descriptive writing skills related to content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and text mechanics for the first-year students at senior high school 2 Sungguminasa was dependent on the comparison of pretest and posttest scores. The researcher used two classes from seven tenth-grade classrooms as research subjects, which were divided into experimental and control groups. The Purposive Sampling approach was used to pick the sample. The sample size for the study was 62 students, with 31 students in X MIA 3 serving as an experimental group and 31 students in X MIA 1 serving as a control group.

The researcher employed a writing exam in this study. The test was divided into two sections: one before treatment (pre-test) and one after treatment (post-test) (post-test). The pretest was used to gather information on the students' prior knowledge of how to write

descriptive writing, and the post-test was used to assess the students' capacity to write descriptive text following treatment.

The researcher was gathered through the pretest and posttest in order to analyze the data. The following procedures were used by the researcher: Writing components rubric qualification is used to score the results of the students' pretest and posttest. Content, structure, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics are the five components of writing that are addressed in this study, as shown in table 1.

Table 1. Category score of Writing

Score	Description
$88 \leq x \leq 100$	Very Good
$75 \leq x < 88$	Good
$61 \leq x < 75$	Average
$47 \leq x < 61$	Poor
$x < 47$	Very Poor

The data were analyzed using SPSS, and conclusions were drawn based on the findings. The results were compared in the experimental and control groups using descriptive and inferential statistics such as mean score, standard deviation, and t-test. Using the fishbone method and the SPSS 24.0 program, ANOVA was used to determine which aspects of descriptive writing, such as content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics, were significantly improved.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

The researcher employed pre-test and post-test to gather data. Prior to therapy, the experimental and control groups were given a pretest to determine the students' writing skills. The goal of the test was to determine the experimental and control groups' prior knowledge before treatment. Following therapy, both the experimental and control groups were given the same test to see if the fishbone method might improve the students' writing abilities. The researcher used the t-test analysis to assess the data.

1. The students' writing ability in the Pre-test

The results of the students' descriptive writing abilities in the pretest of the experimental group before using the fishbone method and the control group before using the lecture approach are presented in this part. The researcher discovered information about the pupils' grades, which had been classified into groups, as shown in table 2.

Table 2. The Rate Frequency and Percentage Distribution

Scores Pre-test	Experimental Group		Control Group	
	Freq	Perc	Freq	Perc
100-88	0	0,00	0	0,00
88-75	0	0,00	2	6,45
75-61	5	16,13	10	32,26
61-47	16	51,61	17	54.84
47-0	10	32,26	2	6,45
Total	31	100,00	31	100,00

Table 2 reveals that the majority of the students in the experimental group's pretest acquired "poor," "average," and "extremely poor," with 16 (51.61 percent) individuals acquiring "poor," 5 (16.13 percent) students acquiring "average," and 10 (32.26 percent) students acquiring "very poor." "Very good" and "good" were not earned by any of the students. On the other hand, in the control group's pretest, 17 (54.84 percent) of the students were classified as "Poor." None of the students received "Extremely Good," two students (6.45%) received "Good" and "very poor," and ten students (32.26%) received "average."

The researcher illustrates the mean and standard deviation of the two groups' pretest results in the following table 3 to support the data described above.

Table 3. The Mean Score and Standard Deviation

Group	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Experimental Group	51.03	7.32
Control Group	58.54	8.21

The mean scores and standard deviation of the experimental and control groups before the students were given treatment are shown in table 3. According to the table above, the experimental group's pretest means the score was 51.03, which was considered low, whereas the control group's pretest means the score was 58.54, which was also considered poor. According to the results, the mean score of the students' writing ability in the pretest was considerably different.

Furthermore, in order to provide a clear picture of the student's ability to write descriptive prose in the pretest, the researcher visualized the data using the five components of writing, as shown in Table 4.

Table 4. The Pretest Mean Score Based on the Components of Writing

Writing Component	Experimental Group	Control Group
	Mean Score	Mean Score
Content	53.87	59.03
Organization	58.70	65.80
Vocabulary	51.45	60.64
Language Use	41.54	51.35
Mechanics	49.03	54.19

The students' pretest mean scores in each component of the two groups were different, as shown in Table 4. According to the data, the experimental group's mean

content score was 53.87, whereas the control group's mean content score was 59.03. The experimental group scored 58.70, while the control group scored 65.80. The experimental group had a mean vocabulary score of 51.45, while the control group had a mean vocabulary score of 60.64. The experimental group's mean score was 41.54, whereas the control group's mean score was 51.35, as determined by language use. The final question concerned the students' average score by mechanic. The experimental group had a mean score of 49.03, while the control group had a mean score of 54.19.

2. The Students' Writing Ability in The Posttest

The results of the students' descriptive writing skills in the post-test of the experimental group after using the fishbone method and the control group after using the lecture approach are presented in this part. As shown in Table 5, the researcher discovered data linked to the students' grades that had been classified into groups.

Table 5. The Rate Frequency and Percentage Distribution Post-test

Range Score	Experimental Group		Control Group	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
100-88	1	3.23	0	0.00
88-75	2	6.45	6	19.35
75-61	24	77.42	11	35.48
61-47	4	12.90	13	41.94
46-0	0	0.00	1	3.23
Total Score	31	100.00	31	100.00

Table 5 shows that the majority of students in the experimental group's posttest, 24 (77.42 percent), received "Average." 1 (32.33%) student received "very good," 2 (6.45%) students received "good," and 4 (12.90%) students received "poor." "Very Good" was not earned by any of the students. On the other hand, the majority of students in the control group's posttest showed that 13 (41.94 percent) were classified as "poor." 6 (18.35%) pupils received "good," 11 (35.48%) kids received "average," and 1 (3.23%) student received "very low." None of the students were deemed "exceptionally good."

Furthermore, the experimental group's mean posttest scores differed from the control group's. The experimental group's mean posttest score was 67.25, which was characterized as "Average," whereas the control group's mean posttest score was 63.25, which was also categorized as "Average." It was discovered that following treatment, the experimental group's mean score was greater than the control group's, despite the fact that both groups' mean scores qualified at the same level. It demonstrates that using the fishbone method to treat pupils can increase their descriptive writing ability.

Moreover, depending on the five components of writing, the mean score of the students' posttest scores. The posttest mean scores of the students in each component of the two groups were different, as shown in the table. According to the data, the experimental group's mean content score was 70.43, which was greater than the control group's mean score of 63.65; 70.43 > 63.65. The mean score of the

experimental group was 78.38, whereas the mean score of the control group was 67.90, which was smaller than the experimental group's mean score of 78.38 > 67.90. The experimental group's mean vocabulary score was 70.48, while the control group's mean score was 68.38, which was lower than the experimental group's mean score; 70.48 > 68.38. It was discovered that the experimental group's mean score was 51.87, which was higher than the control group's mean score of 55.48; 51.87 > 55.48. The final point concerns the students' average mechanics score. The mean score of the experimental group was 67.09, while the mean score of the control group was 60.64; 67.09 > 60.64. According to this description, the experimental and control groups' skills in producing descriptive text after the treatment are distinct in the sense that the experimental group's ability in writing text is superior to the control group's skill.

3. Test of Significance (T-test)

Because the significant value (2-tailed) was 0.00, it was smaller than = 0.05, there was a significant difference between the experimental and control groups in the pretest, according to the results of data analysis. Despite this, the posttest significant value (2-tailed) was 0.052, which was greater than = 0.050. It means that the null hypothesis (H0) has a high probability of being true. It suggests that using the fishbone approach did not increase the ability of first-year students at senior high school 2 Sungguminasa to write descriptive texts in terms of content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics.

Moreover, although there was no significant difference in overall score in the posttest, there was a significant difference in writing components between the experimental and control groups. In terms of the significance of the five components, the results obtained in both groups were different. The content had a significant value of 0.015, the organization had a significant value of 0.013, the vocabulary had a significant value of 0.549, the language used had a significant value of 0.259, and the mechanics had a significant value of 0.054. Those significant writing component scores plainly show that content and organization were smaller than expected (0.050). In other words, using the fishbone method greatly improved the content and organization.

4. Test of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

The score of F-obs 17.71 was higher than F-table 17.71 > 2.43, according to the results of the SPSS 24.0 program analysis. As a result, H1 was approved but H0 was refused. As a result, the five components (content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics) have different average scores, and the data also revealed that the statistics test p = 0.00 (0.05) revealed that there was a significant difference score among the five components of students' writing ability in the experimental group or that they have different scores.

Furthermore, the organization was the most improved aspect of writing. Because the students can arrange the topic phrase to form a broad statement that is followed by a supporting sentence, the mean score of the organization was 78.38, which was higher than the other components. After that, vocabulary (70.48) had a higher score since students were able to employ acceptable words in a phrase. Next, content (70.43) had a higher score since the students can clearly communicate information in writing form and the material is properly unified and completed. The fourth higher result was mechanics (67.09), which indicates that pupils can

correctly employ capitalization and punctuation. Language use (51.87) received the lowest score of the other components since it refers to grammar and language punctuation, however, the fishbone approach did not adequately describe how to apply language use in writing.

In conclusion, the use of the fishbone method did not improve the students' descriptive writing abilities. Organization, however, was the most substantial improvement of the five writing components.

4. CONCLUSION

The researcher came to the following conclusion based on the research data and discussions:

(1) The application of the fishbone method influenced two components of writing, namely organization, and content, whereas the other components were not affected. It means that the probability value (0.052) was higher than the threshold for significance (0.05). As a result, the implementation of the fishbone method in the descriptive text had no effect on the students' descriptive writing abilities.

(2) The probability value (0.00) was lower than the significant value (= 0.05) in the variant score of the five writing components. Furthermore, the average score of five writing components revealed that the organization was better than the others. This leads to the conclusion that organization is the most significant improvement among the five writing components.

In light of the findings and conclusions presented, the researcher suggests the following:

(a) In the classroom, teachers should monitor the use of the fishbone method effectively in the areas of vocabulary, language use, and mechanics, as the findings of this study did not show any effect on those components; and

(b) Further research with a more thorough investigation of the fishbone method in writing skills should be conducted in various genres.

REFERENCES

Ahmed, S. T. S. (2019). Chat and learn: Effectiveness of using WhatsApp as a pedagogical tool to enhance EFL learners reading and writing skills. *International Journal of English Language and Literature Studies*, *8*(2), 61-68. https://doi.org/10.18488/journal.23.2019.82.61.68

Akki, F., & Larouz, M. (2021). The relationship between speaking and writing in descriptive discourse in a Moroccan university EFL context. *International Journal of Linguistics and Translation Studies*, *2*(1), 124-134. https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlts.v2i1.102

Alquraishy, S. W., Meteab, S. A. A., & Mahlool, G. M. (2021). Exploring the Role of the Fishbone Diagram on Iraqi EFL Learners' Expository Writing. *Review of International Geographical Education Online*, *11*(5), 2111-2119. https://rigeo.org/submit-a-menuscript/index.php/submission/article/view/939/849

Ardianto, D. N. H., & Eviyuliwati, I. (2020). The Effect of Fishbone Diagram on Students' Writing of Analytical Exposition Text. In *ICEMS 2019: Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Education in Muslim Society, ICEMS 2019, 30*

September-01 October 2019, Jakarta, Indonesia (p. 268). European Alliance for Innovation.

Azbaki, O., Hagal, M. A., & Ramadhan, A. R. (2021). Ishikawa Model for Improving the use of Brainstorming Technique to Elicit User Requirements. In *2021 IEEE 1st International Maghreb Meeting of the Conference on Sciences and Techniques of Automatic Control and Computer Engineering MI-STA* (pp. 254-258). IEEE. https://doi.org/10.1109/MI-STA52233.2021.9464467

Bailey, S. (2014). *Academic writing: A handbook for international students*. Routledge.

Bilsel, R. U., & Lin, D. K. (2012). Ishikawa cause and effect diagrams using capture recapture techniques. *Quality Technology & Quantitative Management*, *9*(2), 137-152. https://doi.org/10.1080/16843703.2012.11673282

Borgman, J., & Dockter, J. (2018). Considerations of access and design in the online writing classroom. *Computers and Composition*, *49*, 94-105. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2018.05.001

Coccia, M. (2018). The Fishbone diagram to identify, systematize and analyze the sources of general purpose Technologies. *Journal of Social and Administrative Sciences*, *4*(4), 291-303. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3100011

Emilda, I., & Hamzah, H. (2021). The Effect of Fishbone Method on Students Writing Ability of Report Text. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, *10*(4), 715-723. https://doi.org/10.24036/jelt.v10i4.114903

Farooq, M. S., Uzair-Ul-Hassan, M., & Wahid, S. (2020). Opinion of second language learners about writing difficulties in English language. *South Asian Studies*, *27*(1). http://journals.pu.edu.pk/journals/index.php/IJSAS/article/viewFile/2847/1092

Fauziah, M. (2022). The Effectiveness Of Fishbone Method On Students' Writing Ability Of Argumentative Text. *LENTERNAL: Learning and Teaching Journal*, *3*(1), 10-14. https://doi.org/10.32923/lenternal.v3i1.2229

Ghosh, K. (2014). Creativity in business schools: towards a need based developmental approach. *Global Journal of Flexible Systems Management*, *15*(2), 169-178. https://doi.org/10.1177/00472395211047865

Harrington, H. J. (2016). Cause-and-Effect Diagram. *The Innovation Tools Handbook, Volume 2: Evolutionary and Improvement Tools that Every Innovator Must Know*, 5.

Holliway, D. R. (2004). Through the eyes of my reader: A strategy for improving audience perspective in children's descriptive writing. *Journal of research in childhood education*, *18*(4), 334-349. https://doi.org/10.1080/02568540409595045

Jabbarova, A. (2019). Psychological characteristics of written texts. *Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal*, *2019*(1), 21. https://uzjournals.edu.uz/tziuj/vol2019/iss1/21

Khair, U., & Misnawati, M. (2022). Indonesian language teaching in elementary school: Cooperative learning model explicit type instructions chronological technique of events on narrative writing skills from interview texts. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, *6*, 172-184. https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v6nS2.1974

Le Quy, M. H. (2021). Students' Vocabulary Memorization is Enhanced via Fishbone Diagram. In *18th International Conference of the Asia Association of Computer-Assisted Language Learning (AsiaCALL–2-2021)* (pp. 380-387). Atlantis Press. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.211224.037

Luo, T., Wu, C., & Duan, L. (2018). Fishbone diagram and risk matrix analysis method and its application in safety assessment of natural gas spherical tank. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *174*, 296-304. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.10.334

Mak, B., & Coniam, D. (2008). Using wikis to enhance and develop writing skills among secondary school students in Hong Kong. *System*, *36*(3), 437-455. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2008.02.004

Morin, O., Kelly, P., & Winters, J. (2020). Writing, graphic codes, and asynchronous communication. *Topics in cognitive science*, *12*(2), 727-743. https://doi.org/10.1111/tops.12386

Myles, J. (2002). Second language writing and research: The writing process and error analysis in student texts. *Tesl-Ej*, *6*(2), 1-20. http://www.tesl-ej.org/wordpress/issues/volume6/ej22/ej22a1/?wscr

Nasir, N. (2014). Fishbone Strategy in Teaching English in Indonesia: a Tool Organizer for Learning EFL Reading. In *2nd International Conference on Education and Language 2014*. Bandar Lampung University.

Puranik, C. S., & AlOtaiba, S. (2012). Examining the contribution of handwriting and spelling to written expression in kindergarten children. *Reading and writing*, *25*(7), 1523-1546. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-011-9331-x

Reilly, J. B., Myers, J. S., Salvador, D., & Trowbridge, R. L. (2014). Use of a novel, modified fishbone diagram to analyze diagnostic errors. *Diagnosis*, *1*(2), 167-171. https://doi.org/10.1515/dx-2013-0040

Samanian, S., & Roohani, A. (2018). Effects of self-regulatory strategy development on EFL learners' descriptive writing and reflective thinking. *Research in English language pedagogy*, *6*(1), 95-116. https://doi.org/10.30486/RELP.2018.538782

Shinde, D. D., Ahirrao, S., & Prasad, R. (2018). Fishbone diagram: application to identify the root causes of student–staff problems in technical education. *Wireless personal communications*, *100*(2), 653-664. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11277-018-5344-y

Slameto, S. (2016). The Application of Fishbone Diagram Analisis to Improve School Quality. *Dinamika Ilmu: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 59-74. https://doi.org/10.21093/di.v16i1.262

Siddiqui, K. A. (2020). Analyzing Factors Influencing the Paragraph Organization in English Language Writing of Intermediate Students. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, *32*(1), 99-106. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1259517

Sufeni, M., & Fatimah, S. (2018). Using "Fishbone Diagram" to Teach Writing Discussion Text to Senior High School Students. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, *7*(3), 548-555. https://doi.org/10.24036/jelt.v7i3.101102

Turan, U., Fidan, Y., & Yıldıran, C. (2019). Critical thinking as a qualified decision making tool. *Journal of History Culture and Art Research*, *8*(4), 1-18. https://doi.org/10.7596/taksad.v8i4.2316

Venkatesan, L., & Merlin, A. (2019). Effectiveness of fish bone diagram as a teaching tool. *TNNMC Journal of Nursing Education and Administration*, *7*(1), 22-25.

Xu, Z., & Dang, Y. (2020). Automated digital cause-and-effect diagrams to assist causal analysis in problem-solving: a data-driven approach. *International Journal of Production Research*, *58*(17), 5359-5379. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2020.1727043

Yaacob, A., & Suriyanti, S. (2016). Exploring teacher strategies in teaching descriptive writing in Indonesia. *Malaysian Journal of Learning and Instruction*, *13*(2), 71-95. https://doi.org/10.32890/mjli2016.13.2.3