JoTELL *Journal of Teaching English, Linguistics, and Literature* published by English Education Study Program, Faculty of Languages and Arts, Universitas Negeri Manado, Vol. 3 No. 3, pp. 303-310

# THE EFFECTIVENESS OF FISHBOWL TO STUDENT' SPEAKING ABILITY AT SMA NEGERI 1 MANADO

## FABIOLA KAROUW, IGNATIUS J.C. TUERAH, PAULA HAMPP UNIVERSITAS NEGERI MANADO

Correspondence author: <u>javiertuerah@unima.ac.id</u>

Received: 10 January 2024 Accepted: 19 February 2024 Published: 22 February 2024

#### Abstract:

Speaking is a mode of communication that includes the creation, transmission, and receiving of ideas. Unfortunately, most students taught that they are not able to speak English well enough. The usage of teacher-teaching methods may be the root of the issues. In certain cases, the instructor maintains control over the majority of the class by providing a few opportunities for students to practice speaking in front of the group. Determining if Fishbowl is helpful for improving students' speaking ability is the aim of this study. The case was conducted in the SMA Negeri 1 Manado. Thirty-six twelfth-grade students served as the subjects of this investigation. The researcher carried out a quantitative investigation using a pre-experimental design and a single group for the pre- and post-tests. During the process of gathering data, the researcher employed an experiment. The study employed two tests: a pre-test and a post-test. The format of the pre- and post-tests is the same, but the subjects are not. According to the study's results, the mean score of the posttest (86,19) was higher than the pre-test's (32,91). This suggests that pupils' speaking abilities were enhanced by the Fishbowl approach.

Keywords: Teaching, Teaching techniques, Fishbowl, Speaking skills, Student

## INTRODUCTION

Because humans are social creatures, communication is crucial, to transmit a message or piece of information to someone else in daily life, communication is important (Liando et al., 2023; Liando et al., 2022; Liando & Tatipang, 2022; Liando, 2010). Furthermore, language is a crucial component of communication. The four language abilities are, as we all know, speaking, writing, listening, and reading. Every pupil must become proficient in it in order to follow language learning instructions without difficulty One of the four most important language competency abilities is speaking, especially for those who speak English as a second or foreign language (Kumayas & Lengkoan, 2023). Given the rise of English as an international language

for communication, McDonough et al. (2013) state that it is obvious that many learners need to communicate and interact in English in a variety of contexts, such as for business, travel, or other professional reasons.

The world's most important language nowadays is English. Almost everyone uses it for communication in a wide range of nations worldwide. English has long been a subject of particular interest. This is due to the fact that English is crucial in many facets of our lives. The primary language used internationally is English. Language is a medium of communication for peoples all over the world to achieve commercial, social, cultural, scientific, and technological goals, according to Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 20, 2003. Additionally, language proficiency is necessary for professional advancement, therefore students must be able to comprehend and apply English in order to become more confident in the face of international competition. In Indonesia, junior and senior high schools are required to take English classes. Despite this, very few graduates of these schools possess the ability to speak effectively in English.

According to Abdurrahman, speaking is one of process communication that consists of producing, receiving, and transferring an idea (Usman, 2015). It means that other people should understand a message or idea. Most students are shy or afraid to give their opinion when carrying out learning in the classroom or when the teacher asks students to describe something based on the material. They are not confident in their abilities, and students become anxious and perplexed when asked to speak in English in front of the class.

The fishbowl has an important thing that the teachers and learners can be used in the learning process. A statement confirms from Michael Cholewinski that using a cultural and conversational level, the Fishbowl is very diverse and in high demand. This activity sheds new light on the difficulties faced by reluctant communicative English students. He also said this technique is a long-term approach for solving problems (Cholewinski, 2014). The usage of teacher-teaching approaches can contribute to the above listed issues. By providing limited chance for students to practice speaking in class, the teacher controls the majority of the class. The

researcher carried out a study titled "The Effectiveness of the Fishbowl for students' speaking ability" based on the previously provided explanation.

## **RESEARCH METHOD**

In this study, a pre-experimental methodology was employed by the researcher to gather quantitative data using a single group pre- and post-testing. The oral exam was the instrument used by the researcher to obtain the required data. The test consists of two parts: pre- and post-tests. The subjects of the pre- and post-tests are different, but they follow the same framework. To ascertain the extent of students' confidence and ability to speak in front of the class, the researcher administered a pre-test. The researcher gathered the test assessment findings after the students were instructed to discuss and argue the issue of "Indonesian Presidential Election 2024" in front of the class.

The researcher started the post-test as usual, went over the fishbowl and asking and exchanging opinions once more, administered a post-test to determine the efficacy of the procedures employed, and then introduced the topic, "The Relocation of the Capital of Indonesia." In order to monitor how the Fishbowl learning strategy had impacted the students' ability to articulate their opinions and arguments, as well as their development in speaking in front of the class and confidence, the researcher asked each student to present their ideas and arguments on this topic. The researcher applied the Mean Formula as follows to analyze the data:

$$\overline{x} = \frac{\Sigma x}{N}$$

Where:

 $\bar{x}$  = the mean score

 $\sum x$  = all score of the sample

N = total number of students

#### FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The researcher used a class of thirty-six students as their sample. Participants in this study were SMA Negeri 1 Manado students in class XII Bahasa. The class XII Bahasa students used the Fishbowl method as a teaching tool to enhance their

speaking skills during the treatment. The results of the pre- and post-tests were shown, along with the percentage of each. The post-test was administered following in-class instruction, while the pre-test was administered before treatment.

The researcher looked at each student's pre-test (T1) and post-test (T2) results throughout this phase. Using the results of the two tests, the researcher estimated the accurate response for each student and multiplied it by four. Below are the findings from the examination of the pre-test (T1) and post-test (T2) data.

Table 1. The score of students in T<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>2</sub>

| STUDENTS | SCORE (T <sub>1</sub> ) | SCORE (T <sub>2</sub> ) |  |
|----------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| 1        | 29                      | 84                      |  |
| 2        | 25                      | 80                      |  |
| 3        | 25                      | 80                      |  |
| 4        | 30                      | 75                      |  |
| 5        | 27                      | 84                      |  |
| 6        | 30                      | 80                      |  |
| 7        | 30                      | 90                      |  |
| 8        | 25                      | 85                      |  |
| 9        | 40                      | 80                      |  |
| 10       | 35                      | 90                      |  |
| 11       | 35                      | 75                      |  |
| 12       | 35                      | 85                      |  |
| 13       | 40                      | 95                      |  |
| 14       | 20                      | 80                      |  |
| 15       | 25                      | 80                      |  |
| 16       | 40                      | 95                      |  |
| 17       | 40                      | 90                      |  |
| 18       | 50                      | 100                     |  |
| 19       | 45                      | 95                      |  |
| 20       | 25                      | 90                      |  |
| 21       | 27                      | 85                      |  |
| 22       | 30                      | 80                      |  |
| 23       | 45                      | 90                      |  |
| 24       | 40                      | 90                      |  |

| 25   | 27               | 85               |
|------|------------------|------------------|
| 26   | 50               | 100              |
| 27   | 50               | 90               |
| 28   | 25               | 80               |
| 29   | 20               | 80               |
| 30   | 30               | 85               |
| 31   | 35               | 90               |
| 32   | 30               | 90               |
| 33   | 30               | 85               |
| 34   | 40               | 95               |
| 35   | 25               | 80               |
| 36   | 30               | 85               |
| N=36 | $\sum x = 1.185$ | $\sum x = 3.103$ |

The highest pre-test score was 50, and the highest post-test score was 100, according to the students' scores in the above table. With a score of 20, the pre-test had the lowest score, while the post-test had the highest score of 75.

Table 2. The frequency distribution matrix of pre-test (T1)

| Score | Tally     | Frequency | Cumulative | Cumulation | Cumulative |
|-------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|
|       |           |           | Frequency  | Proportion | Precentage |
| 50    | III       | 3         | 36         | 1          | 100        |
| 45    | II        | 2         | 33         | 0,91       | 91         |
| 40    | IIIII I   | 6         | 31         | 0,86       | 86         |
| 35    | IIII      | 4         | 25         | 0,69       | 69         |
| 30    | IIIII III | 8         | 21         | 0,58       | 58         |
| 29    | I         | 1         | 13         | 0,36       | 36         |
| 27    | III       | 3         | 12         | 0,33       | 33         |
| 25    | IIIII II  | 7         | 9          | 0,25       | 25         |
| 20    | II        | 2         | 2          | 0,05       | 5          |

As can be seen from the above table, 36 students completed the pre-test. The pre-test results showed that three students received the highest score of fifty, two students received forty, six students received forty, four students received thirty, one student received twenty, three students received twenty-seven, seven students received twenty, and two students received the lowest score of twenty.

Table 3. The frequency distribution matrix of post-test (T2)

| Score | Tally       | Frequency | Cumulative | Cumulative | Cumulative |
|-------|-------------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|
|       |             |           | Frequency  | Proportion | Persentage |
| 100   | II          | 2         | 36         | 1          | 100        |
| 95    | IIII        | 4         | 34         | 0,94       | 94         |
| 90    | IIII IIII   | 9         | 30         | 0,83       | 83         |
| 85    | IIIII II    | 7         | 21         | 0,58       | 58         |
| 84    | II          | 2         | 14         | 0,35       | 35         |
| 80    | IIIII IIIII | 10        | 4          | 0,11       | 11         |
| 75    | II          | 2         | 2          | 0,05       | 5          |

As seen in the above table, thirty-six students completed the post-test. Two students obtained a score of 100, four scored 95, nine scored 90, seven scored 85, two scored 84, ten scored 80, and two scored the lowest, 75, according to the post-test results.

The mean score (x) for each test is calculated by dividing the total score of the pre-test (T1) and post-test (T2) students by the total number of research subjects or students. The analytical stage is now complete.

Table 4. Result of Mean Score

| Pi            | re-test | Pos                        | Post-test |  |  |
|---------------|---------|----------------------------|-----------|--|--|
| $\sum x(T_1)$ | 1.185   | $\sum x$ (T <sub>2</sub> ) | 3.103     |  |  |
| N             | 36      | N                          | 36        |  |  |
| Mean score    | 32,91   | Mean score                 | 86,19     |  |  |

The results of the study show that thirty-six (36) students completed the test. On the pre-test, two (2) students scored the lowest at 20, while three (3) students scored the best at 50. On the post-test, two (2) students scored 100, the greatest possible score, and two (2) students scored 75, the lowest possible score. 32,91 was the mean score (x) prior to the test, and 86,19 was the mean score (x) following it. The students' speaking skill was still low before utilizing Fishbowl, according to the pre-test findings, but it had improved by the time the post-test results were obtained.

## **CONCLUSION**

The findings indicate that the post-test mean score (86,19) is greater than the pre-test mean score (32,91). This implies that the Fishbowl method of improving students' speaking skills worked. The researcher concluded that the students' satisfaction of learning was enhanced by the use of Fishbowl. Fishbowl could make the lecture more interesting. Fishbowl can be utilized in the classroom to assist pupils improve their speaking skills and get past any obstacles they may be having.

The researcher's recommendations are based on the conclusion, which states that English teachers should choose and use efficient teaching and learning techniques. Because using useful strategies can pique students' attention and motivate them to learn the English language.

#### REFERENCES

- Arikunto, S. 2010. *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta
- Cholewinski, M. (2014). Fishbowl: A speaking activity. *English Teaching Forum* (TESOL), Oct-Dec, Januari, 1–8.
- Kumayas, T., & Lengkoan, F. (2023). The challenges of teaching grammar at the university level: Learning from the experience of English lecturer. *Journal of English Culture, Language, Literature and Education*, *11*(1), 98-105.

Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 20. (2003). Act of the Republic of Indonesia

- on National Education System 1. System, 20, 1–58.
- Liando, N. V., Tatipang, D. P., & Lengkoan, F. (2022). A study of translanguaging practices in an EFL classroom in Indonesian context: A multilingual concept. *Research and Innovation in Language Learning*, *5*(2), 167-185.
- Liando, N. V., Dallyono, R., Tatipang, D. P., & Lengkoan, F. (2023). Among English, Indonesian and local language: Translanguaging practices in an Indonesian EFL classroom. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *13*(1), 204-216.
- Liando, N. V. (2010). Students' vs teachers' perspectives on best teacher characteristics in EFL classrooms. *TEFLIN Journal*.
- Liando, N. V. F., & Tatipang, D. P. (2022). English or Indonesian Language? Parents' Perception Toward Children's Second Language Learning Context. *Jurnal Lingua Idea, 13*(1), 61-75.
- McDonough, J., Shaw, C., & Masuhara, H. (2013). *Materials and Methods in ELT: a teacher's guide* (Third Edition). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Usman, A. (2015). Using the think pair share strategy to improve students speaking ability at stain ternate. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(10), 37–46.