

Improving Speaking Skill By Using Fishbowl Technique to the eight grade Students of Mts Plus Bahrul Ulum Islamic Centre Sungailiat

IMPROVING SPEAKING SKILL BY USING FISHBOWL  
TECHNIQUE TO THE EIGHT GRADE STUDENTS OF MTS PLUS  
BAHRUL ULUM ISLAMIC CENTRE SUNGAILIAT

Sunday<sup>1</sup>

**Abstract**

The objectives of the study were to explain the implementation of fishbowl technique in improving speaking skill and to find out there was any significant difference speaking skill between students who were taught by using fishbowl technique and students who were taught by non-fishbowl technique at Mts Plus Bahrul Ulum Islamic Centre Sungailiat. The samples were 67 students that were taken from the second year students of eight classes of Mts Plus Bahrul Ulum Islamic Centre Sungailiat. The samples were VIII D as experimental group and VIII C as control group. The result of the test was analyzed by using statistical analysis of *Paired sample t-test* and *Independent sample t-test*. Based on Paired Sample T-Test, it could be seen that the mean difference of pre-test and post-test in experimental group was -50.48, while the mean difference of pre-test and post-test in control group was -31.50.

In addition, the result of difference analysis in post-test of experimental and control group showed that the value of  $t$  obtained was 11.15 which exceed the critical value of  $t$ -table 2.00 (at the significant level  $p < 0.05$  in two tailed testing with degree of freedom 65). It means that the null hypothesis was rejected and the research hypothesis was accepted. The result of this study revealed that the post-test scores were better than the pre-test scores of experimental group. It could be seen by comparing their means. The mean of the pre-test scores was (12.27) while the mean of the post-test scores was (62.75). In line with the result, the researcher suggests that the fishbowl was one of the effective techniques to increase students' enthusiasm in learning English. This result hopefully would motivate the English teachers of Mts Plus Bahrul Ulum Islamic Centre Sungailiat.

**Keywords:** Improving, Speaking Skill, Fishbowl Technique

**A. Background of the Study**

English is one of the most important languages used by many people in the world as a tool of communication. English is used by some aspects, mainly politic, economic, social communication, business, education and tourism. As a result,

---

<sup>1</sup> English Language Education Study Program Tarbiyah Department State College of Islamic Studies Syaikh Abdurrahman Siddik Bangka Belitung. NIM. 1113071

people should know English to communicate with someone throughout the world.

Furthermore nowadays goal of teaching speaking is to improve students' communicative skills, because, only in that way, students can express themselves and learn how to follow the social and cultural rules appropriate in each communicative circumstance. In other words, there is an effective way that teaching speaking skill can be done through a task that help the students gain awareness, a practice and some aspect of linguistics knowledge for develop a productive skill.

Based on the preliminary study from observation conducted at MTs Plus Bahrul Ulum Islamic Centre Sungailiat, on May 27th to June 3rd 2016, the researcher joined the class and watched the learning and teaching process. The response of asking and answering questions in English was the focus on the research.

There were some problems that students faced, *First*, the students had low motivation in learning English. During the teaching and learning process they did not pay attention to the teacher, were not enthusiastic to the subject matter, they seemed to get bored and uninterested in English subject, they did not participate actively in the instructional activity, and some students looked sleepy during the instructional process. *Second*, the students felt disquiet. Such as some of students had ideas, but they felt worried about what friends would say, they also had worry feeling if other students would debate their ideas, they did not feel confident to tell what they meant, and there was competition among students, so the students who were lack in English felt ashamed to compete with others who were good enough in English.

Based on the interview with the classroom teacher, speaking was a real problem in her classroom activity because the students just spoke a few words. It was proved when they had to present a story written on their own words. She saw that there were only few of the students presented it well, most of them did not meet the requirements (correct vocabulary, good pronunciation).

In dealing with such problem, the researcher believed that the fishbowl technique is a good technique in managing classroom activity especially in conducting speaking activity. Working in group could solve the problems of students who do not like speaking in front class. The Fishbowl technique is a technique that allows one group to demonstrate a technique, while another observes and gives feedback.

A study by Na'imatul Rosidah, showed that the use of Fishbowl Technique was affective to improve students' speaking ability. Because fishbowl technique giving more practice and exercise. The other by Puput Apriyani, suggested that the application of fishbowl method and the students' speaking competence could be applied as one of teaching methods to improve students' speaking competence because it is make students feel fun and active in class. Another study by Kadek Ayu Nopiani, showed that the there was an improvement for using fishbowl technique, because fishbowl technique give students' positive changing attitude and motivation in learning speaking skill through fishbowl technique.

## **B. Objectives of the Study**

In order to solve the problem, the following objectives were set:

- a. To describe the implementation of fishbowl technique to improve students' speaking skill.
- b. To know whether there would be or not any significant differences in students' speaking skill between the students who are taught by fishbowl technique and those who are taught by non-fishbowl technique.

## **C. Literature Review**

### **a) Definition of Speaking Skill**

Speaking is one of the skills that have to be mastered by students in learning English. Speaking involves interaction with one or more participants, it can be concluded that if the students can speak English fluently that can help them to easy communicate and also explore their idea. According to Abheghan Sanige, "Speaking is one of the four natural language skills. The other three natural language skill are listening, reading, and writing. This means that effective speaking also involves a good deal of listening. Speaking takes place everywhere and had become parts of our daily activities. Speaking is the most difficult skills to be learned by students, among the four skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing).

Speaking skill is a challenging skill in teaching learning process, the teacher needs to be taught explicitly the communicative classroom activities. It is hoped for the teacher to give correction to the students' mistakes related to the characteristics of the spoken language in order to have natural communication. They need to be able to produce understandable language with grammatical sentences, appropriate words, and clear pronunciation.

Aspects of Speaking are fluency, pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, interactive communication, appropriateness, and complexity.

### b) Fishbowl Technique

Fishbowl is a technique which involves groups of people seating in circles in order to promote students' engagement and opportunities to closely observe, take notes, and give responses orally. Wood (2007) states that, "Fishbowl technique is a way to organize a medium to large-group discussion that promotes student engagement and can be used to model small- group activities and discussions.

There is a concept of the fishbowl technique based on the definitions above, fishbowl is a technique which involves groups of students seating in circles. It means that fishbowl is used to organize medium to large group activities which consist of different abilities.

Table 1

Implementation of Fishbowl Technique in the Class

NO.	Teacher Activity	Students' Activity
1.	Pre Activities : Teacher greets the students	The students respond greeting from the teacher.
2.	Main Activities : 1. The teacher start off some small groups of between 4 and 6 students, who are tasked with talking about a particular topic.  2. The teacher re-groups the class, moving their chairs into 2 circles, one circle is a large "fish-bowl" round the outside and the other small circle is the "fish" in the middle of the class.  3. The teacher watches the discussion	The students follows the teacher instruction, each students in a small group speak and writes down their thoughts and views on a piece of paper.  The students in small circle are the fish, and the fish as a speaker, and the students in the large group are the fishbowl as a listener.  During the discussion, one students from each group should sit in the small circle and tell everyone in the class about what was discussed in their group. One students who volunteers should write all new

No	Teacher Activity	Students' Activity
3.	<p>Post Activities :</p> <p>The teacher review the discussion and the teacher explain to the students about rule changes of the groups. Consequently, each meeting every students will get an opportunity be a fish or fishbowl.</p>	<p>thoughts and ideas on a paper. Fish students only speak of new ideas and thoughts that have not already been noted.</p> <p>The students listener disagrees with what is being said by the “spokes-fish” of their group can go up and tap them gently on the shoulder.</p> <p>This means that they will swap places.</p> <p>The students listen to teacher’s explanation.</p>

### c) Aspect to Evaluate Speaking Skill

To know the students progress, there should be evaluation in the end of research. Researcher assesses the student’s performance in order to know which categories improved or decreased. According to Harris D.P. (1969), there are four categorizes of oral proficiency scoring. It can be seen on the tables below:

Table 2

#### Rating Scale

Pronunciation	21-25	5. Speech consist of almost appropriate pronunciation
	16-20	4. Speech consists of hardly incorrect pronunciation
	11-15	3. Speech consists of some inappropriate pronunciation
	6-10	2. Speech consists of mostly inappropriate pronunciation
	1-5	1. Speech consists of very poor pronunciation
Grammar	21-25	5. Makes few (if any) noticeable errors of grammar or
	16-20	4. Occasionally makes grammatical and/or word-order
	11-15	3. Makes frequent errors of grammar and word order
	6-10	2. Grammar and word order errors make comprehension
	1-5	1. Errors in grammar and word order so severe as to

Vocabulary	21-25	5. Use of wide range of vocabulary taught previously
	16-20	4. Sometimes uses inappropriate terms and/or must rephrase ideas
	11-15	3. Frequently uses the wrong words; conversation somewhat limited
	6-10	2. Misuse of words and very limited vocabulary make comprehension quite difficult
	1-5	1. Vocabulary limitations so extreme as to make conversation virtually impossible
Fluency	21-25	5. Speech is quite flowing style, mostly easy to understand
	16-20	4. Speed of speech seems to be slightly affected by language
	11-15	3. Speed and fluency are rather strongly affected by language
	6-10	2. Usually hesitant; often forced into silence by language
	1-5	1. Speech is so halting and fragmentary as to make conversation

However, there are four components usually used to analyze speech performance, they are grammar, pronunciation, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension. But the researcher just used grammar, pronunciation and fluency based on the students' problems to improve student's speaking skill. The scoring also can include accuracy, articulation, eye contact, expression, intonation and gesture of the speaker. The researcher uses those speaking scoring rubric to collect the data, adopted from table 2.2.

Aspects	Score	Scale	Explanation
Pronunciation		21-25	5. Speech consist of almost appropriate
		16-20	4. Speech consists of hardly incorrect
		11-15	3. Speech consists of some inappropriate
		6-10	2. Speech consists of mostly inappropriate
		1-5	1. Speech consists of very poor pronunciation

Fluency	21-25	5. Speech is quite flowing style, mostly easy to
	16-20	4. Speed of speech seems to be slightly affected by language
	11-15	3. Speed and fluency are rather strongly affected by language
	6-10	2. Usually hesitant; often forced into silence by language
	1-5	1. Speech is so halting and fragmentary as to make conversation virtually impossible
Grammar	21-25	5. Makes few (if any) noticeable errors of grammar or word
	16-20	4. Occasionally makes grammatical and/or word-order errors
	11-15	3. Makes frequent errors of grammar and word order which
	6-10	2. Grammar and word order errors make comprehension difficult. Must often rephrase sentences and/or
	1-5	1. Errors in grammar and word order so severe as to make

#### D. Research Methodology

##### a) The Method Of Research

To increase the Speaking of students in MTs Plus Bahrul Ulum Islamic Centre and the process of “Improving Speaking Skill by Using Fishbowl Technique”, the researcher used *quantitative approach*. Sugiyono (2011) states that, *Quantitative approach* means that research methods is used to examine the population or a particular sample, collecting data by using research instrument, the data analysis by using quantitative/statistics, with the aim to test the hypotheses that have been set.

The researcher divided the subject into two groups. There was an *experiment group* where this group intentionally influenced by certain variables. The researcher gave the treatment to the students. In this case, the researcher treated the students by using Fishbowl method. Also, there was a *control group* where this group couldn't be influenced by other variable. For this group, the researcher taught by using conventional method. The control group was intended as a comparison to know whether there was a change or not after the

researcher had given the treatment by using Fishbowl technique.

**b) The Population and Sample**

The population in this study was all the second grade pupils of MTs Plus Bahrul Ulum Islamic Centre Sungailiat in academic year 2015/2016 with a total number 128.

Table 3

Table of population

No	Class	Number Of The Students
1	VIIIA	32
2	VIIIB	31
3	VIIIC	34
4	VIIID	33
<b>TOTAL</b>		127

*Source: Documents of Mts Plus Bahrul Ulum Islamic Centre Sungailiat in academic year 2015/2016*

The researcher chose students of VIII C and VIII D as samples. The headmaster suggested the researcher to take those two classes because both of them had the low score in speaking skill. The researcher determined the treatment group and control group through the score of students. Pre test result showed that students in class VIII D got lower score than students in class VIII C. the students in VIII D had problem in fluency, pronunciation and grammar meanwhile VIII C was better. Based on that result class VIII C was chosen as a control class and class VIII D was chosen as experimental class.

**c) Analyzing The Data**

**1) data of Test**

In this research, the researcher cooperated with Ms. Alice Crocker as the rater. Ms. Alice took a part to correct and assess the data, including validity test, pre test and post test. After all was corrected by Ms. Alice the researcher conducted statistic analysis. Statistic analysis was used to analyze the data by using certain statistic formulas. It was used to test the hypotheses which have been formulated. To find out whether or not there was a significant difference in achievement between the experimental group and the control group, the researcher used *matched t-test*. The researcher used



matched  $t$ -test to know whether the hypotheses is accepted or rejected. If the matched  $t$ -test result is smaller than the value of the  $t$ -table,  $H_0$  is accepted and therefore,  $H_1$  is rejected. If the  $t$ -test result is higher than the value of the  $t$ -table,  $H_1$  accepted and  $H_0$  is rejected.

## **2) Data of Observation**

To analyse the data of observation, the researcher applied it to know the implementation of fishbowl technique to improve students speaking skill. This data analyzed by using observation sheet developed by Said Zulfikar. In the observation sheet, there are some data related to; attendance of students, attention of students, interaction of students, and cooperation of students.

## **3) Data of Documentation**

The researcher used documentation as the source to complete the research data. This data used photos as the instrument to collect the data in order to see the implementation of Fishbowl Technique to the eight grade students of MTs Plus Bahrul Ulum Islamic Center Sungailiat. The other kinds of documentation which be used to get data are syllabus, lesson plan, learning material, rating scale, and photos during teaching and learning process.

## E. THE RESULT OF OBSERVATION

### a. The Result of Observation in Experimental Group

Table 4  
The Result of Observation

Meeting tag	Attendance			Attention			Activeness in Asking and Answering Question			Doing All The Activities		
	Number of students	Percentage	Category		Percentage	Category						
1	Pre Test	Pre Test	Pre Test	Pre Test	Pre Test	Pre Test	Pre Test	Pre Test	Pre Test	Pre Test	Pre Test	Pre Test
2	33	100%	Very Good	32	96%	Very Good	15	<53%	Low	21	63%	Low
3	32	96%	Very Good	26	78%	Good	17	<53%	Low	19	57%	Low
4	33	100%	Very Good	28	84%	Good	27	81%	Good	22	66%	Good
5	33	100%	Very Good	30	90%	Very Good	25	75%	Good	26	78%	Good
6	33	96%	Very Good	26	78%	Good	28	84%	Good	21	63%	Good
7	33	100%	Very Good	25	75%	Good	29	87%	Good	26	78%	Good
8	33	100%	Very Good	26	78%	Good	33	100%	Very Good	24	72%	Very Good
9	33	100%	Very Good	21	63%	Avera ge	24	72%	Good	29	87%	Good
10	33	100%	Very Good	24	72%	Good	23	69%	Good	24	72%	Good
11	33	100%	Very Good	30	90%	Very Good	21	63%	Avera ge	33	100%	Avera ge
12	33	100%	Very Good	32	96%	Very Good	21	63%	Avera ge	33	100%	Avera ge
13	33	100%	Very Good	29	87%	Very Good	24	72%	Good	32	96%	Good
14	Post Test	Post Test	Post Test	Post Test	Post Test	Post Test	Post Test	Post Test	Post Test	Post Test	Post Test	Post Test

From the result of the table above could be read as a scale of value in this following table :

Table 4.2

The Scale of Value

SCALE	CATEGORY
85-100%	Very Good
69-84%	Good
53-68%	Average
<53%	Low

Based on the result of observation, from 2<sup>nd</sup>-13<sup>th</sup> meeting for students' attendance categorized in very good type during the treatment. For students' attention, in the 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting, (32:96%) in very good category. In 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting, (26:78%) ran in good. In 4<sup>th</sup> meeting, (28:84%) classified in good category. In 5<sup>th</sup> meeting (30:90%) classified in very good category. From 6<sup>th</sup> meeting until 9<sup>th</sup> meeting include in average category. In 10<sup>th</sup> meeting (24:73%) classified in good category. From 11<sup>th</sup> meeting and 13<sup>th</sup> meeting included in very good category.

In addition, for students' activeness in asking and answering question showed that from 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting and 3<sup>rd</sup> includes in low category. In 4<sup>th</sup> meeting (27:81%) was improve in good category. 5<sup>th</sup> meeting (25:75%) classified in good category. In 6<sup>th</sup> meeting (28:84%) classified in good category. 7<sup>th</sup> meeting and 8<sup>th</sup> included in very good category. In 9<sup>th</sup> meeting (24:72%) and in 10<sup>th</sup> meeting (23:69%) classified in good category. In 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> meeting (21:63%) classified in average category. And 13<sup>th</sup> meeting (24:72%) classified in good category.

Therefore, for doing all the activities, from 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting until 4<sup>th</sup> meeting, the students' cooperation included in average category. In 5<sup>th</sup> meeting (26:78%) classified in good category. In 6<sup>th</sup> meeting (21:63%) classified in good category. In 7<sup>th</sup> meeting (26:78%) and 8<sup>th</sup> meeting (24:72%) classified in good category. In 9<sup>th</sup> meeting (29:87%) classified in very good category. In 10<sup>th</sup> meeting (24:72%) classified in good category. And in 11<sup>th</sup> until 13<sup>th</sup> meeting, the students' cooperation included in very good category.

**b. The Result of Observation in Control Group**

Table 5  
The Result of Control

Meeting	Attendance			Attention			Activeness in Asking and Answering Question			Doing All The Activities		
	Number of student	Percent age	Category	Number of students	percent age	category	Number of students	Percent age	Category	Number of students	Percent age	Category
1	Pre Test	Pre Test	Pre Test	Pre Test	Pre Test	Pre Test	Pre Test	Pre Test	Pre Test	Pre Test	Pre Test	Pre Test
2	32	96%	Very Good	31	93%	Very Good	21	63%	Average	21	63%	Average
3	33	100%	Very Good	27	81%	Good	23	69%	Good	28	84%	Good
4	33	100%	Very Good	22	66%	Average	24	72%	Good	29	87%	Very Good
5	33	100%	Very Good	24	72%	Good	20	60%	Average	25	75%	Good
6	33	96%	Very Good	33	100%	Very Good	32	96%	Very Good	28	84%	Good
7	33	100%	Very Good	29	87%	Very Good	31	93%	Very Good	30	90%	Very Good
8	32	96%	Very Good	31	93%	Very Good	31	93%	Very Good	27	81%	Good
9	33	100%	Very Good	31	93%	Very Good	31	93%	Very Good	30	90%	Very Good
10	33	100%	Very Good	30	90%	Very Good	32	96%	Very Good	28	84%	Good
11	33	100%	Very Good	29	87%	Very Good	30	90%	Very Good	30	90%	Very Good
12	32	96%	Very Good	29	87%	Very Good	29	87%	Very Good	28	84%	Good
13	33	100%	Very Good	27	81%	Good	32	96%	Very Good	31	93%	Very Good
14	Post Test	Post Test	Post Test	Post Test	Post Test	Post Test	Post Test	Post Test	Post Test	Post Test	Post Test	Post Test

From the result of the table above could be read as a scale of value in this following table :

Table 6

The Scale of Value

SCALE	CATEGORY
85-100%	Very Good
69-84%	Good
53-68%	Average
<53%	Low

Based on the result of observation, from 2<sup>nd</sup>-13<sup>th</sup> meeting for students' attendance categorized in very good type during the treatment. For students' attention, in 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting (31:93%) classified in very good category. In 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting (27:81%) classified in good category. In 4<sup>th</sup> meeting (22:66%) classified in average category. In 5<sup>th</sup> meeting (24:72%) classified in good category. From 6<sup>th</sup> meeting until 12<sup>th</sup> meeting the students' attention included in very good category. And 13<sup>th</sup> meeting (27:81%) classified in good category.

In addition, for students' activeness in asking and answering question showed that 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting (21:63%) classified in average category. In 3<sup>th</sup> meeting (23:69%) and 4<sup>th</sup> meeting (24:72%) includes in good category. In 5<sup>th</sup> meeting (20:60%) include in average category. And From 6<sup>th</sup> meeting until 13<sup>th</sup> meeting includes in very good category.

Therefore, for doing all the activities, 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting (21:63%) classified in average category. In 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting (28:84%) classified in good category. In 4<sup>th</sup> meeting (29:87%) classified in very good category. In 5<sup>th</sup> meeting (25:75%) and 6<sup>th</sup> meeting (28:84%) classified in good category. In and 7<sup>th</sup> meeting (30:90%) classified in very good category. In 8<sup>th</sup> meeting (27:81%) classified in good category. In 9<sup>th</sup> meeting (30:90%) classified in very good category. In 10<sup>th</sup> meeting (28:84%) classified in good category. In 11<sup>th</sup> meeting (30:90%) classified in very good category. In 12<sup>th</sup> meeting (28:84%) classified in good category. And in 13<sup>th</sup> meeting (31:93%) classified in very good category.

**c. The Computation Result**

**1) The results of pre-test and post-test in experimental group.**

Table 7

The score of pre-test and post-test of experimental group in speaking skill by using fishbowl technique

No	Nama Siswa	Score							
		Pre Test				Post Test			
		Pronunciation	Fluency	Grammar	Total	Pronunciation	Fluency	Grammar	Total
1.	Adelia	3	4	3	10	20	21	22	63
3	Ananda Nabillah Ismi	3	4	3	10	20	20	22	62
2	Arsyadika Rismi	5	5	5	15	20	22	22	64
4	Avizza Tuzzahra	4	3	5	12	20	22	22	64
5	Bulan Rozi	5	5	5	15	22	20	20	62
6	Dahlia Perawati	5	5	5	15	20	22	20	62
7	Deca Lestari	4	4	5	13	20	22	20	62
8	Devi	5	5	5	10	20	20	21	61
9	Dhea Novariza	6	5	5	16	20	22	20	62
10	Fika Zuliandari	4	4	2	10	20	22	20	62
11	Firna Nahwa Firdausi	4	3	4	11	20	22	20	62
12	Gita Puspita Sari	5	4	2	11	21	22	20	63
13	Intannia Maharani	6	4	2	12	22	22	20	64
14	Irvie Febriandiny	5	2	3	10	22	22	21	65
15	Juliana	5	5	5	15	21	20	20	61
16	Julia Octaviani	6	4	2	12	21	22	20	63
17	Kholis Na'imah	5	2	3	10	21	22	20	63
18	Ladya Thoriqaulan K	7	7	5	19	22	22	20	64
19	Nabilah	4	4	2	10	20	22	20	62
20	Nadila Dwi Julianti	4	4	3	11	20	22	20	62
21	Nahla Uyunul Hawwa	4	4	4	12	22	22	20	64
22	Nida Ankhofia	4	4	4	12	22	22	20	64
23	Noni Agustin	6	4	2	12	22	22	20	64
24	Nurul Fitriah	5	2	3	10	21	22	20	63
25	Nini Anggraini	4	4	3	11	20	22	20	62
26	Qoniatuzzahra	5	5	5	15	20	22	22	64
27	Salsabilla Faturohma	4	4	5	13	20	22	20	62
28	Sana	5	5	5	10	20	22	20	62
29	Selfira Paradisah	6	5	4	15	20	22	20	62
30	Silvi Qilani Ovila S P	6	4	2	12	21	22	20	63
31	Syafira Zahra	6	4	2	12	21	22	20	63
32	Tesa Adilla Giani B	4	4	3	11	20	22	20	62
33	Tesa	4	4	5	13	21	22	20	63
TOTAL		405				2071			

**2) The results of pre-test and post-test in control group.**

Table 8

The score of pre-test and post-test of control group in speaking skill by using fishbowl technique

No	Nama Siswa	Score							
		Pre Test				Post Test			
		Pronunciation	Fluency	Grammar	Total	Pronunciation	Fluency	Grammar	Total
1.	Ade Saputri	7	7	7	21	20	15	20	55
3	Ade Septia Putri	13	10	7	30	20	20	20	60
2	Alfika	11	9	7	27	22	15	20	57
4	Amelia Yuda Prasetya	10	9	7	26	22	15	20	57
5	Ardila Safitri	9	6	7	22	18	15	19	52
6	Asri Oktaviana N	9	6	7	22	20	20	20	60
7	Cut Nadia Alfadhah	10	10	10	30	20	20	20	60
8	Cindi	8	9	8	25	20	20	20	60
9	Desta Effendi	8	8	8	24	20	16	22	58
10	Diola Rahmadona P	8	8	8	24	22	15	23	58
11	Elisya Putri	7	7	7	21	20	15	20	55
12	Endang Balika	9	7	9	24	20	15	20	55
13	Faustina Khairunnisa	8	9	8	25	22	16	23	59
14	Firly Annisa	10	10	10	30	20	20	20	60
15	Firza Nanda Belrado	10	8	8	26	20	20	20	60
16	Ghina Ramadhina	10	10	9	29	22	16	23	59
17	Ismi Zulfa K	7	7	7	21	22	16	23	59
18	Meda	11	9	10	30	20	21	20	61
19	Mellina	12	8	8	27	19	19	15	53
20	Micha Arnola	8	8	8	24	20	16	20	56
21	Nadia	8	9	8	25	20	20	20	60
22	Peni	8	9	8	25	19	19	15	53
23	Rabiatul Adawiyah	8	9	8	25	20	15	20	55
24	Rahmi Wulandari	10	8	8	26	22	15	20	57
25	Regina Dwi Cantika	9	6	7	22	20	15	20	55
26	Rila Aulia	10	8	6	24	19	20	15	54
27	Rosa Vebiola	13	8	8	28	20	20	15	55
28	Sawatun Fitri	12	8	8	27	20	20	15	55
29	Shuha Chulifatinusa	10	8	6	24	22	16	23	59
30	Silvia Cartika	10	10	9	29	22	16	23	59
31	Siti Fatonah	11	9	5	25	19	18	15	52
32	Tiasa Thasya	10	10	10	30	20	20	20	60
33	Zahira Aulia	10	10	9	29	20	20	20	60
34	Zerlinda Salsabila	12	8	8	27	22	15	20	57
TOTAL					874				1890

### 3) The statistical analysis of students' posttest between experimental and control group

Table 9

		Group Statistics			
score	categories	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
	post_exp	33	62.7576	1.00095	.17424
	post_control	34	57.2059	2.68305	.46014

Based on paired samples t-test statistic above, it could be described that the differences analysis of students' post test between the experimental and control group were the mean of the experimental group was 62.75, the standard deviation was 1.00, the standard error mean was .174, while the mean of control group was 57.20, the standard deviation was 2.68, and the standard error mean was .460.

Table 10

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
score		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
	Equal variances assumed	37.887	.000	11.155	65	.000	5.55169	.49769	4.55774	6.54565
	Equal variances not assumed			11.283	42.247	.000	5.55169	.49202	4.55892	6.54447

In the result of independent samples test table, the independent differences showed that the mean post-test of the experimental and control group in equal variances assumed or equal variances not assumed were 5.55, standard error difference in equal variances assumed was .497, standard error difference in equal variances not assumed was .492 and t-obtained in equal variances assumed was 11.15, t-obtained in equal variances not



assumed was 11.28 at the significant .000 in equal variances assumed and at the significant .000 in equal variances not assumed for two tailed and degree of freedom 37.88. Since in equal variances the p-output was .000 lower than probability 0.05 and t-obtained was 11.15 higher than the critical value of t-table 2.00, it could be stated that there was significant difference in post-test between experimental group and control group.

#### 4) Interpretation

The result of hypotheses showed that  $H_0$  was accepted and  $H_a$  was rejected. Because t-obtained was higher than t-table, it could be stated that there was significant and  $H_0$  was accepted and  $H_a$  was rejected. It can be inferred that the students who were taught by fishbowl technique got better score than those who were taught by using conventional method. The highest score of pre-test in experimental group was 19 and control group was 30. However, the highest score of post-test in experimental group was 65, while the highest score in control group was 61. Then, the mean of pre-test in experimental group was 12.27, while the mean of pre-test in control group was 25.70. And the mean of post-test in experimental group was 62.75, while the mean of post-test in control group was 57.20. In this case, it can be stated there was significant difference in experimental groups.

## F. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

### a. Conclusion

1. The students who were taught by using fishbowl technique got better score than those who were taught by using conventional method. It can be seen from the mean score of the post test in the experimental group which higher than those in the control group. Besides, the result of the *independent sample test* showed that there was a significant difference between students who were taught by using fishbowl technique and students who were taught by using non fishbowl technique.
2. The usage of fishbowl technique improved students' speaking skill.  
This can be seen from the result of *paired sample t-test* in experimental group. In this case, there was an improvement from students' mean scores of pre-

test and post-test.

**b. Suggestions**

1. for the teacher

- a. The teacher should choose the materials that are appropriate and not too difficult for the students.
- b. Before assigning fishbowl technique to the students, the teacher should make sure that the students have fully understood and have the information they need.
- c. The teacher should keep control the students' activities.
- d. The teacher should present the language in an enjoyable, relaxed and understandable way.

2. for the students

- a. The researcher suggests to the students that they are not shy of acting out their speaking performance, they should be active and creative in enriching their vocabulary and also they should ask to the teacher if there is something that they do not understand regarding to the speaking activities. In relation to the teaching and learning speaking skill by using fishbowl technique of speaking, the students should have internal motivation to study.
- b. The students should also have strong willingness and good preparation to the study. During fishbowl technique the students should really do what their ask them to do. This study can be a reference and comparison study; In addition, this technique can enrich the other researcher's knowledge about a good way in teaching and learning of speaking.

3. for the further researcher

Lastly, the result of study can be used as a reference for other studies in the same or different field. For further researcher hopefully can add comprehension and vocabulary as an aspect for evaluate students speaking skill, and will followed with pronunciation, grammar, and fluency. This research is expected to be useful and can enrich the other researchers' knowledge about a good strategy in teaching and learning reading comprehension, especially in descriptive texts.

## REFERENCES

- Bygate, Martin. 1987. *Speaking (Language Teaching :A Scheme for Teacher Education)*. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Hadfield, Jill Charles. 2008. *Introduction to Teaching English*. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Harmer, Jeremy. 2001. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. London : Longman Publisher.
- Halliday, M.A.K. 1985. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London : Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press. Second Edition.
- Hughes, Rebecca. 2011. *Teaching and Researching Speaking : Second Edition*. New York : Pearson Education.
- Nunan, David. 2004. *Task-Based Language Teaching*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Sudijono, Anas. 2012. *Pengantar Evaluasi Pendidikan*. Jakarta : PT. Rajagrafindo Persada.
- Thronbury, Scott. 2005. *How to teach speaking*. London : Longman Publishing Group.
- Zulfikar, Said. files.wordpress.com / 2011 /10 / skripsi-audio-lingual-in-teaching speaking.pdf