



FISHBOWL TECHNIQUE AND LEARNING INTEREST EFFECTS ON SPEAKING ACHIEVEMENT OF SMK SEMBAWA

Aswadi Jaya
aswadijaya@yahoo.com
University of PGRI Palembang

Akhmad Habibi
akhmad.habibi@unja.ac.id
Jambi University

Received 1 December 2015
Received in revised form 1 February 2016

Accepted 19 April 2016
Published online 15 May 2016

Abstract. Indonesian students are assumed to have low ability in speaking performance in terms of meaning, form, and communication aspects. This study investigated whether or not Fishbowl Technique and students' learning interest are effective to improve students' speaking achievement. The population of this study was 150 eleventh grade students of SMK SPP Sembawa Banyuasin. Sixty of them were taken to be the sample of the study. They were divided into experimental and control group through cluster random sampling. To collect the data of speaking achievement, the oral test was used. The criteria were interaction, pronunciation, fluency, and grammar. The findings showed that there was a significant difference in achievement before and after the treatment in the experimental group of students' learning interest, it was shown that the sig. The significance Value was $0.000 < 0.05$, it means that the students' speaking achievement significantly increased. The test of Between-Subjects Effects analyses, the significant value of the technique (fishbowl) and the students' learning interest were 0.936, the probability sig. of technique was 0.000, and the interaction between high, medium and low interest was 0.936 which was higher than the significant level of p-value 0.05, it means that there was no significant interaction between students' learning interest and fishbowl technique. It could be meant that the learning interest did not contribute to improve the students' speaking achievement when the fishbowl technique was applied.

Keywords: *Fishbowl, Interest, Speaking*

Introduction

Speaking is one of the important skills that must be mastered by the students. By having this skill they can perform their competence in English. For example, the students can share their knowledge, value and attitude to others through speaking. Therefore, those competences can be applied in the real life for communication. Richards & Rodger (2002) point out that many language learners in the world study English in order to develop proficiency in that skill. As a matter of fact, Indonesian learners commonly had not attained a good level of oral proficiency. Some researchers showed this problem, for example. Kusmaryati (2009) finds out that English students have a great number of errors in speaking such as in pronunciation, grammatical accuracy, vocabulary, fluency and interactive communication. Beh (1997) also reports that eighty percent of the students' English spoken and written proficiency is less than good.

Padmadewi (1998) points out that student feel anxious in speaking class and Tutyandary (2005) states that some of them keep silent in speaking class. It happens because of the pressure of speaking tasks which require them to present individually and spontaneously in limited time. Tutyandary (2005) mentions that the students keep silent because of self-confidence, lack of prior knowledge and poor teacher-learner relationship.

In addition, Education First-English proficiency Index (EF-EPI) showed the ranks of 60 countries in communication proficiency that considers speaking as the basic skill. These ranks were based on the comparison of 60 countries and more than three million learners. Indonesia was on the 25th rank at moderate proficiency level with 53.44EF EPI score. While the highest score (was very high proficiency) was Sweden with 68.69 EF EPI scores and the lowest was Iraq with 38.16 EF EPI scores. It is shown on the table below

Table 1. EF-English Proficiency Index

Level of Proficiency	Rank	Countries
Very High	1-7	Sweden-Finland
High	8-17	Poland-Portugal
Moderate	18-28	Slovakia-Indonesia (25) Vietnam
Low	29-43	Uruguay-Egypt
Very Low	44-60	Chile-Iraq

Source- EF-EPI, 2013

One local example was on the following table that showed the achievement of English Proficiency of SMK SPP Sembawa in English 2013.

Table 2. Students' Achievement in English

Subject	Academic Year	Class	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
English	2013/2014	X	60	88	76.00
English	2013/2014	XI	65	90	75.40
English	2013/2014	XII	60	90	78.90
Total					76.76

Source: SMK SPP SembawaBanyuasin, 2013

The mean of students' achievement was 76. 00 for the tenth grade students, 75.40 for the eleventh grade students and 78.90 was the twelfth grade students with the standard minimum 75.00.

Indonesian learners face problems in developing their English proficiency especially in speaking achievement. It is not only related to linguistic knowledge,

but also personality, cultural aspect and teaching strategies. Asian countries students are diffident to use English because of shyness, inhibition and nervousness.

Other factors that influence students in language learning specially in speaking are the size of class, facilities and the role of English as the foreign language. Based on Padmadewi's survey (1998), it could be concluded that most classes in Indonesia have big number of students, from 30 until 50 students in each class. It impacted to the length of time that is very short for students to speak out in the classroom.

Miller (2010) in his study found that fishbowl techniques can encourage the students' English proficiency and Lee, Chen & Chao (2011) also found that interest in learning can influence the result of the teaching and learning process. Based on the previous studies the fishbowl and interest can be very interesting to be proven that they can influence the students' speaking achievement. Andika (2013) in his study found that fishbowl technique and students' learning motivation can increase the students' speaking achievement.

Based on the researcher's mini research at SMK SPP Sembawa, in the process of study, the students got the difficulties in studying speaking, it commonly happened when the teacher asked the students to have conversation with their partner or having discussion. Moreover, if the teacher asked them to have an oral activity in front of class, most of them seemed to be confused about what they should do. Most of the problems were caused by the teaching strategy. The strategy could not fulfill what the students needed in learning speaking skill. It meant the teaching strategy must be modified, if possible, replaced with new one. In other words, to reach a good development in teaching speaking, the teacher should apply various teaching techniques to increase the students' achievement.

Based on the questionnaire given to the eleventh grade students and teacher who taught at SMK SPP Sembawa at the present, it could be identified that the situations of speaking class was not interesting. The teacher seldom created the group of discussion to promote the students in exploring the ideas and that situation made the students were reluctant to practice their English. The researcher also identified that the students had low learning interest.

Table 3. Sample of Questionnaire

No	Classroom Activities	Frequency (%)				
		Never	rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often
1.	Speaking pairs or groups of discussion.		74.3			
2.	Reading text and answering the questions from the text				56	22
3.	Translating reading text to Bahasa.				52	13.0
4.	Written practice; answering written questions.				23.3	50
5.	Grammar activity (Constructing sentences based on grammatical formula)			27.8		38.1

Siegel (2009) states that Interest is a strong feeling or desire to do something to the lesson in order to learn the new things. When students were interested on something, they tend to pursue it and excel at it. Furthermore, interest also referred to serious feeling to focus and pay attention to thing that considered as fun thing/ activity, wonderful thing, an attractive thing or activity. It meant the students' learning interest appear when they like something, so if it was in the school subject, sometimes the teacher found some students who liked some subjects only not all subjects based on some reasons. It was caused by some reasons, one of them was the students disliked the materials because they did not understand and also sometimes, the students disliked the teachers' habit, so that was why, the student would not focus on the study or not interest.

To carry out this study, the researcher got the eleventh grade students of Perkebunan and TPH programs in the academic year 2013/2014. The researcher intended to see the effects of using fishbowl technique and students' learning interest in increasing speaking achievement. The researcher hoped that fishbowl technique could bridge the students to promote their speaking achievement.

From the facts and the reasons, the researcher was interested in conducting research in the form of experiment to the eleventh grade students of SMK SPP Sembawa entitled "The effects of fishbowl technique and learning interest on speaking achievement of the eleventh grade students of SMK SPP Sembawa Banyuasin".

The problems of this research were (1) was there any significant difference of the eleventh grade students' speaking achievement after they were taught by using fishbowl technique and those who were not? (2) Was there any significant interaction effect of fishbowl technique and learning interest on students' speaking achievement?

Based on the problems above, the hypotheses were formulated as follows (1) There was a significant difference of the eleventh students' speaking achievement after they were taught by using fishbowl technique and those who were not (2) There was a significant interaction effect of fishbowl technique and learning interest on students' speaking achievement.

Research Methodology

The researcher used an experimental method by applying factorial design. Most designs involved only one single independent variable. In factorial design, two or more independent variables are involved (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). This kind of design was used for two primary purposes: (1) to see if the effects of an intervention are consistent across characteristics of the subjects and (2) to examine the unique effect of the independent variables together (this is called an interaction). There were two groups in this study: one experimental group and control group. In the experimental group, the students got the treatment by using fishbowl technique the control group got the treatment by using the discussion conventional method. Both groups were given a pre-test and post-test with the same treatment.

This study employed factorial experimental design. The researcher used this design because this study involved two parallel groups in which X1 and X2

here refer to the treatments that applied to experimental group which was taught by using fishbowl technique, the second group by using discussion conventional technique. The design could be seen as follow:

Table 4. The Design of the Study

Experimental group	R	O ₁	X ₁	Y ₁	O ₂
Control group	R	O ₁	-	Y ₁	O ₂
Experimental group	R	O ₁	X ₁	Y ₂	O ₂
Control group	R	O ₁	-	Y ₂	O ₂
Experimental group	R	O ₁	X ₁	Y ₃	O ₂
Control group	R	O ₁	-	Y ₃	O ₂

Source: Fraenkle and Wallen, 1993.

Means:

- R : Random
- O₁ : Pre-test
- X₁ : Treatment of experimental group using Fishbowl Technique
- Y₁ : High learning interest
- Y₂ : Medium learning interest
- Y₃ : Low learning interest
- O₂ : Post-test

The application of fishbowl technique and students English learning interest in factorial design was illustrated in Table 5.

Table 5. The Factorial Design

Students' Learning Interest	Strategy	
	Fishbowl Technique (X1)	Conventional Technique (X2)
High (Y ₁)	X ₁ Y ₁	X ₂ Y ₁
Medium (Y ₂)	X ₁ Y ₂	X ₂ Y ₂
Low (Y ₃)	X ₁ Y ₃	X ₂ Y ₃

The researcher conducted the research at SMK SPP Sembawa Banyuasin and got the agreement from the school principal. The population of the research was all students at the eleventh grade with the total 150 students.

Table 6. The population of the Study

No	Class	Number of Students
1	XI Perkebunan 1	30
2	XI Perkebunan 2	30
3	XI Perkebunan 3	30
4	XI TPH 1	30
5	XI TPH 2	30

Source: SMK SPP Sembawa Banyuasin, 2013

The cluster random sampling was used in this investigation. The sample was the eleventh grade students of Perkebunan 2 and Perkebunan 3 of SMK SPP Banyuasin. Fraenkel & Wallen (1990) state that there are times when it is not possible to select sample of individuals from population due to administrative or other restriction, a researcher may include all of the subjects from the chosen clusters into the final sample, which is called one-stage random sampling. Two classes were chosen in which first class was experimental where the fishbowl

technique treatment was applied and the second was be control group trained by conventional technique. Each class contained thirty students both for the experimental group and control group.

To assess the reliability of the speaking test achievement, the researcher asked the two raters to assess the test items. Inter-raters reliability of the speaking test achievement is the extent to which two or more individuals agree. It addressed to the consistency of rating scale system implementation. The reliability statistic program in SPSS was used for the analysis. The reliability coefficient of speaking test was 0.998. If the reliability coefficient of speaking test obtained was more than 0.700, according to Creswell (2005), it could be judged that the test was reliable. Meanwhile for the questionnaire was analyzed by using Alpha Cronbach formula as a program in SPSS for window. Cronbach's Alpha Reliability coefficient of the questionnaire in try out was 0.859. Therefore, it was reliable.

Findings and Interpretations

Findings

In the classification of students' learning interest in experiment and control group, it showed the data of the students' learning interest were obtained by the questionnaire. The questionnaire contained 30 items that were used to identify students' learning interest in learning speaking. The highest score was 120 and the lowest score was 40. When the student got score 0 until 40, it meant that they had low learning interest, when the score was 41 until 80, it meant that they had medium learning interest and when their score 81 until 120. It meant they had high learning interest. In experiment group, there were 10 students who had low learning interest, 10 students who had medium learning interest, and 10 students who had high learning interest. While in control group, there were 9 students had low learning interest, 10 students had medium learning interest, and 11 students had high learning interest.

The summary of descriptive analysis of pretest in the experiment group and control group could be seen as below.

Table 7. The Summary of Descriptive Statistics of Pretest in the Experiment Group and Control Group

Group	Pretest				
	Score		SD	Median	Mean
	Lowest	Highest			
Experimental					
Low	40.00	50.00	3.77	43.7	43.7
Medium	54.00	75.00	6.57	61.25	62.9
High	70	80	3.14	76.25	75.9
Control					
Low	20.00	50.00	10.23	40	36.66
Medium	51	65	5.57	61.25	59.6
High	55	80	6.45	75	73.18

The summary of descriptive analysis of posttest in the experiment group and control group could be seen as below.

Table 8. The Summary of Descriptive Statistics of Posttest in the Experiment Group and Control Group

Group	Pretest				
	Score		SD	Median	Mean
	Lowest	Highest			
Experimental					
Low	40.00	50.00	3.77	43.7	43.7
Medium	60.00	80.00	5.70	70	69.9
High	78	90	3.66	80	81
Control					
Low	35.00	55.00	7.08	42.5	43.61
Medium	52	75	8.43	65	64.45
High	70	80	2.90	75	75

The normality of pretest scores used Kolmorov Smirnov type two statistic parametric showed the result of the test, where it informed, if the sig value or the probability score was higher than 0.05, it meant the data was normal. From the description the data computation, it showed the result of the probability score of experiment group was 0.135, it meant the test was distributed normally.

The homogeneity test was a measurement and it used to decide the variance of the data. In this study, to know the homogeneity of the data pretest and posttest of the experimental and control group, the data was computed using SPSS program and the result showed that the significance of 0.455 was higher than 0.05. It means that data was homogeneous.

To find out whether or not there was significance difference in speaking achievement before and after the treatment of the experimental group, the researcher compared the result of the pre-test with those of post-test in the experimental group by using paired sample t-test.

Table 10. Paired Samples Statistics Pre-Test and Post-Test Taught Using Fishbowl Technique to Speaking Achievement

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Sig. (2 tailed)
Pair 1	Pretest	60.8500	30	14.18787	2.59034	.000
	Posttest	67.6000	30	13.05387	2.38330	

Based on the calculation, the researcher found that the mean in the pre-test of the experimental group taught using fishbowl technique was 60.85, while in the post-test, the mean was 67.60. It could be interpreted that the different mean between pre-test and post-test was 6.75 or in other words, there was an increasing average score after the students got the treatment and it was 6.75. Based on the explanation, meaning that, the students posttest achievement that were taught using fishbowl technique got the difference achievement from the pre-test. It also explained that the value of sig was 0, 00 at the significance level < 0.05 in two tailed, it meant that there was a significant difference in achievement before and after the treatment in the experimental group.

The researcher applied two-way ANOVA which was concerned with the investigation of the interaction effects between one dependent variable (speaking achievement) and other variables (Fishbowl and interest). In this analysis the researcher wanted to investigate whether there was any difference speaking achievement among the students who had different learning interest after the treatment.

The result of descriptive statistics in two-way ANOVA indicated that 10 students who had high learning interest and taught using fishbowl technique got the mean score of 81.10 with the standard deviation 3.66, while 10 students who had medium learning interest and taught using fishbowl technique got the mean score of 69.95 with the standard deviation 5.7, while 10 students who had low learning interest and taught using fishbowl technique got 51.75 with the standard deviation 3.91. Meanwhile 11 students who had high learning interest and taught using conventional technique got 73.81 with the standard deviation 6.85, while 10 students who had medium learning interest got the mean 63.10 with the standard deviation 5.42 and 9 students who had low learning interest got the mean 43.61 with the standard deviation 7.08.

From the explanation above, it could be seen that the students who had low learning interest and were taught by using fishbowl technique, achieved the mean of score 51.75, while the students who had medium learning interest had 69.95 mean of score, and the students who had high learning interest achieved 81.10 mean of score. It meant that fishbowl was mostly effective used in teaching speaking in high, medium and low learning interest.

Table 11. The Levene's test of equality of error variance indicated significance

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Speaking_Score

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	9579.371 ^a	5	1915.874	61.320	.000	.850
Intercept	244080.425	1	244080.425	7812.077	.000	.993
Technique	823.867	1	823.867	26.369	.000	.328
Interest	8960.065	2	4480.033	143.389	.000	.842
Technique * Interest	4.171	2	2.085	.067	.936	.002
Error	1687.175	54	31.244			
Total	260043.750	60				
Corrected Total	11266.546	59				

a. R Squared = .850 (Adjusted R Squared = .836)

the level was 0.664. As this value was higher than 0.05, the analysis of variance was not significant. Meaning that, there was no significant difference among the students score. In other words, the data was homogeny.

Based on table above, it was found that the interaction of technique and learning interest score was 0.936, with the criteria test if the probability (sig) > 0.05 meaning that there was no significant interaction effect between learning interest and fishbowl technique. In other words, the learning interest did not give

significant contribution on increasing the eleventh grade students' speaking achievement.

Interpretations

Based on the data analysis, the students' achievement in speaking taught by using fishbowl technique had a significant increase. It indicated that teaching speaking using fishbowl technique gave a significant difference on students' achievement in speaking than conventional technique. It can be seen from the results of the posttest which were higher than those of the pretest. The data of the students' achievement that was taught by using the fishbowl technique had more significant increase than who were taught by using the conventional technique.

The reason can be explained why fishbowl technique can improve the students' speaking achievement. The researcher believed that students' speaking achievement improved because they were exposed to speak by using fishbowl technique. Miller (2010) states fishbowls are used to stimulate conversation in class, with an emphasis on deep listening, critical thinking, critical questioning and thoughtful response. Since the students were divided into two group which were inner and outer group. The technique of fishbowl helped the students to expose their opinion so they tried to speak among the friends. Richard (2010) states the learning process needs the meaningful and motivating condition. The teacher was a guide and motivator in the class to help them in solving the problem in discussion.

The aspect of speaking developed significantly as a result of the method applied during the treatment time. Comprehension was mostly developed followed by fluency and language control. This result happened because the fishbowl technique used the meaning as a starting point for language development which provided the good chance for the students to explore their ideas by themselves. Nunan (2004) said that pedagogical activities involve communicative language use in which the users' attentions are focused on meaning rather than grammatical form. Briefly, in doing and finishing the activities they needed comprehension. The aspect of fluency also influenced more by fishbowl technique because the students have to use English in phases of discussion, in preparing, producing the presenting the ideas.

The significant difference of the students' learning interest found before and after the treatment means that fishbowl that was applied in the teaching and learning process was effective in improving the students' learning interest.

This can be proved that contributions were given by the aspects of teachers, materials, initiatives and motivations. By applying fishbowl technique in the learning process, the students had good learning experience because it provided the relax atmosphere. Brown (2006) believes that learning interest can increase the peoples' motivation, persistence and interaction.

Furthermore, the students were free to speak what they were going to express during the discussion. It also built perception to share the knowledge, so each student was trained to manage their emotion. In this kind of classroom atmosphere gave large opportunities to build their knowledge, skill and learning

interest. Nunan (2004) said that experiential provides the psychological view of learning as the part of growth. They become increasingly self-directed and responsible for the process of the learning. So the learner is increasingly in charge of their learning.

Indeed, the writer noted the students' speaking achievement in high learning interest; medium learning interest and low learning interest were significantly increased when they were taught by using the fishbowl technique.

Conclusions

The conclusion from the study would be decided based on data finding and the data processed in this investigation, it would be concluded as the following description.

First, there was a significant difference of the eleventh students' speaking achievement after they were taught by using fishbowl technique and those who were not. This meant that exposure of fishbowl technique was effective in improving students' speaking achievement. There were some aspects improved, namely: interaction, pronunciation, fluency and grammar. The comprehension also influenced more by fishbowl technique because the students have to participate in phases of discussion, in preparing, producing and presenting the ideas so that the students had good learning experience because it provided the relax atmosphere.

Second, there was no interaction effect of the fishbowl technique and learning interest on the students' speaking achievement. The learning interest did not give significant contribution on increasing the eleventh grade students' speaking achievement when the fishbowl technique was applied.

Suggestions

Based on the conclusion above, some suggestions are offered. First, the students of SMK SPP Sembawa Banyuasin are suggested to use Fishbowl technique in learning speaking in order to improve their speaking achievement. It would be better if they try to implement Fishbowl technique in their classroom. In this way, the students can be developed all aspects of speaking achievement through practicing Fishbowl technique. As the result, the students are able to improve their speaking achievement from using whatever language they have already known, discussion with the guidance of the teachers until presenting a very real linguistic challenge to communicate clearly and accurately in language appropriate to the circumstances.

Second, the English teachers are encouraged to apply Fishbowl technique in teaching English, especially speaking in order to make them aware of the objectives of the lesson, develop better perception of their own ability. Moreover, in order to make this teaching methodology gives great contribution to the students' speaking achievement and learning interest. The teachers should find the way to control activities without arising students' anxiety which may affect their learning interest. Hopefully, the teachers control the students' behavior not only to have fun experiencing the language, but also to achieve all target of the learning. Moreover, the teachers should play the role as language advisor in order to give

holistic experience of language use, and to stimulate them present their language clearly and accurately.

Finally, other researchers are suggested to do further research to overcome the weaknesses of this present research like the aspect of level discourse, interaction, pronunciation, and fluency in speaking achievement. It is also suggested to use the same technique (Fishbowl) or any others which are thought to be more influential. Since the researcher did look any other skills besides speaking then it would be worth applying fishbowl technique in teaching the other language skills.

References

- Andika. (2013). *The effect of fishbowl technique and students' learning motivation toward the eighth grade speaking's ability of SMP Xaverius 1 Palembang*. (Unpublishedmagister's thesis). PGRI University, Palembang, Indonesia.
- Beh, Y. (1997). Current research in Southeast Asia. *RELCJournal*, 28(1), 175-179.
- Brown, H. D. (2006). *Language assessment principles and classroom practice*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Education First. (2013). *EF: English proficiency index*. Retrieved from www.ef.com/epi.
- Fraenkel, J. R., & Norman R, W. (1990). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill, Inc.
- Kusmaryati, S. (2009). Improving speaking achievement through classroom discussion. *Bahasa dan Seni*. 34(1), 234-256.
- Lee, C., Chao, L., & Chen. (2011). The influence of interest in learning and learning hours on learning outcomes of vocational college students in Taiwan; Using a teacher's' instructional attitude as the moderator. *Global Journal of Engineering Education*, 2(2), 16-20.
- McMillan, J.H., & Schumacher, S. (2010). *Research in education: Evidence-based inquiry*. New York, NY: Pearson.
- Miller, M. (2010). Techniques for encouraging peer collaboration: Online threaded discussion or fishbowl interaction. *Instructional Psychology*, 33 (2), 10-15.
- Nunan, D. (2004). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. (2008). *Teaching listening and speaking from theory to practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, C. J., & Rodgers, T.S. (2002). *Approaches And Methods In Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Siegle, D. (2009). *The importance of recognizing student's interest and parenting for high potential*. New York, NY: Addition Wesley Longman.
- Patmadewi, N.N. (1998). Students' anxiety in speaking class ways of minimizing it. *Ilmu Pendidikan*, 5 (2), 60-70.
- Trumper, R. (2006). Factor affecting junior high school students' learning interest in Biology. *Israel English Education and Teaching*, 1(1).31-35.
- Tutyandari, C. (2005). Breaking the silence of the students in an English language class. *English Language Teaching*, 2(2), 161-167.