

## THE IMPROVEMENT OF FISHBOWL TECHNIQUE ON TENTH GRADE SPEAKING ACHIEVEMENT

Ummul Khair<sup>1</sup>, Faozatulo Telaumbanua<sup>2</sup>, Eflin Novalynda Simorangkir<sup>3</sup>, Fatimah<sup>4</sup>, Cicik Sri Lestari<sup>5</sup>

SMAN 1 GAS<sup>1</sup>, SMP N 1 Lotu<sup>2</sup>, SMP N 1 Raya Kahean<sup>3</sup>, SMPN 37 Batam<sup>4</sup>, SMPN 10 Talang Ubi<sup>5</sup>

Corresponding email: khairafia11@gmail.com

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article History

Submission: June 18, 2023

Review: June 27 – June 28, 2023

Revised: June 29, 2023

Accepted: June 29, 2023

Punlished: June 30, 2023

#### Keywords

Fishbowl Technique

Speaking achievement

Giving Opinion

### ABSTRACT

This research is concerned with the influence of fishbowl on speaking achievement of the tenth-grade students of SMAN 1 GAS INHIL RIAU. The objectives of this study were to find out: a) whether or not there was a significant influence of speaking achievement of the tenth-grade students of SMAN 1 GAS INHIL RIAU who were taught by using fishbowl technique and those who were not, and b) whether or not there was a significant difference of speaking achievement between the tenth-grade students of SMAN 1 GAS INHIL RIAU who were taught by using fishbowl technique. The population was the tenth-grade students of SMAN 1 GAS INHIL RIAU in academic year of 2022/2023. Purposive Sampling technique used to take a sample of this study which consisted of 80 students. In this study used a quasi-experimental design, there were experimental group and control group. Both of them were given a pre-test and post-test (before and after treatment). In analysing the data, paired sample t-test and independent sample t-test would be applied. Based on statistical analysis, the result of paired sample t-test showed that  $t_{\text{obtained}} (14.835) > t_{\text{table}} (2.079)$  it means that the students' speaking achievement was significantly influenced. Then the result independent sample t-test, the value of  $t_{\text{obtained}} (3.592)$  was higher than the critical value of  $t_{\text{table}} (2.079)$ . It means that there was significant difference of SMAN 1 GAS INHIL RIAU who were taught by using fishbowl and those who were not.

### Introduction

Speaking is a human skill to communicate with another human. Many things must be considered in speaking, namely how to deliver and expertise in speaking. Cameron (2001, p. 40) states that speaking is the active use of language to express meaning so that others can understand them (Arini & Wahyudin, 2022). This is a process of interaction where speakers intend to build meaning through producing, receiving and processing information (Bailey, 2005, p. 25). Speaking is very important ability in doing daily activities because people can react to other persons and situation and express their students, thought, and feeling through spoken language.

According to Pollard (2008, p. 34) and Leong and Ahmadi (2017), speaking is one of the most difficult aspects for students to master. Generally, when students speak English, they only listen what the teachers' material and then the students did assignment without

giving feedback and discussing about the speaking material. However, teachers might to stimulate students to speak English. Students were bored when they did assignment in groups. Most of students rely solely on smart students to do the speaking assignments because of that some of students were inactive to involve speaking activities. Thus, learning process becomes ineffective and students' competences were still low. Therefore, many things must be considered in the use of good teaching techniques. It must also pay attention to the potential of students to be taught. The goal is that students can easily provide material. In addition, other teaching materials can be easily taught and shorten the time to teach one teaching material.

According to Munjayanah (2004, p. 17), the students' problems of speaking skills were as follows:

### **1. Inhabitation**

Unlike reading, writing or listening activities, speaking requires some degree of real-time exposure to an audience. Learners are often inhibited about trying to say thing in foreign language in the classroom: worried about mistakes or simply shy of the attention that their speech attract.

### **2. Nothing to say**

Even they are not inhibited, they often hear learners complain that they cannot think of anything to say: they have no motive to express themselves beyond the guilty feeling that they should speak.

### **3. Low or uneven participation**

Only one participant can talk at a time if he or she is to be heard; and in large group this means the each one will have only very little talking time. This problem is compounded of some learners to dominate, while other speaks very little or not at all.

### **4. Mother tongue use**

It is easier for the students to use their mother tongue in their class because it looks naturally. Therefore, most of the students are not disciplined in using the target language in the learning process.

In addition, As stated by Jones in Richards (2008, p. 19), speaking people tend to be getting meaning and exploring ideas. Students mostly face some problems in speaking English because of lack of vocabularies that causes the students more difficult to understand what the speaker say and to keep the interaction going on and usually the students make grammar mistake. The students' wrong tenses sometimes they want to speak in the past tense but they used to speak in present tense instead of the past tense. Moreover, pronunciation students in learning a second language are caused by the different elements found between his/her language and the target language.

Tuan and Mai (2015) revealed that students usually found difficulties in speaking because of some factors, such as confidence, listeners support, students' listening ability, and pressure to perform well that can influence the students' speaking performance. Then,

response from the audiences whether their attention, respect, and appreciation influence students to perform well in speaking English.

Based on the experts' views there are some factors of speaking skills problems. First is lack of vocabulary that the students had demotivated to increase their stock of vocabulary. The Second is grammar mistake that cause a lack of students' knowledge in learning grammar and they don't practice their grammar in speaking. Third is lack of pronunciation where the students had limited exposure to listen and little time talking time to practice their English.

To overcome the obstacles, a teacher needs a dozen different method and various kinds of techniques and select a good strategy and technique for students' particular purposes. The selection of the strategy and a technique should depend on the student's needs. One of the techniques to teach speaking achievement is a fishbowl technique.

Based on Yee (2001, p. 11) and Ameen and Ahmed (2023), fishbowl is a technique which involved groups of people seating in circles in order to promote student's engagement and opportunities to closely observe, take notes, and give responses orally. In addition, a fishbowl technique is used to encourage verbal communication among class members to deliver important information, issues and share opinions. It was also technique that can be used for many things, such as modelling group discussions or any other classroom instructional method. Related to Khadijah (2017, p. 214) fishbowl technique is used to promote students' engagement in a group activity It can also be used to help the students think critically about a topic.

Kindzt (2011, p. 7) proposes two reasons for implementing fishbowl in teaching speaking. First, fishbowl technique has simple rules that generate a wide range of complex interaction. It means that fishbowl will build classroom interaction among students. It makes a good condition where the interaction among the students more dominant than interaction between the teacher and the students. Second, fishbowl technique students identify and deal with inhibitions about speaking. It means each student shows their understanding by producing their opinions orally. The students think and find some reasons as the background of what they are going to say. The other students will actively listen and observe to one student who is talking. They have to give responses, comments, idea, or correct the mistakes. It obviously shows that the students interact with each other. This technique involves ways taught to the students how to be a good listener or a speaker.

In this study, the writers used two studies as previous related study, the study was conducted by Aswandi and Ahmad (2016) which entitled "The effects of fishbowl technique and learning interest on speaking achievement of eleventh grade students of SMK SPP Sembawa Banyuasin". The aim of the study was to find out the weather fishbowl technique and students' learning interest are effective to improve student's speaking achievement or not. The sample of this study was 150 eleventh grade students of SMK SPP Sembawa Banyuasin. The results of the study showed a progress in student's speaking achievement what they were taught by using fishbowl technique. There are the similarities and the

differences between the previous study and this present study. The similarities of this previous study and the writer's study were: (1) both studies used the experimental method, (2) the techniques for both studies used fishbowl technique to increase students' speaking skill. The differences between the previous study and the writer's study were (1) the previous study used three variables, fishbowl technique, learning interest, and speaking achievement, while this study used two variables, fishbowl technique and speaking achievement, and (2) a sampling technique, the previous study used random sampling technique, while of this study used purposive sampling technique.

The second study was a study of Setyawati in (2016), entitled "The effectiveness of using fishbowl method in teaching speaking at the eleventh-grade students of SMK Negeri 1 Karanganyar in the academic year of 2015/2016". In her study, the aim of the study was to examine the influences of fishbowl technique toward students' speaking achievement. The result of the research showed that fishbowl technique could motivate students to increase their speaking skill to the eleventh-grade students of SMK Negeri 1 Karanganyar. The similarities between this study and the writer's study were: (1) both studies used purposive sampling technique to take a sample, and (2) both studies used two variables, students' speaking achievement and a fishbowl technique.

The differences between the previous study the writer's study were: (1) the sample of the previous study was the students of Vocational High School SPP Sembawa Banyuasin, while the sample of this study was the students of Junior High School Utama Bakti Palembang, and (2) the objectives of both studies. There were two objectives of previous studies: (1) to describe the students' ability in speaking at the eleventh-grade students of SMKN1 Karanganyar, and (2) to find out whether Fishbowl method is effective or not in teaching speaking at the eleventh-grade students of SMKN 1 Karanganyar. Meanwhile, this study had two objectives that were: (1) to find out whether or not there was a significant influence of speaking achievement of the eighth-grade students of SMP Utama Bakti Palembang who were taught by using fishbowl technique and those who were not, (2) to find out whether or not there was a significant difference of speaking achievement between the eighth-grade students of SMP Utama Bakti Palembang who were taught by using fishbowl technique.

In a classroom, there are some students who have different abilities and characteristics which influence to their engagement during the learning processes. In some cases, not all students focus on the lesson. Some of them make noise or tend to be reluctant to show their thoughts or ideas in front of the others. Furthermore, in fishbowl activity, the students have an equal position to say and give idea to the other students. Therefore, they have to fully concentrate and give attention to students' talk. It means that all of the students give response and none of them are passive. It provokes the students to be active and sustain their motivation and attention.

Based on the writer's observation at SMAN 1 GAS INGIL RIAU, the tenth-grade students' speaking achievement scores were varied and they could be categorized middle It

can be seen from the students' score, the average score of students only got 60. Even though the teacher taught speaking for a long time, the result was considered unsatisfactory because of lack of vocabulary mastery, pronunciation and motivation.

Therefore, it is necessary to improve the quality of teaching and learning speaking achievement by applying an appropriate technique to develop the students' speaking achievement. The writers would like to use fishbowl to overcome the students' speaking problems. Taylor (2007, p.55) believed that fishbowl can be effective teaching tools for group discussion. Fishbowl technique has intrinsic value in helping certain students identify and deal with obstacle about speaking. Fishbowl concerns on students' speaking ability. The students have freedom to share their thoughts orally. They have autonomy to show their input in front of the other students through spoken language. When the students were talking, the teacher noted some mistakes which often appear. The correction was given in the end of the lesson, so that the students can identify the difficulties faced by the students during speaking activities. Besides, fishbowl is also used to give condition interaction among the students in the class. The more the students interact, the more practices in speak English.

Due to the effectiveness of fishbowl technique, the writers were interested in conducting research entitles "The Influence of Fishbowl Technique on Speaking Achievement of the tenth Grade Students of SMAN 1 GAS INGIL RIAU". This research is to find out whether or not there was a significant influence of the tenth-grade students of SMAN 1 GAS INGIL RIAU who were taught by using fishbowl technique and those who were not and to find out whether or not there was a significant difference between the tenth-grade students of SMAN 1 GAS INGIL RIAU who were taught by using fishbowl technique.

Silberman (2002, p. 132) stated a fishbowl technique is a discussion format in which most of the class form a circle discussion, group discussion around it. There were two groups in fishbowl technique, inner group and outer group. The inner group is a fishbowl group and the outer group is an observer. Teacher gives the inner group some topic to be discussed and then the outer group is to observe them. Fishbowl is a discussion technique that involves an outer circle of students sits around a smaller, inner circle of students. Students in the inner circle engage in a depth discussion, while students in the outer circle consider what is being said and how it is being said. Inner circle students are challenged to participate in a high-level discussion, while the outer circle is able to be listener of the discussion and critique content, logic, and group interaction. Furthermore, this technique serves two purposes to provide structure for in-depth discussion and to provide opportunities for students to model or observe group processes in a discussion setting (Barkley, et al., 2005, p. 145-146).

Yee (2001, p. 11) and Ameen and Ahmed (2023), stated that fishbowl is a technique which involves groups of people seating in circles. It means that fishbowl is used to organize medium to large group activities which consist of different abilities. The groups chairs are an inner circle and outer circle. There are two distinct groups in this technique. The groups are distinguished based on the students' ability. The inner circle consists of the students whose ability is lower than the students in the outer circle.

The Fishbowl technique refers to teach a variety of social skills. It is one way to shine a light on the specific social skills that can either move a discussion forward or shut it down. The Fishbowl offers the class an opportunity to closely observe and learn about social interaction that can be applied in any content area. (Opitz, 2008, p. 102).

Furthermore, fishbowl technique as problem solving with the help of groups is by gathering knowledge or ideas from others. Fishbowl can be used as a technique to build a mutual agreement in solving a problem. There is a moderator to stop the discussion and invite who are not in the circle to offer their thoughts and comments on what they heard.

Fishbowl technique can be used to model discussions of challenging or controversial material in any subject area. For example, a language teacher can use fishbowl discussions as a way to start a discussion on a topic, to improve students' speaking skill. Wood (2007, p. 54) states that 'fishbowl is a way to organize inner circle and outer circle to promote students' engagement. It can be used to model small group activities and discussion.' The writers can summarize the fishbowl can be the right technique to help students share their opinions. This technique is effective way to use in class discussions. This technique can also be used, so that students do not feel bored learning in class.

The application of fishbowl techniques can also improve students' speaking skills in terms of fluency, pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary. This is obtained from students who are self-sufficient to be able to speak English as an achievement that must be taken by these students. By doing many discussions for each meeting, the students have a lot of vocabulary. The teacher must evaluate the results of the discussion at each meeting, the goal is that students can improve and add good ways to speak English. This fishbowl technique will continue to be carried out alternately for groups that have not yet appeared or discussed. The aim is to train students who do not have the skills to speak more skillfully and dare to express their opinions.

In this fishbowl technique, each student is required to be responsible for what is being conveyed. In this case, students are trained to solve their own problems independently. Next, they will learn from mistakes or get new knowledge from friends who criticize the student's assumptions. With this fishbowl technique students also learn to dare to speak English in front of public or crowds. Besides that, it grows and strengthens their mentality in public to speak English.

The problem of this study was limited to explore the influence of fishbowl technique on speaking achievement in the form of monologue test at Tenth grade students of SMAN 1 GAS INHIL RIAU. Fraenkel et al (2012, p. 83) say that hypothesis is a prediction of the possible outcomes of a study. There are two hypotheses to be proposed for the research: Null Hypothesis (H<sub>0</sub>) and alternative Hypothesis (H<sub>a</sub>). In this study, the research attempts to find whether following hypotheses are approved:

Ha1: There was a significant influence of speaking achievement of the tenth-grade students of SMAN 1 GAS INHIL RIAU who were taught by using fishbowl technique and those who were not.



H01: There was no a significant influence of speaking achievement of the tenth-grade students of SMAN 1 GAS INHIL RIAU Utama who were taught by using fishbowl technique and those who were not.

Ha2: There was a significant difference of speaking achievement between the tenth-grade students of SMAN 1 GAS INHIL RIAU who were taught by using fishbowl technique and those who were not.

H02: There was no a significant difference speaking achievement between the tenth-grade students of SMAN 1 GAS INHIL RIAU who were taught by using fishbowl technique and those who were not.

## Method

In this study, the writers used a quasi-experimental design where the writers use pre-test, treatment, and post-test. Based on Creswell (2014, p. 172), the design involves the experimental group A and control group B selected without random assignment. In this study design, there are two intact groups of classes involved. The writers gave different treatment to both groups, the first group was experimental group which was taught by using fishbowl technique, while the second group was control group which was not taught by using fishbowl technique. Both of groups were given pre-test before treatment and post-test after the treatment. The results of pre-test and the post-test would be analysed. The research design can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1. Types of on-Equivalent Group

<b>Group A</b>	01 ((Pre-test))	X (Treatment)	03 (Post-test)
<b>Group B</b>	02 ((Pre-test))	Traditional Method	04 (Post-test)

*Sources: Creswell (2014, p.172)*

There are two kinds of variable. They are independent variable and dependent variable. Creswell (2012, p. 115-116) states that independent variable is an attribute or characteristic that influences or affects an outcome or dependent variable whereas dependent variables is characteristic that is dependent on or influenced by the independent variable. In this study, independent variable is fishbowl technique and dependent variable is students' speaking achievement.

According to Fraenkel and Wallen (2006, p.93), "population the group of interest to the researcher, the group to whom the researcher would like to generalize the result of the study". The population of this study was the tenth-grade students of SMAN 1 GAS INHIL RIAU in 2022/2023 with the total number of 250 students.

Selection of the sample is very important step in conducting a study. The writers took the sample to determine the validity of the research results or conclusion from the result of the study. Based on Fraenkel and Wallen (2009, p.91), sample is the group of something which information is obtained for the research. In other words, a sample is a group or subset of population, specifically, in research. Sampling is referred to as selecting an element of the population (individual participant, or object) that is representing the entire population.

In this study, the samples would pick out from the population, and then would be divided into two classes. The writers used purposive sampling. According to Creswell (2012, p.143), purposive sampling is a non-probability sampling method and it occurs when elements selected for the sample are chosen by the judgment of the researchers. The writers used purposive sampling to take a sample by taking some consideration as follows: 1) the students have low capability in speaking, 2) similar total number of the students in both classes, and 3) both classes taught by the same teacher.

Table 2 The Sample of The Investigation

No	GROUP	CLASS
1	The experimental group	X1
2	The control group	X2
TOTAL		80

(Source: The main students' book of SMAN 1 GAS INHIL RIAU)

For this study, the writers used spoken test to collect the data. There are two test, pre-test and post-test. Pre-test was given to the students before giving treatment, and post-test was given at the end of treatment in order to know the result of treatment given. In this study, the writers gave spoken test in the form of monologue to collect the data. In a test, students were asked to deliver an opinion with the topic "Dangerous of Smoking" by using video call in WhatsApp application. Then, the students' speaking test would be scored by two ratter's that they used analytical rubric adopted from brown, (2001, p. 173) to determine the results of students' speaking achievement.

In scoring the students' speaking performance, the writers used analytical rubric adopted by Brown (2001, p.173). Based on speaking scoring rubric, there are five aspects measured: grammar, vocabulary, comprehension, fluency and, pronunciation.

A good test can be seen from the content validity. According to Brown (2004, p.23), content validity is a form that based on the degree to which a test adequately and sufficiently measures skill or behaviour it sets out to measure. In this study the writers asked two validators to judge and identify whether it was applicable. The instrument was given to the validators who were the English Teacher of SMAN 1 GAS INHIL RIAU and a lecturer of UNRI RIAU. From the result of validity of the speaking instrument test shows that the test was moderate in the level of appropriateness.

Based on the Aiken's index,  $V < 0.4$  is poor valid,  $V = 0.4 - 0.8$  is mediocre, and  $V > 0.8$  the instrument is strong valid. From the result of validity of the speaking instrument test shows that V-value was 3.6. Since V-value (3.6) was higher than 0.8, it means that the instrument was strong valid, to examine the students' speaking score, the writers used inter ratter reliability. Fleming & Judith (2004, p. 39) stated that inter-rater reliability involves two or more assessors to assess the same instrument. It is used when scores of their test are independently rated by two or more judges or ratter's that is to avoid the subjectivity and bias. Thus, the ratter's provided one lecturer from UNRI RIAU and the other one was English teacher from SMAN 1 GAS INHIL RIAU. The writers chose the ratter's because they have graduated from master degree and have taught English for more than 5 years.



Based on their experience in teaching and scoring their students' speaking skill, they were capable enough to be the ratter's. The reliability of the test was analysed by using Statistic Package for Social Science version 24 (SPSS 24).

Based on the results of reliability test the writers found the values of correlation of coefficient in pre-test for experiment group was 0.843 and the post-test experimental group was 0.916. Meanwhile pre-test for control group was 0.837 and the post test was 0.884. The correlation score of the test was higher than 0.70. It was indicated that the results of reliability test for both groups were reliable. In descriptive Statistics, the students' pre-test and post-test score are analysed. It is done to know the speaking scores of the students' pre-test and post-test in experimental and control groups including the score of median, mode, standard error of means, standard deviation, minimum and maximum score.

The writers compared the post-test result of both experimental group and control group in order to know the data is normal or not and homogeny or not, the writers analysed the normality by using kolmogrov-smirnov and homogeny by using levene statistic. The test of homogeneity would be used to find out the mean of data from two or more different groups while the test of normality would be used to find out the mean of data from two or more different groups and to know whether the data distribution is normal or not. The following is an explanation about normality and homogeneity.

Normality test is used to measure the obtained data is normal or not in the study. Based on Flynn (2003, p.17), a value less than 0,05 indicate that the data are non-normal. In measuring normality test, the writers use sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov in SPSS program. Homogeneity test is used to measure whether to obtained data are homogenous or not. According to Flynn (2003, p.18), the data can be categorized whenever is higher than 0.05. To determine whether the students' score is homogeneous or not, the students' post-test scores in the experimental and control groups by using levene statistic. In measuring homogeneity test, the writers used SPSS 24 program software.

Based on Kent (2016, p.7) Pair T-test is compares two means (pre-test and post-test) that are from same individual, object, or related units. Pair Sample T-test as procedure used to compare the average of two variables in group. It means that useful to test for samples receiving treatment which sample between before and after give treatment. To get t-test result the writers use SPSS 24 Program.

Technique for analysing the data the writers used independent sample t-test. In giving the score for students' post-test, the writers asked for the assistance of the ratters. The ratters gave the students' score based on the scoring rubrics. The post-test raw scores were converted into percentages to find out whether each group make any progress of their speaking skill. The writers compared the post-test result of both experimental and control group.

## **Results and Discussion**

### **Findings of the research**

### Descriptive Statistics of Experimental Group

The result of pre-test in experimental group showed, the minimum score was 35, the maximum score was 70, the mean score was 47.69 with the standard deviation was 9.645. And number of statistic post-test for control group was 23. Next, in post-test group the minimum score was 60, the maximum score was 80, and the mean score was 67.00 with the standard deviation 5.799.

### The Result of Paired Sample T-test in Experimental Group

The result of paired sample t-test in experimental group showed that the value of t-obtained was 14.835 at the significance level 0.000 with degree of freedom was 22 (See Appendix H). Since t-obtained (14.835) was higher than t-table (2.079) and the significance level (0.000) was lower alpha value (0.05), it was assumed that there was a significant influenced students' speaking achievement after they were taught by using fishbowl technique. The result of paired sample t-test in experimental group is presented in Table 3.

Table 3 The Result of Paired Sample Test in Experimental Group

Group		Mean	Mean Difference	Std. Deviation	t-obtained	Df	Sig. (2 tailed)
Experimental	Pre-test	47.70	19.304	6.241	14.835	22	0.000
	Post-test	67.00					

### The Result of Paired Sample T-test in Control Group

The result of paired sample t-test in control group showed that the value of t-obtained was 8.165 at the significance level 0.000 with degree of freedom was 22. Since the t obtained (8.165) was higher than t-table (2.079) and the significance level (0.000) was lower than alpha value (0.05), it can be stated that the students' speaking achievement of control group was also significant influenced after given the treatment (lecturing method). The result of paired sample t-test in experimental group is presented in Table 4.

Table 4 The Result of Paired Sample Test in Control Group

Group		Mean	Mean Difference	Std. Deviation	t-obtained	Df	Sig. (2 tailed)
Control	Pre-test	48.70	9.913	5.822	8.165	22	0.000
	Post-test	58.61					

### The Result of Independent Sample T-test

After the data were collected from both control and experimental group, the writers used independent sample t-test to compare the result of post-test from both control and experimental groups after being given the treatment. Table 5 presents the results of independent sample t-test.

Table 5 Independent Sample T-Test

Group		Mean	Mean Difference	t-obtained	Df	Sig. (2 tailed)
Post-test	Experimental	67.00	8.391	3.592	44	0.001

Control	58.60
---------	-------

The post-test result from independent sample t-test showed that the value of t-obtained was 3.592. At the significance level was 0.001 with degree of freedom was 44 (See Appendix J). As the t-obtained (3592) was higher than t-table (2.079) and the significance level was lower than alpha value (0.05), it can be stated that the null hypothesis (Ho2) was rejected and the alternative hypothesis (Ha2) was accepted. Therefore, there was a significant difference of speaking achievement between Tenth grade students of SMAN 1 GAS INHIL RIAU who were taught by using fishbowl technique and those who were not.

### Discussion

Based on the results of independent sample t-test, the difference between two groups was significant. It can be seen the result of post-test between experimental group and control groups had significant difference of speaking achievement between students who were taught by using fishbowl technique and lecturing teaching technique. It is assumed that the use of fishbowl technique is very effective because students more active during the learning process, students are also given the opportunity to participate in developing creative ideas in solving problems, demanding students think, and training students to accept and appreciate each answer from their friends. Moreover, Fishbowl technique contributed a significant improvement towards the students speaking skill achievement. Previous research, such as supports the findings of this study, (Aswadi & Akhmad, 2016 & Setyawati, 2016). It might be caused that the use of fishbowl technique which could make the students participate actively during the lesson.

### Conclusion

The writers concluded that fishbowl technique was significant to influence students' speaking achievement in giving opinion. It is concluded that students in experimental group had higher progress than in control. Based on conclusion above, the writers that the result of paired sample t-test in experimental group showed that the t-obtained (14.835) was higher than t-table (2.079) and the significance level (0.000) was lower than alpha value (0.05).

The result of paired sample t-test in control group showed that the t-obtained (8.165) was higher than t-table (2.079) and the significance level (0.000) was lower alpha value (0.05). It can be stated that there was significant using fishbowl technique to influence students' speaking achievement to Tenth grade students of SMAN 1 GAS INHIL RIAU. It means that the null hypothesis (Ho1) was rejected and the alternative hypothesis (Ha1) was accepted. The result of independent t-obtained (3.592) was higher than t-table (2.079) and the significance level (0.001) was lower than alpha value (0.05), it can be stated there was a significant difference on speaking achievement between student who were taught by using fishbowl technique and who were not. It meant that the null hypothesis (Ho2) was rejected and the alternative hypothesis (Ha2) was accepted.

## References

- Ameen, S. T., & Ahmed, S. M. A. (2023). Fishbowl technique at TESOL Classes and Figuring out Speaking Skills Limitations and Solutions: (A various schools in Duhok city). *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, (45), 234-245. <https://doi.org/10.33193/IJoHSS.45.2023.574>
- Arini, M., & Wahyudin, A. Y. (2022). Students' perception on Questioning Technique in Improving Speaking Skill Ability at English Education Study Program. *Journal of Arts and Education*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.33365/jae.v2i1.70>
- Aswadi, J., & Akhmad, H. (2016). Fishbowl technique and learning interest effects on speaking achievement of smk sembawa. *Jambi-English Language Teaching*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.22437/jelt.v1i1.2899>
- Bailey, Kathleen M. (2005). *Practical English language teaching: Speaking*. New York: The McGraw-Hill
- Barkley, E. F., Cross, K. P., & Major, C. H. (2005). *Collaborative learning techniques: A handbook for college faculty*. USA: Jossey -Bass.
- Brown, H. Douglas. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. 2nd ed. White Plains, NY: Pearson Education
- Brown, H. Douglas. (2004). *Language assessment: Principle and classroom practices*. New York: Pearson Education Company
- Cameron, L. (2001). *Teaching language to young learners*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (4th ed)*. New York: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach (4th ed)*. USA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Fleming, J. A., McCracken, J., & Carran, D. (2004). A Comparison of Two Methods of Determining Interrater Reliability. *Assessment for Effective Intervention*, 29(2), 39–51. <https://doi.org/10.1177/073724770402900204>
- Flynn, D. (2003). *Student guide to SPSS*. Barnard College: Columbia University. Retrieved from <http://barnard.edu/site/default/files/spps.pdf>
- Fraenkel and Wallen. (2006). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Fraenkel and Wallen. (2009). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Fraenkel, J. R., and Wallen, N.E., and Hyun, M.H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies
- Kent. (2016). SPSS tutorials paired sample t-test. Retrieved from <http://libguides:library.kent.edu/SPSS?PairedSampleTest>
- Khadijah. (2017). Teaching speaking using the fishbowl technique, *English Education Jurnal*, 8. (2), 214.

- Kindzt, D. (2011). Complexity and the language classroom. *Academia: Literature and Language*, 67:235-258.
- Leong, L. M., & Ahmadi, S. M. (2017). An Analysis of Factors Influencing Learners' English speaking Skill. *International Journal of Research in English Education*, 2(1), 34-41. Sid. <https://Sid.Ir/Paper/349619/En>
- Munjayanah, A. (2004). *The Implementation of Communicative Language Teaching Speaking at LIA Surakarta: An Ethnography*. Surakarta: UMS.
- Opitz, C. (2008). *Fishbowl Method*. Edutopia.
- Pollard, A. (2008). *Reflective teaching (3 rd ed): Evidence informed professional practice*. Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Richards, J. C. (2008). *Teaching listening and speaking from theory to practice*. New York, United States of America: Cambridge
- Setyawati, V. R. (2016). *The Effectiveness of Using Fishbowl Method in Teaching Speaking at the Eleventh Grade Students of SMK N 1 Karanganyar in the Academic Year of 2015/2016*. S1 Thesis. Unpublish.
- Silberman, M. L. (2002). *active learning 101 strategies to teach any subject*. Simon and Schuster Company.
- Taylor, D. B. (2007). *Fostering engaging and active discussion in middle school classrooms*. New York: Allyn & Bacon.
- Tuan, N. H., & Mai, T.N. (2015). Factors affecting students' speaking in the EFL Classroom. *International Journal of Humanities and social Science*, 4(6).
- Wood, K. D., & Taylor, D. B. (2007). Fostering engaging and active discussions in middle school classrooms. *Middle School Journal*, 39(1), 54-59. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00940771.2007.11461615>
- Yee, K. (2001). Interactive Techniques. In A. Morrison-Shetlar & M. Marwitz (Eds.), *Teaching Creatively: Ideas in Action* (pp. 1-20). Outernet.