



THE IMPLEMENTATION OF CONVERSATION IMPROVEMENT ON FISHBOWL METHOD TO IMPROVE THE SPEAKING ABILITY OF STUDENTS: A CASE STUDY OF TEACHING EFL AT SMAN 2 KUPANG

By Fransiskus Xaverius Ivan Rahas

(English Teacher of SMA Negeri 1 Kupang)

rahasfransiskus@yahoo.co.id

Abstract: This research was conducted in Class X of SMAN 2 Kupang in the academic year 2018/2019. The subjects in this study were 36 students of class X IPA 1 of SMAN 2 Kupang. This study aimed to determine the increase in English speaking skills of students by applying the fishbowl method based on conversation improvement. This type of research was qualitative with descriptive design. Data collection techniques used in this study were tests, observations, and speaking assessment sheets. The researcher observed what students did while having a conversation in class. The researcher used 4 (four) conversation improvement strategies. In the pre-research, there were 31 students (86%) failed to reach the minimum completion criteria. In the first cycle, there was an increasing of the results of students' speaking skills where 41% students reached the minimum completion criteria. At this stage, students had not shown significant improvement in linguistics aspects (such as stress, speech, tone and rhythm) and non-linguistics aspects (such as fluency and mastery of the topic). The results of the first cycle were followed up by the second cycle. The results showed that there was an increasing in the minimum completion criteria for 88%. There were also significant improvements in linguistics aspects (such as stress, speech, tone and rhythm) and non-linguistics aspects (such as fluency and mastery of the topic).

Keywords: *Speaking, fishbowl, conversation improvement*

INTRODUCTION

The application of the national curriculum basically requires English teachers to be more creative, innovative, and productive in using and applying various media, approaches, methods, techniques, and learning strategies for students in the classroom. But the real challenge for teachers is whether teacher is able to explore effective and efficient methods or strategies to improve English competence while integrating teaching materials in accordance with the national curriculum. One language competence that is considered important is speaking competence. Speaking indicates the knowledge that students have in order to interact with others in various situations and cultures (Hymes, 1972; Canale and Swain, 1980; Celce-Murcia, 2007).

In learning English at SMAN 2 Kupang, students often experienced a decrease in fluency in communication when they were asked to speak in front of the class. There were a number of students still feeling afraid to stand before their classmates. In fact, it was common to see some students nervous, stand rigid, and forget what to be said when dealing with a number of other students. There were also students who were passive and lazy to speak in front of the class. Based on preliminary observations, the researchers found that the low speaking ability of students in English was caused by a lack of training in speaking English in the class, the

inaccuracy of the techniques used by the teacher, and the lack of vocabulary for students. Among the many factors that caused the low skills of students to understand in English, the inappropriate learning techniques were the most dominant factors. Therefore, the teacher needs to design a teaching strategy in which students are encouraged and motivated to communicate so that they do not experience speech problems and difficulties, do not misunderstand the other person, and communication is not interrupted. And one of the strategies applied to improve students' speaking skills is the application of Fishbowl methods based on conversation improvement. This method is the development of the Fishbowl method by using the concept of Conversation Analysis which focuses on solving problems when students talk, hear, or understand in an interactive conversation (Seedhouse, 2005, Wong & Waring, 2010).

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Speaking is the ability to say sounds of articulation, and to express and convey thoughts, ideas, and feelings (Tarigan, 2008). By interacting or dialogue with the speech partner, the speaker produces speech to achieve a certain goal by expressing the desire to do something; negotiate and / or solve certain problems; or build and maintain social relations and friendship.

Fishbowl Method based on Conversation Improvement

Fishbowl method is a discussion learning method that involves listening and speaking skills and demands active participation from discussion participants (Harmer, 2004). This method has a unique form of discussion because it consists of large groups and small groups that form two circles, namely large circles and small circles at one time and place simultaneously (Daryanto, 2010: 5). Small groups occupy the position of small circles inside a large circle. The role of the teacher in this method proposes three main concepts, namely (a) the structure of the speech flow; (b) turn-taking; and (c) how to identify and correct communicative problems (Richard & Schmidt, 2002). Huth (2011) suggests the application of conversation repair in teaching English can help teachers explain the patterns of language interaction produced by students. Conversational improvement is defined as the application of treatment to problems that occur during the activities of speaking, listening or understanding someone's speech during a conversation (Wong & Waring, 2010).

In the Conversation repair study, there are two types of conversation improvement mechanisms, namely (a) self-initiated improvements, where corrective actions are carried out by the source's own problem, and (b) improvements made by others in the conversation (Liddicoat, 2007). Conversational improvement is characterized by problems such as grammatical errors, inaccurate pronunciation, and sound errors when returning conversations that can hinder the conversation between two parties (Gardner & Wagner, 2004). There are 8 (eight) types of conversation improvements that can be applied in the method of teaching English (Wong & Waring, 2010), which is opening a class with the use of *Huh?*, *What? Pardon? I'm sorry?*; use of question words (*WH-Interrogative*); partial repetition of the spoken problem plus the use of question words (partial repetition of trouble-source + *WH-interrogative*); repeating some of the problems (partial repetition of the trouble-source) using different intonations; use of sentence 'you mean'; directly exposed (Correction Repair Strategy); request for repair by asking the speaker to repeat the statement; and non-verbal improvement with body movements, eye gaze, facial expressions and silence.

RESEARCH METHOD

The research method used is classroom action research. The approach used in this study is a qualitative and quantitative approach. Qualitative data was obtained through direct tests, observations, and speaking assessment sheets. The quantitative approach relates to comparisons of student speaking test results both in the initial test (pre-test), assessment of assignments in cycles I and II, and post-test. This research was conducted in

class X IPA 1 of SMAN 2 Kupang with 36 students. This class was chosen because this class is occupied by students with better academic abilities than other classes, are interested in developing speech skills, and have better English speaking skills. The study was conducted from the beginning of July to the beginning of October in 2018. The data collection techniques used in this study were tests, observations, and speaking assessment sheets. Tests were given to students to get students understanding in speaking English. An observation sheet was given to observe the learning process and the results of conducting research in the classroom. A speaking assessment sheet were measuring students' speaking skills during the teaching and learning process. Whereas to interpret scores related to students' speaking ratings were used the evaluation criteria used by Simon (2005). The indicator of the success of this study is that if the average percentage of English language skills (speaking) has reached 75% of students from all students who were sampled in this study and students who get a good category above 60% of the total number of students.

RESEARCH RESULT

Description of Preliminary Observation Results

The initial steps carried out by the researcher before conducting classroom action research were observing the learning skills of English language skills in Grade X students 1. Students were divided into 2 (two) groups, namely observers and small groups (fishbowl). Small groups of 4 (four) students and the rest were included in the observer group. Students are given the opportunity to discuss with their respective groups. The teacher then conducted a pre-action test on 36 students. Based on the results of the test, the number of students who achieved the Minimum Completion Criteria (KKM) was 5 students (14%), and those who had not reached KKM were 31 students (86%) where they were not active in discussions, asking questions, answering questions, and tending to be silent if the teacher asks a question.

Description of Actions in Cycle I

The implementation of learning cycle I consists of four stages, namely planning, implementation (action), observations (observations), and reflection. The first cycle of action is arranged in 4 meetings which are divided into 12 lesson hours. The first meeting was held on Wednesday, August 8, 2018, the second meeting was held on Wednesday, August 15, 2018, the third meeting was held on Wednesday, August 22, 2018, and the fourth meeting (final test) was held on Wednesday, August 29 2018. Implementation of actions at the last meeting is an evaluation or final test. The teacher designed the teaching procedure to speak with several stages, namely the teacher asked students to change the position of the table and ruled students to sit into a large circle (observer) and a small circle (fishbowl) and

introduced the fishbowl method based on the conversation improvement approach to students. Then the teacher took 4 (four) sheets of paper and wrote each conversation improvement strategy on each paper. The teacher asked 4 (four) students to enter into a small group (fishbowl) and chose a sheet of paper that had been prepared. The first sheet of paper was written the question word *What? Huh? Pardon? and Sorry*. The second paper sheet was written the *Who, Where, When*, etc. question words. The third paper sheet was written repetition of a number of conversation sentences without the use of question words. The fourth sheet of paper was written in the sentence "*you mean*". Other students stayed to be observers. Each student from a small group was asked to hear conversations from the observer group and made conversation repairs according to the assignments written on the paper. Teachers walked around the room to monitor and facilitate group discussions and recorded the results of their discussions.

Based on the results of observations, students had not mastered the aspects of speaking skills, both language and non-language aspects. Language aspects that had not been mastered included: pressure, speech, tone and rhythm, while the non-mastery aspects that had not been mastered were fluency and mastery of the material. This was because students did not master the material, and were not used to doing question and answer in English conversation in class. This lack of mastery was indicated by the inability of students to answer 4 (four) questions given by their friends when there was a conversation intervention. Questions with question words *What? Huh? Pardon? Sorry* on the first sheet of paper could only be answered by 15 (fifteen) students or 41%. Questions with *Who, Where, When*, etc on the second sheet of paper could only be answered by 12 (twelve) students or 33%. Questions by repeating the sentence used were only answered by 5 (five) students or 14%. And the question with the phrase "*You mean*" on the fourth sheet of paper was only answered by 7 (seven) students or 19%. However, when compared with pre-action, the first cycle experienced an increase in the results of students' speaking skills to 41%. The value of the first cycle had increased, but had not met the target. Therefore, further action was continued in cycle II.

Description of Actions in Cycle II

Cycle II was a corrective action from cycle I. The researcher planned the action of the second cycle by making a learning design consisting of three meetings, namely 12 September 2018, 19 September 2018, and 26 September 2018. The teacher designed teaching procedures that same as cycle I but with several changes. In this cycle, the teacher provided additional explanations about aspects of linguistic skills (pressure, speech, tone and rhythm) and non-fluency aspects (fluency and mastery of the material). Students were also retrained using the fishbowl method based on

conversation improvement. In this cycle, the teacher required students who had not finished in the first cycle to carry out fishbowl elaboration while students who had completed the first cycle were allowed to become observers. The teacher took 4 (four) papers which had the same conversation improvement strategy as in the first cycle and gave it to student representatives. The four students who entered the small group (fishbowl) were asked to hear conversations from the observer group and made repairs to the conversation according to the assignments written on the paper. The results of the observation showed that students were getting used to the form of conversation improvement and had been able to master the aspects of speaking skills, both language and non-language aspects. Language aspects that had been mastered by students were pressure, speech, tone and rhythm, vocabulary / phrase or diction, and sentence structure used. Meanwhile, the non-professional aspects that had been mastered by students were fluency, material mastery, courage, friendliness, and attitude. Students seemed enthusiastic in following the fishbowl method based on conversation improvement because students got new experiences in conversations that did not rely on memorizing text and were able to develop students' critical thinking skills (high order thinking skills). This can be seen from the results of the research in which the question with the question word *What? Huh? Pardon? and Sorry* on the first sheet of paper could be answered by 30 (thirty) students or 83%. Questions with *Who, Where, When*, etc on the second sheet of paper could be answered by 32 (thirty two) students or 88%. Questions by repeating the sentence used could be answered by 20 (twenty) students or 55%. And the question with the sentence "*You mean*" could be answered by 17 (seventeen) students or 47%. When compared with the first cycle, the second cycle experienced an increase in students' speaking skills from the original number of 15 students increased to 32 students or 88%. The value of cycle II has increased, and meets the indicators of success in this study. Because the target has been reached, the research stops in cycle II

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the study, it was concluded that English language learning through elaboration of the fishbowl method based on conversation improvement could improve the speaking skills of class X IPA1 students at SMA Negeri 2 Kupang. In the pre-action stage, there were 31 students or 86% who were not active in discussions. They did not ask and answer questions, and tended to be quiet when the teacher asked questions. There were only 5 students (14%) who achieved the Minimum Completion Criteria (KKM). After learning activities in the first cycle using the fishbowl method based on conversation improvement, there was an increase in the results of students' speaking skills to 15 students (41%) with

mastery of language aspects (pressure, speech, tone and rhythm) and non-fluency (fluency and mastery of the material) not maximal. These results were followed up by taking follow-up actions in the second cycle with some additional improvements and explanations. After the action, it was found that the speaking skills of students experienced an increase in linguistic aspects (pressure, speech, and tone and rhythm) and non-language aspects (fluency and mastery of the material) indicated by the test scores that had been obtained. In the first cycle the achievement of the KKM value was 15 students or 41%, and achievement of the KKM was increased by 32 students or 88% in the second cycle. This meant that students' speaking skills were increasing by using fishbowl method based on conversation improvement. Based on the conclusions above, the researchers suggested that the fishbowl method based on conversational improvement in learning English should be applied in teaching English speaking at school because it was proven to improve students' speaking skills. This research can also be developed for further research by teachers in schools and provide learning experiences that can foster innovation in language skills.

REFERENCE

- Canale, M. and M. Swain.1980. *Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing*. Applied Linguistics 11
- Celce-Murcia, M. 2007. *Rethinking The Role of Communicative Competence in Language Teaching*. In E. Alcon Soler& M. P. SafontJorda (Eds.), *The intercultural language use and language learning*. Dordrecht: Springer
- Daryanto, 2010. *Media Pembelajaran*. Yogyakarta: Gava Media
- Gardner, R. and Wagner, J. 2004. *Second Language Conversations*. London: Continuum
- Harmer, Jeremy. 2004. *How to Teach English*. New York: Longman Inc
- Huth, T. 2011. *Conversation Analysis and Language Classroom Discourse. Language and Linguistics Compas*. London: Longman
- Hymes, D.H. 1972. *On Communicative Competence*. In J.B. Pride and J. Holmes (eds.). *Sociolinguistics: Selected Readings*. Harmondsworth: Penguin
- Liddicoat, A.J. 2007. *An Introduction to Conversation Analysis*. London: Continuum
- Richards, J.C. & Schmidt, R. 2002. *Longman dictionary of Language teaching and Applied linguistics (Third Edition)*. London: Longman
- Seedhouse, P. 2005. *Conversation Analysis and language learning. Language Teaching*. London: Longman
- Simon. 2005. *Pembelajaran dengan Metode Debat Plus*. Jakarta: Depdikbud

- Tarigan, Henry Guntur. 2008. *Berbicara Sebagai Suatu Keterampilan Berbahasa*. Bandung: Angkasa.
- Wong, J.&Waring, H.Z. 2010. *Conversation Analysis and Second Language Pedagogy*. New York: Routledge