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ABSTRACT
The objective of this study was to improve the speaking ability of non-English department students of Universitas Singaperbangsa Karawang (UNSIKA) by using the shadowing technique. The method of this research was Classroom Action Research (CAR) that was conducted to the PJKR (Pendidikan Jasmani Kesehatan dan Rekreasi) students at second grade of UNSIKA. The subject of the research consists of twenty-five students. The instruments are spoken test and observation guidelines. The research design applied in this study was a collaborative classroom action research consisting of 2 cycles covering 3 meetings for each cycle. The findings of this study showed the improvement of the students’ speaking ability from the first to the second cycle has improved highly. Where the mean score of vocabulary terms was 2 for the pre-cycle test become 3.28 for the second cycle post-test. Besides that, the mean score of grammar in the pre-cycle test was 1.84 increase 3.08 in the second cycle post-test. Same as the pronunciation term, the student's scores from the pre-cycle test to the second cycle test came up from 1.96 to 3.04. Furthermore, for the students speaking accuracy and fluency, their score also increase from 1.44 became 2.92. This research was successful to improve the students speaking ability by using the shadowing technique.
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INTRODUCTION
Students of non-English departments usually have low English language proficiency especially in speaking. Their entrance English scores are below average scores. They are less able in English when compared to their peers. Their utterances are in words or short prefabricated phrases. Their grammar is mostly inaccurate and their pronunciation requires concentrated speaking. The students are less motivated to learn because their English ability is low. When they know their ability, it will give an impact on their motivation in learning English. If students are less motivated to learn their ability can never improve (Littlejohn,
This fact is because of their ‘negative learning experience’, they say goodbye to English as quickly as they can.

However, the curriculum of higher education has included English in every level of the department in university considering English is very important in all aspects of human life. Students are required to take at least 2 credit hours of English before they graduate. Again, they participate in such classes with very little progress. They leave university being unable to do such as short conversation giving directions to a foreign tourist.

Based on an informal interview with 10 randomly selected students of the second year Students of the non-English department in UNSIKA, the researcher found that the students had participated unsuccessfully in the English classes because the teaching of all four skills was too difficult for them and their real need of English was only the ability to communicate satisfactorily for basic needs such as giving directions or other language functions needed for everyday survival. Some of the students still had problems such as anxiety and confusion when they start to speak. Thus, students did not focus on the speaking process, they did not get points from the material which was taught by the lecturer and it makes them hard to practice speaking. As the researcher taught speaking in the classroom and asked students to speak English, most of them could not speak English fluently and they used code-switching and code-mixing when they spoke to the lecturer and their friends.

Furthermore, when the researcher had a preliminary study with non-English department students of UNSIKA, the students had many problems in speaking. First students did not have enough English background or prior knowledge especially theoretically, they said English is very complicated and has many rules especially in constructing a sentence that what they will say. Second students had problems in linguistic knowledge such as phonemes, word grammatical structures, pronunciation, accent, and non-linguistic knowledge such as knowledge about the topic and main idea, about the context, and general knowledge about the world. Third, students seldom practiced speaking because they have limited vocabulary. The fourth, when the students had studied too long part and kept all information in their mind they could not remember it and retell it again using their own words. This problem is caused by some factors such as when the students are in high school, English teaching and learning is focused on helping the students pass the final exam. The students are taught about grammar, structure, and written communication, while the oral one is put aside. He often limits the activities that require the students to speak because in the semester exam the students answer the question through writing and reading. Therefore, the students do not have the self-
confidence even to speak a single word. He also said that the students cannot produce sentences because they have lack vocabulary. However, Limited speaking practices cause students to have low self-confidence as well as limited vocabulary and knowledge about parts of speech. As a result, the students spoke in English hesitantly. As a result, when they come to university and take a non-English Department their English ability become disappears.

Those problems indicate that teaching speaking needs to provide more communication practices. These phenomena raise some questions for the researcher on how to solve the problems. As mentioned previously, the researcher tried to find and design an effective technique to increase the speaking ability of non-English department students.

Brown (2001: 275-276) proposes some principles for designing speaking teaching techniques. They are presented as follows:

a. Use techniques that cover the spectrum of learner needs, from a language-based focus on accuracy to a message-based focus on interaction, meaning, and fluency.

b. Provide intrinsically motivating techniques.

c. Encourage the use of authentic language in meaningful contexts.

d. Provide appropriate feedback and correction.

e. Capitalize on the natural link between speaking and listening.

f. Give students opportunities to initiate oral communication.

g. Encourage the development of speaking strategies.

In order to solve the students’ problem in learning to speak, one of the alternative strategies in teaching speaking that can be used is shadowing techniques. Shadowing has been defined by some experts. Yonezawa & Ware (2008: 1256) state that shadowing is reproducing phrases right after listening to a chunk of meaningful English without looking at the text. Thus, the listener follows the speaker on the CD like a shadow or an echo. Kadota & Tamai (200) in Nakanishi & Ueda (2011: 4) state that shadowing is defined as an act or task of listening in which the learner tracks the target speech and repeats it immediately as exactly as possible without looking at a text. Lambert (1992) in Hamada (2012: 4) defines shadowing as a paced, parrot-style auditory tracking task, conducted with headphones. Rather than a passive activity, however, shadowing is an active and highly cognitive activity in which learners track the heard speech and vocalize it as clearly as possible while simultaneously listening (Tamai, 2001). This process of repeating incoming speech and monitoring the shadowed material engages many areas of the learners’ brains, especially the language centers (Kadota, 2007). According to Shiki et al., (2010), shadowing is the online immediate process
of repeating speech while repeating is an off-line task because it provides learners with silent pauses to reproduce the sounds.

Luster (2005) states that “shadowing”, which means repeating what a speaker says, may be well known as an exercise for simultaneous interpreting, but this technique is also an excellent way of teaching English. The term comes from “shadow” which means shade. We call it shadowing because, just as your shadow does everything that you do when you move, the shadowing voice says everything that the original voice says. Shadowing sometimes goes by other names, such as shadow talking, shadow speaking, mimicking, tracking echoing.

Alicia, (2018) proposed, things that should be required to use speech shadowing technique: Audio player (mp3, mp4, or any music player can be fine), Headphones, Audio recording in the target language, a comfortable place. And next, it can be done by following steps:

1. Listen to the text
2. Replay the text and Repeat in your voice. Be louder and try to match the accent of your target language.
3. Repeat the same text again and again, until you are confident and you speak with the same speed as the audio.
4. You can use transcripts to ease your task of speaking.
5. Once you are confident with the text you are practicing and understood its meaning, you can move on to the next text.

Alicia (2018) also tells 5 reasons why the speech shadowing technique is effective to learn new languages:

1. Speech shadowing helps in better pronunciation
   With speech shadowing, you listen to the language rather than only reading it. You can understand the pronunciation better when you have heard it. Also, you can grasp the accent of the target language or the language you wish to learn.
2. Improves vocabulary of the target language
   As they say, one believes in what their ears listen to. And what you believe in, retains. Similarly, you can add up more words of the foreign language when you listen to it.
3. You can gain fluency of the language by using speech shadowing
   Since we know that one can radically improve his vocabulary with the speech shadowing technique, one can anticipate the fluency over the language both in speaking and understanding.
4. Creates an impression of the sentence structures in mind

When we are repeatedly exposed to listening to something, our mind starts processing the information in the same pattern. So, involuntarily we start framing the sentences in the same pattern. This is similar to a child who first starts to speak and creates sentences according to how his parents speak.

5. Imparts targeted learning

In speech shadowing, we try to match with the audio. So we have a target to achieve. When we have set a target for ourselves, the potential to perform becomes higher. So is with the speech shadowing technique

Doung (2010:716) states that in shadowing exercises, learners repeat what they have heard such as speech and news at the same pace. The purpose of the training is to cultivate learners’ split of attention and the skill of speaking while listening. It is better to do this training in mother tongue at first, and then other languages. At the beginning stage, learners can repeat immediately after they hear something; little by little, they should delay and then repeat. When training, they should listen, speak and think at the same time. Even after repeating for 10 minutes, they can still retell the main idea. Thus, after 2 or 3 months, they can step into the next stage.

The researcher concluded that steps to build shadowing skills are categorized into three steps. Firstly, the learners do the shadowing technique by looking at the script. Secondly, the learners do the shadowing technique without looking at the script. Thirdly, the learners can find some new vocabularies from the script and they can retell the main idea.

METHOD

The researcher conducted Classroom Action Research which involved a cycle of planning, implementation, observation, and reflection. This research was conducted at the second-grade students at non-English Department students of UNSIKA. There were 25 students in the class. The criteria of success of this study were determined by two components, namely classical indicators and individual indicators in which 70% of the students were available obtaining a score of 3 (good), and 70% of the students responded positively to the use of the shadowing technique in improving their speaking ability. Next, the data gained in this study were both qualitative and quantitative data. Furthermore, the research instruments used to obtain valid data were the oral test and observation guidelines. The data obtained were analyzed by using comparative descriptive analysis; and statistical
analysis. The research procedures involved in this study were a plan, action, observation, and reflection. The procedures are as follows:

1. Plan

In this step, the researcher prepared several types of equipment before going to action including the instruments of collecting data, they are verbal test, guidelines of observation and students’ quiz. In addition, the researcher also designed a lesson plan for each meeting as a framework in the class.

2. Action

The steps of the shadowing technique that was implemented in this research are presented in the following:

1) The researcher told a story, an experience, or an opinion as introductory teaching or he gave the students some questions relating to the script of shadowing material that would be learned by the students;

2) The researcher gave the students a copy of the material script. The students were given one different topic in every meeting;

3) The students were given instructions and motivation regarding the shadowing technique. The researcher motivated the students to speak English fluently nearly like native speakers on the video, CD, or MP3 after doing shadowing technique;

4) The researcher turned on the laptop and the speaker. After that she turned on the video, CD, or MP3 of the script of shadowing material;

5) The students were instructed to listen and to repeat directly what the speaker was saying on MP3. It was repeated three times. In the first turn, the whole student listened and repeated directly what the speaker was saying by looking at the script. In the second turn, the whole student listened and repeated directly again what the speaker was saying by looking at the script. If the researcher thought that the remaining time was limited, she omitted the second turn of the shadowing technique. After that, she asked the students to read, understand and find 5-10 new words whole passages in every meeting. In the third turn, the students were asked to shadow one by one by looking at or without looking at the script. Each student was instructed to shadow one paragraph for one student. In every turn, the students could pause in every phrase or sentence if the speaker spoke too fast;
6) Every student was asked to speak in 2-3 minutes about the content of the given material and their opinion on it. The researcher could give additional questions to the students or she could give discussion or debate related to the shadowing material if there was remain time left, and;

7) At the end of class, the researcher motivated the students to do the shadowing technique at home without a teacher. She motivated the students to speak English fluently nearly like native speakers on the video, CD, or MP3 after doing shadowing technique. Moreover, she could give the students data regarding the material script of shadowing technique with video, CD or MP3 or web site so that they could practice shadowing technique at home.

3. Observation

A moment to observe the event, movement, or process is provided in this step. The researcher observes several things happening in the class when the shadowing technique is used. In this case, the observer observes the class participation including the students’ attitude, interest, emotion, and their response in the class. Moreover, the researcher observes the weaknesses of that activities either. Afterward making a note of weaknesses identified to recover in the next meeting.

4. Evaluation and Reflection

As the last step, the researcher focuses on analyzing the indicators that have and have not been achieved. After analyzing the indicators, the researcher focused on the indicator that has not been achieved yet. Next, looking for the problem solving to achieve the indicators. Afterward, the researcher thinks the planning and acting in the next meeting.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

1. The Findings of Preliminary Study

The pre-cycle study was conducted with the second-grade students of PJKR at UNSIKA. From this preliminary study, it was found that most of the students in the class viewed speaking as the most difficult English skill comparing to the three other skills. The speaking problems faced by the students in the class accounted for lack of vocabulary, fewer ideas, mispronunciation, bad fluency.
Table 1. The Result of Pre-Cycle Test

| Component          | Scores (s) | Frequencies (f) | Percentages (%) |
|--------------------|------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| **Vocabulary**     | 5          | 0               | 0               |
|                    | 4          | 1               | 4               |
|                    | 3          | 2               | 8               |
|                    | 2          | 18              | 72              |
|                    | 1          | 4               | 16              |
|                    | 0          | 0               | 0               |
| **Mean Score: 2**  |            |                  | 100             |
| **Grammar**        |            |                  |                 |
|                    | 5          | 0               | 0               |
|                    | 4          | 1               | 4               |
|                    | 3          | 4               | 16              |
|                    | 2          | 10              | 40              |
|                    | 1          | 10              | 40              |
|                    | 0          | 0               | 0               |
| **Mean Scores: 1.84** | 25        |                  | 100             |
| **Pronunciation**  |            |                  |                 |
|                    | 5          | 0               | 0               |
|                    | 4          | 0               | 0               |
|                    | 3          | 7               | 28              |
|                    | 2          | 10              | 40              |
|                    | 1          | 8               | 32              |
|                    | 0          | 0               | 0               |
| **Mean Scores: 1.96** | 25        |                  | 100             |
| **Accuracy and Fluency** | 25 |                  |                 |
|                    | 5          | 0               | 0               |
|                    | 4          | 0               | 0               |
|                    | 3          | 2               | 8               |
|                    | 2          | 7               | 28              |
|                    | 1          | 16              | 64              |
|                    | 0          | 0               | 0               |
| **Mean Scores: 1.44** | 25        |                  | 100             |

Mean scores’ accumulation: 1.81

Table 1 showed that after calculating all the components the mean score of the students’ speaking ability before applied the shadowing technique was only 1.81 classified as poor. Therefore, it was concluded that the students’ speaking ability should also be improved to achieve the criteria of success of this study.
2. The Results of Achievement Speaking Test in the First Cycle

Table 2. The Result of the post-cycle test (The First Cycle Post-test)

|                  | Scores (s) | Frequencies (f) | Percentages (%) |
|------------------|------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Vocabulary       | 5          | 0               | 0               |
|                  | 4          | 5               | 20              |
|                  | 3          | 7               | 28              |
|                  | 2          | 10              | 40              |
|                  | 1          | 3               | 12              |
|                  | 0          | 0               | 0               |
| Mean Score: 2.56 |            | 25              | 100             |
|                  | 5          | 0               | 0               |
|                  | 4          | 3               | 12              |
|                  | 3          | 8               | 32              |
|                  | 2          | 9               | 36              |
|                  | 1          | 5               | 20              |
|                  | 0          | 0               | 0               |
| Mean Scores: 2.36|            | 25              | 100             |
|                  | 5          | 0               | 0               |
|                  | 4          | 2               | 8               |
|                  | 3          | 11              | 44              |
|                  | 2          | 7               | 28              |
|                  | 1          | 5               | 20              |
|                  | 0          | 0               | 0               |
| Mean Scores: 2.4 |            | 25              | 100             |
|                  | 5          | 0               | 0               |
|                  | 4          | 1               | 4               |
|                  | 3          | 7               | 28              |
|                  | 2          | 10              | 40              |
|                  | 1          | 7               | 28              |
|                  | 0          | 0               | 0               |
| Mean Scores: 2.08|            | 25              | 100             |

Mean scores’ accumulation: 2.35

Table 2 showed after calculating all the components the mean score of the students’ speaking ability in the achievement oral test in the first cycle was increased from 1.81 to 2.35 classified as average. Therefore, it was concluded that the students’ speaking ability still needs to be improved because the criteria of success were not gain yet.
3. The Results of Achievement Writing Test in the Second Cycle

**Table 3. The Result of the post-cycle test (The Second Cycle Post-test)**

|          | Scores (s) | Frequencies (f) | Percentages (%) |
|----------|------------|----------------|-----------------|
| **Vocabulary** |            |                |                 |
| Mean Score: 3.28 |            |                |                 |
| Scores(s) | Frequencies(f) | Percentages (%) |                 |
| 5        | 1          | 4              |                 |
| 4        | 9          | 36             |                 |
| 3        | 11         | 44             |                 |
| 2        | 4          | 16             |                 |
| 1        | 0          | 0              |                 |
| 0        | 0          | 0              |                 |
| **Grammar** |            |                |                 |
| Mean Scores : 3.08 |            |                |                 |
| Scores (s) | Frequencies (f) | Percentages (%) |                 |
| 5        | 1          | 4              |                 |
| 4        | 6          | 24             |                 |
| 3        | 12         | 48             |                 |
| 2        | 6          | 24             |                 |
| 1        | 0          | 0              |                 |
| 0        | 0          | 0              |                 |
| **Pronunciation** |            |                |                 |
| Mean Scores : 3.08 |            |                |                 |
| Scores (s) | Frequencies (f) | Percentages (%) |                 |
| 5        | 1          | 4              |                 |
| 4        | 4          | 16             |                 |
| 3        | 15         | 60             |                 |
| 2        | 5          | 20             |                 |
| 1        | 0          | 0              |                 |
| 0        | 0          | 0              |                 |
| **Accuracy and Fluency** |            |                |                 |
| Mean Scores : 3.04 |            |                |                 |
| Scores (s) | Frequencies (f) | Percentages (%) |                 |
| 5        | 1          | 4              |                 |
| 4        | 3          | 12             |                 |
| 3        | 14         | 56             |                 |
| 2        | 7          | 28             |                 |
| 1        | 0          | 0              |                 |
| 0        | 0          | 0              |                 |

Mean scores’ accumulation: 3.08
Table 3 showed that after calculating all the components the mean score of the students’ speaking ability in the achievement oral test in the second cycle improved significantly in which it was 3.08 classified as good. Therefore, it was concluded that this research should be stopped because the students’ speaking ability has improved and achieved the criteria of success of this study.

The results of observation being discussed in this section were the observation conducted both in the first cycle and in the second cycle. The results are as follows

| Aspects                   | Score | Change |
|---------------------------|-------|--------|
|                           | C1    | C2     |
| Learning Activities       |       |        |
| Doing their conversation based on the lecturing’s instruction. | 60    | 75     | +15  |
| Asking a question to their lecturer if there is an instruction that is not clear. | 65    | 85     | +20  |
| Giving comments and suggestions about their friends’ jobs. | 60    | 85     | +25  |
| Presenting their discussion result without being appointed by the lecturer. | 50    | 70     | +20  |
| Discussing and working together with their friends in doing their assignments. | 70    | 80     | +10  |
| Doing assignments from their lecturer well. | 70    | 80     | +10  |
| Creativity                |       |        |
| Showing their curiosities with asking a question to their lecturer and friends. | 70    | 85     | +10  |
| Exploring their ideas.     | 60    | 70     | +10  |
| Thinking and are not hopeless for looking for an answer using books or asking their friends. | 60    | 65     | +5   |
| Feeling of Happiness      |       |        |
| Looking happy in the learning process. | 70    | 80     | +10  |
| Not feeling sleepy during the teaching and learning process. | 70    | 70     | 0    |
| Interaction               |       |        |
| Discussing with their lecturer | 65    | 75     | +10  |
| Discussing with their friends. | 70    | 70     | 0    |
| Working together with their friends. | 70    | 75     | +5   |
| Mean Score                | 60    | 72.85  | +10.71 |

Based on the table of observations above, the teaching and learning process was beyond the researcher's expectation, the class process only got 60% mean score or was categorized fairly. But seeing the comparison score above, between results of the first cycle and the second cycle observations showed that were several significances for the students’
activities. In this case, the mean score of the first cycle observation was 60 whereas the mean score of the second cycle observation achieved 72.85.

Furthermore, the students’ first-class observation was only categorized fairly good whereas in the second cycle the observation score achieved a good level. That means there was a bit of improvement in students’ participation supporting the conversation in the class with space 10.71. That improvement caused the researcher to become proud even that was not very significant but at least the action process in the second cycle worked better. Further, the comparison above showed that almost every indicator aspect showed up. Nevertheless, there were a few indicators stay in the same score, unlike the researcher's hopes.

The data found in this study showed that the success of students in improving their speaking ability was affected by some factors. They are; 1) Shadowing technique was able to press the students’ errors in speaking English; 2) Shadowing could encourage the student's motivation and their involvement into the class; 3) Presenting a theme could automatically make an interaction each of students; 4) The curiosity of students about a theme can make them explore anything that comes in their minds, it also let them want to understand what they were discussed by asking questions. This step made the students practice their speaking ability.

On contrary, this study was also found some weaknesses in the use of shadowing techniques in teaching speaking. First, the students were lack of confidence in doing speaking. Second, some of the students still have a fewer idea of what they would speak to other friends. Third, some of the students can’t improve their accuracy and fluency competencies because afraid of made mistakes in front of their friends. Forth, limited vocabulary made students were lazy to make an interaction such as giving a question or suggestion in a speaking activity. Fifth, sometimes, many of the students wanted to speak their mind (asking questions, giving suggestions, giving addition, and giving protest) which made class being crowded.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

The results of this study showed that the use of the shadowing technique could improve the students’ speaking ability. It could be seen from the improvements of students’ speaking scores and the students’ involvements in the teaching and learning process starting from the first cycle to the second cycle. Furthermore, relating to the research findings
in the previous discussion, the conclusion is presented in the following statements; 1) A number of the students’ problems (less ideas, mispronunciation, bad fluency and accuracy) of conducting Shadowing technique at the beginning of research decreased. As a matter of expectation, the second cycle post-test scores indicated that their previous problems in conversation could be decreased even not all recovered perfectly; 2) Shadowing technique was able to press the students’ errors in speaking English; 3) The data showed that the students’ competence in speaking ability to communicate the theme became higher in the end section of this research. It proved enough the effects as well as the benefits of cooperative learning in enhancing the students’ speaking grade; 4) Shadowing technique could encourage the student's motivation and their involvement in the class; 5) This Class Action Research proved enough that students’ speaking ability could be improved by utilizing shadowing technique.
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