# IMPROVING STUDENTS' SPEAKING ABILITY THROUGH SHADOWING TECHNIQUE AT SMA NEGERI 1 TONDANO

## GRATIA IMANUELA RENGKUNG, IGNATIUS JAVIER C. TUERAH, LIVIANNI LAMBE
## Universitas Negeri Manado
Correspondance author: javiertuerah@unima.ac.id

**Abstract:** Speaking is a crucial language acquisition skill, particularly for students learning English as a foreign language (EFL), where many have trouble with vocabulary, pronunciation, and fluency. The purpose of this study is to investigate whether the Shadowing Technique can help grade XI students at SMA Negeri 1 Tondano become more proficient speakers. By using this method, the study aims to enhance students' fluency, pronunciation, and vocabulary, all of which will enhance their speaking abilities. To evaluate the efficacy of the shadowing technique, this study employed a pre-test and post-test experimental design with a single group. A speaking exam with an emphasis on vocabulary, grammar, fluency, and pronunciation was used to gather data. With the aid of SPSS, reliability, normality, homogeneity, and t-tests were used to analyze the data. After using the shadowing technique, the students' speaking skills significantly improved, according to the results. With a significant difference (t = -10.591, p < 0.05) in the t-test results, the students' mean score rose from 47.33 on the pre-test to 61.17 on the post-test. These results endorse the inclusion of shadowing techniques in language learning curricula and support their use in enhancing speaking abilities, particularly in fluency and pronunciation.

**Keywords: Shadowing Technique, improving, speaking ability, senior high school**

## INTRODUCTION

Speaking is one of the most important English language skills. Students should be able to respond to messages from others and express their ideas, thoughts, and feelings verbally. This is a useful skill. Speaking is typically employed as a communication strategy to facilitate the exchange of information. Stated differently, it can be used to provide a straightforward response that encourages people to take action and express their opinions (Rahmawati, 2016). According to Pakula (2019),

speaking is one of the most crucial language learning abilities. However, learning or teaching this skill takes effort, so the right method or strategy needs to be applied. According to Tarigan (1981), speaking is the capacity to produce articulation, sound, or expressiveness (saying, exhibiting, thinking, and concept), as well as instruction and emotion.

In EFL (English as a Foreign Language) classes, speaking English is crucial to learning the language. According to Brown, communicative language training fosters speaking proficiency. He argues that sociolinguistic and pragmatic abilities are just as crucial to effective speaking as linguistic elements like grammar and pronunciation. EFL teachers should provide their students with numerous opportunities for meaningful classroom participation, according to (Brown, 2007). Martin Bygate contends that rather than relying solely on explicit teaching, speaking English in EFL classes should be viewed as a skill that is developed via interaction and practice. Students must engage in meaningful communication activities that allow them to freely and creatively express themselves through language, according to (Bygate, 2001).

Language learners encounter both language-related and non-language-related issues when attempting to enhance their speaking abilities. Linguistic problems include problems with vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, and fluency. Learners may struggle to produce sounds that aren't in their native tongue, run out of words to express themselves, make grammatical errors, or speak more slowly due to slower brain activity. According to Zhang (2009), "Lack of vocabulary, improper grammar, and fear of making errors are the main linguistic problems that EFL learners face in speaking". On the other hand, non-linguistic problems relate to people's relationships and thoughts. Some of these include anxiety, lack of confidence, fear of making mistakes, limited practice opportunities, and cultural differences in communication styles. "Anxiety is quite possibly the affective factor that most pervasively obstructs the learning process," (Horwitz et al., 1986). Additionally, learners may struggle with motivation, learning strategies, and limited exposure to real-world language use,

particularly in EFL contexts. Students find it more difficult to develop their speaking skills because of the frequent interactions between these linguistic and non-linguistic factors.

Researchers discovered the same issue with speaking abilities at SMA Negeri 1 Tondano, as previously explained. The majority of students were insecure, had poor fluency, and had a small vocabulary. It was clear from the students' responses that their lack of vocabulary was the main reason they did not want to communicate in English. They also struggled to understand what other people were saying and to pronounce words correctly.

The ways in which students learn the language and the ways in which teachers teach them to speak English should be balanced. Both affect students' English language proficiency. Lessons are a series of planned activities involving information and the surroundings that teachers use to assist students in learning. Thus, the optimal learning environment will be necessary for learning activities to be successful. One thing teachers can do to create these ideal conditions is to use a range of teaching strategies.

As a solution to the earlier issue, the researcher employed the shadowing technique to solve this one. One learning method that can be applied to enhance English speaking is the shadowing technique. Students who are taught using the shadowing technique listen to spoken language and immediately repeat what they hear. This approach assists students in imitating the target language's speech patterns, intonation, rhythm, and pronunciation. When used to teach speaking, the shadowing technique promotes active listening and ongoing practice, which helps students become more confident, accurate, and fluent speakers. Because it requires students to recognize audio by its pronunciation, the shadowing approach is a helpful tool for teaching speaking because it enables them to follow and analyze how an utterance should be produced. Students can study at their own pace without feeling constrained, unwilling, or silent thanks to these shadowing activities. According to Karasawa (2010), shadowing is a learning strategy that involves listening to a sound

as much as possible without stopping, much like a shadow. Another definition of shadowing is hearing and imitating a parrot's sound through headphones (Hamada, 2012).

As previously explained, the researcher at SMA Negeri 1 Tondano carried out a study titled "Improving Student's Speaking ability through Shadowing Technique" in order to ascertain and validate the hypothesis that shadowing technique can enhance students' speaking abilities.

## RESEARCH METHOD

A one-group pre-test and post-test comprised the pre-experimental design used in this study. Data gathered in a natural setting by naturally interested individuals or scholars using natural procedures is known as quantitative research. This indicates that using quantitative data makes it possible to apply rigorous statistical analysis to successfully assess concepts and hypotheses. SMA Negeri 1 Tondano has 30 students in the XI grade, and the researcher used them as the research subjects. In order to evaluate students' speaking abilities in the areas of vocabulary, grammar, fluency, and pronunciation, this study employed speaking tests or students' speaking performances through dialogues as both the pre-test and post-test instruments. "Expressions of Happiness, Sympathy, and Apology" are among the topics covered in the dialogue, which is based on the Pathway to English textbook for high school students in grade 11. This study used three primary statistical tests to analyze the data: the t-test using SPSS, the homogeneity test, and the normality test.

**Table 1. Research Design**

| Pre-Test | Treatment | Post-Test |
|----------|-----------|-----------|
| $O_1$ | X | $O_2$ |

**(Arikunto, 2010)**

Explanation:

      O1    = Pre-Test

      X     = Treatment

      O2    = Post-Test

In order to assess the speaking test that was administered to the students, the researcher used the score classification to ascertain the students' scores.

**Tabel 2. Scoring For Speaking**

| SCORING FOR SPEAKING | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| ASPECT | SCORE | CLASSIFICATION | DESCRIPTION |
| Fluency | 5 | Excellent | Speech that is fluid and smooth with few to no pauses, no word-searching attempts, and excellent volume |
| | 4 | Very Good | Speech that is fluid and free of pauses, with a small word search and one or two inaudible words |
| | 3 | Good | Rephrasing and word-searching cause some hesitation and unevenness in speech, which is generally smooth; the volume waver |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 2 | Average | Often, speech is hesitant and leaves some sentences unfinished: very low volume |
| | 1 | Poor | With the exception of brief, memorized phrases, speech is strained, hesitant, and slow: speech that is inaudible and difficult to perceive as continuous |
| | 5 | Excellent | The pronunciation is flawless: Excellent accent work |
| | 4 | Very Good | The pronunciation is clear and the accent is well-executed. |
| Pronunciation | 3 | Good | The pronunciation is accurate: Despite some effort, the accent is not native. |
| | 2 | Average | The pronunciation is fine; there is no attempt to adopt a native accent. |
| | 1 | Poor | The pronunciation is poor and difficult to understand. No attempt |

| | | | to speak with a native accent |
|---|---|---|---|
| Grammar | 5 | Excellent | Some grammatical errors that may have resulted from an attempt to incorporate a variety |
| | 4 | Very Good | Regular grammatical mistakes that don't affect meaning; minimal structural diversity |
| | 3 | Good | Frequently occurring grammatical errors, even in basic structures, can occasionally obfuscate meaning |
| | 2 | Average | Even in basic structures, frequent grammatical errors obscure meaning. |
| | 1 | Poor | Some grammatical errors that may have resulted from an attempt to incorporate a variety |
| Vocabulary | 5 | Excellent | Possible causes of some grammatical errors include an attempt to incorporate a variety of |

| | 4 | Very Good | Good command of the language and a wide variety of comparatively well-chosen words |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 3 | Good | The vocabulary range is inadequate for adequate language control. |
| | 2 | Average | Poor language control: a limited vocabulary with some words that are obviously missing |
| | 1 | Poor | Poor language control: used vocabulary is inconsistent |
| | 5 | Excellent | Outstanding command of linguistic elements; a large vocabulary with thoughtful selections |

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Thirty students in one class provided the data that was gathered. This information comes from the pre-test and post-test results of students who took a speaking exam in which they discussed the topic "Express to Happiness" in pairs while posing the scenario "Getting into a dream University." The researcher recorded the students' speaking performances in order to evaluate each one and produce the following findings:

## Tabel 3. Students' Pretest Score

| Number of Student | Score | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| | Rater 1 | Rater 2 |
| 1 | 60 | 60 |
| 2 | 50 | 70 |
| 3 | 55 | 55 |
| 4 | 45 | 55 |
| 5 | 50 | 40 |
| 6 | 60 | 60 |
| 7 | 70 | 60 |
| 8 | 25 | 35 |
| 9 | 30 | 30 |
| 10 | 50 | 50 |
| 11 | 55 | 65 |
| 12 | 50 | 60 |
| 13 | 40 | 40 |
| 14 | 30 | 40 |
| 15 | 35 | 45 |
| 16 | 20 | 40 |
| 17 | 45 | 45 |
| 18 | 40 | 40 |
| 19 | 35 | 45 |
| 20 | 40 | 60 |
| 21 | 70 | 70 |
| 22 | 45 | 45 |
| 23 | 65 | 65 |
| 24 | 30 | 30 |
| 25 | 35 | 45 |
| 26 | 30 | 30 |
| 27 | 40 | 40 |
| 28 | 55 | 45 |
| 29 | 55 | 55 |
| 30 | 55 | 55 |

The scores that two raters assigned to thirty students in the Pre-Test are displayed in the table above. The maximum and lowest scores for Rater 1 were 70

and 20, respectively. Rater 2 had a maximum score of 70 and a minimum score of 30.

**Table 4. Students' Posttest score**

| Number of Student | Score | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| | Rater 1 | Rater 2 |
| 1 | 75 | 75 |
| 2 | 80 | 80 |
| 3 | 65 | 55 |
| 4 | 70 | 70 |
| 5 | 65 | 65 |
| 6 | 75 | 65 |
| 7 | 70 | 80 |
| 8 | 50 | 40 |
| 9 | 45 | 35 |
| 10 | 70 | 50 |
| 11 | 70 | 70 |
| 12 | 60 | 60 |
| 13 | 70 | 60 |
| 14 | 40 | 40 |
| 15 | 45 | 55 |
| 16 | 45 | 45 |
| 17 | 55 | 55 |
| 18 | 65 | 55 |
| 19 | 50 | 50 |
| 20 | 65 | 65 |
| 21 | 85 | 75 |
| 22 | 75 | 65 |
| 23 | 70 | 70 |
| 24 | 45 | 45 |
| 25 | 50 | 50 |
| 26 | 40 | 40 |
| 27 | 50 | 60 |
| 28 | 80 | 80 |
| 29 | 60 | 60 |
| 30 | 85 | 85 |

The scores that two raters assigned to thirty students on the Post-Test were displayed in Table 2 above. Rater 1 received a maximum score of 85 and a minimum score of 40. While for Rater 2, the highest score was also 85 and the lowest score was 35.

**Table 5. Computation of Pretest and Posttest**

| Number of student | Score | |
|:---:|:---:|:---:|
| | Pre-test | Post-Test |
| 1 | 60 | 75 |
| 2 | 60 | 80 |
| 3 | 55 | 60 |
| 4 | 50 | 70 |
| 5 | 45 | 65 |
| 6 | 60 | 70 |
| 7 | 65 | 75 |
| 8 | 30 | 45 |
| 9 | 30 | 40 |
| 10 | 50 | 60 |
| 11 | 60 | 70 |
| 12 | 55 | 60 |
| 13 | 40 | 65 |
| 14 | 35 | 40 |
| 15 | 40 | 50 |
| 16 | 30 | 45 |
| 17 | 45 | 55 |
| 18 | 40 | 60 |
| 19 | 40 | 50 |
| 20 | 50 | 65 |
| 21 | 70 | 80 |

| Number of student | Score | |
|---|---|---|
| | Pre-test | Post-Test |
| 22 | 45 | 70 |
| 23 | 65 | 70 |
| 24 | 30 | 45 |
| 25 | 40 | 50 |
| 26 | 30 | 40 |
| 27 | 40 | 55 |
| 28 | 50 | 80 |
| 29 | 55 | 60 |
| 30 | 55 | 85 |
| **Total** | **1420** | **1835** |

According to Table 5, students' Pre-Test scores ranged from 30 to 70, with 70 being the highest possible score. On the Post-Test, students received a maximum score of 85 and a minimum score of 40. As a result, the pupils' speaking skills improved.

SPSS was used to statistically analyze the gathered data. Descriptive statistics, the T-test, the homogeneity test, and the normality test were all part of the statistical analysis.

**Table 6. Normality Test**

**Tests of Normality**

| | Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a] | | | Shapiro-Wilk | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Statistic | Df | Sig. | Statistic | Df | Sig. |
| Pretest | .133 | 30 | .187 | .944 | 30 | .116 |
| Posttest | .115 | 30 | .200[*] | .954 | 30 | .214 |

*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests were used to determine the normality of the pretest and posttest data mentioned above. In the pretest, the Shapiro-Wilk test yielded a significance value of 0.116 and the Kolmogorov-Smirnova test yielded a significance value of 0.187, both of which were greater than 0.05 and demonstrated that the pretest data was distributed normally. Similarly, in the posttest, the Shapiro-Wilk test yielded a value of 0.214, which was also greater than 0.05, and the Kolmogorov-Smirnova test yielded a significance value of 0.200* (the lower limit of the actual significance), suggesting that the posttest data had a normal distribution. Therefore, based on the normality test results, it was possible to conclude that the pretest and posttest data were both normally distributed.

### Table 7. Homogeneity Test

**Test of Homogeneity of Variances**

Skor Pre Tets and Post test

| Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|
| .289 | 1 | 58 | .593 |

Levene's Test results for the homogeneity of variance test revealed a significance value of 0.593, beyond the significance level of 0.05. Pretest and posttest results were therefore comparable or homogeneous.

### Table 8. T-Test

**Paired Samples Test**

| | Paired Differences | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | | | |
| | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | Lower | Upper | T | Df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
| Pair 1 Pre-test - Posttest | −13.833 | 7.154 | 1.306 | −16.505 | -11.162 | -10.591 | 29 | .000 |

Table 8 indicates that the two-tailed t-test significance value was.000 < 0.05. Therefore, it could be said that students' speaking abilities were impacted by the shadowing technique. The null hypothesis (Ho) was thus disproved.

The purpose of the study was to assess how well the shadowing technique helped grade 11 students at SMA N 1 Tondano improve their speaking abilities. The students' pre-test and post-test scores differed significantly, according to the T-test analysis results. The statistical results confirmed a significant improvement (t = -10.591, p < 0.05), with the post-test mean score (M = 61.17) significantly higher than the pre-test mean score (M = 47.33). These results demonstrate how well shadowing works to improve students' speaking skills.

Students were asked to listen to recordings of native speakers and then instantly repeat them in order to apply the shadowing technique. Through consistent practice, this approach assisted students in enhancing their confidence, fluency, and pronunciation. Students were able to internalize language patterns and improve their speaking abilities over time thanks to the methodical approach.

In conclusion, the substantial improvement in their T-test score demonstrated that the shadowing technique was a successful approach to teaching speaking. This complemented the technique's theoretical and empirical benefits and validated its practical use in improving speaking performance.

## REFERENCES

Arboleda, G. G. (2023). Shadowing technique : Exploring pre-service EFL teachers ' perspectives to improve speaking skills Técnica de Shadowing : Explorando as Perspectivas de Professores de Inglês como Língua Estrangeira em formação para melhorar habilidades de fala. 2023, 1–7.

Arikunto, S. (2010). MetodePenelitian. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Aziza, N. (2020). The importance of English language. International Journal on Orange Technologies, 2(1), 22–24.

Brown, H. (2007). Principles of languagelearning and teaching, San Francisco State University

Goldenberg, C. (2008). Teaching English language learners: What the research does and does not say. American Educator, Summer, 8–44.

Hamada, Y. (2012). Incorporating World Englishes into Shadowing Training. MEDIA, ENGLISH AND COMMUNICATION, 2(1), 109-125.

Hamzar. (2014). THE IMPLEMENTATION OF SHADOWING TECHNIQUE TO IMPROVE STUDENTS' SPEAKING PERFORMANCE.

Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. The Modern language journal, 70(2), 125-132.

Jackson, M. (2000). Seeing Language: Using Non-fiction to Teach Students About Language. Language Arts Journal of Michigan, 16(1). https://doi.org/10.9707/2168-149x.1369

Januarty, R., Asib, A., & Suparno, S. (2018). Junior High School Students' Internal and External Problems in Speaking: A Preliminary Study of Implementing Shadowing Technique to Improve Students' Speaking Skills. International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding, 5(4), 10. https://doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v5i4.151

Juneri, R. (2018). The Effect of Speech Shadowing Technique on Students Speaking Ability.

Karasawa, M. (2010). Shadowing ga Nihongo Gakushuusha ni Motarasu Eikyou: Tanki Renshuu ni Yoru Hatsuonmen Oyobi Gakushuusha Ishiki no Kanten Kara. Ochanomizu Joshi Daigaku Jinbun Kagaku Kenkyuu, 6(1), 209-220.

Kheider, M., & Languages, F. (2015). Exploring the Role of Shadowing in the Development of EFL Learners' Speaking Skill:

Kürüm, E. Y. (2016). Teaching Speaking Skills. Annals of the University of Oradea: Economic Science, 25(1), 264–273.

Larasati, F. (2018). Student Centered Learning: an Approach To Develop Speaking Skill in Efl Classroom. English Community Journal, 2(1), 153.

https://doi.org/10.32502/ecj.v2i1.1004

Misrawati, Anugrawati, N., & Mallapiang, Y. (2023). Using Shadowing Technique in Teaching Speaking To the Eleventh Grade Students of Mas Darul Fath Bontolangkasa. English Language Teaching Methodology, 3(3), 289–296. https://doi.org/10.56983/eltm.v3i3.526

Noviyenty, L. (2018). Strategies in Learning and Techniques in Teaching English Speaking. ENGLISH FRANCA : Academic Journal of English Language and Education, 2(1), 35. https://doi.org/10.29240/ef.v2i1.454

Omar, H. M., & Umehara, M. (2010). Using "A shadowing" technique' to improve english pronunciation deficient adult Japanese learners: An action research on expatriate japanese adult learners. Journal of Asia TEFL, 7(2), 199–230.

Onyi Yusuf, H. (2012). Language as a tool for national integration: The case of English language in Nigeria. International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature, 1(5), 194–201. https://doi.org/10.7575/ijalel.v.1n.5p.194

Pakula, H. M. (2019). Teaching speaking. Apples-Journal of Applied Language Studies, 13(1), 95-111.

Rahmawati, D. (2016). The Effectiveness of Using Guessing Game Technique Toward the Eight Grade Students Speaking Skill at MTs Negeri Bandung. Skripsi. State Islamic Institute (IAIN) Tulungagung.

Rao, P, S. (2019). The importance of speaking skills in English classrooms. Alford Council of International English & Literature Journal, 2(2), 6–18.

Salim, A., Terasne, T., & Narasima, L. (2020). Enhancing the Students' Pronunciation Using Shadowing Technique At Senior High School Students. Journal of Languages and Language Teaching, 8(1), 20. https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v8i1.2212

Sari, R. M. (2018). Increasing Students' Speaking Performance Through Shadowing Technique at The Eleventh Grade of SMAN 1 Raman Utara Academic Year 2017/2018. Doctoral Dissertation, IAIN Metro, 77–28.

Shiota, K. (2012). The effectiveness of shadowing on students' psychology in

language learning. Accents Asia, 5(1), 71–83.

Swondo, A. P. (2018). The Effect of Role Playing Technique on Students Speaking Ability. Journal MELT (Medium for English Language Teaching), 1(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.22303/melt.1.1.2016.1-16

Tarigan, H. G. (2019). Berbicara; ssebagai suatu keterampilan berbahasa.

Wilson, R. M. (1968). English language. In Year's Work in English Studies (Vol. 49, Issue 1). https://doi.org/10.1093/ywes/49.1.34

Zhang, S. (2009). The Role of Input, Interaction and Output in the Development of Oral Fluency. English language teaching, 2(4), 91-100.

Zuhri Rosyidi, A., & Salman Paris, A. (2022). the Effect of Shadowing Technique in Teaching Speaking At a University. 4(3), 281–292.