

Consciousness-Raising Strategy in Developing ELT Students' Speaking Accuracy

Panji Wisastra*, Hery Yufrizal, Flora
FKIP Universitas Lampung, JL.Prof. Dr. Soemantri Brojonegoro No. 1
*e-mail: panji.wisastra@gmail.com. Telp. 085366625669

Abstrak: Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui apakah strategi peningkatan kesadaran dapat meningkatkan kesadaran ketepatan berbicara siswa dan kemampuan ketepatan berbicara siswa. Penelitian ini menggunakan desain satu kali test awal dan test akhir. 26 siswa jurusan bahasa Inggris di universitas Lampung menjadi sampelnya. Peneliti menggunakan kuesioner dan test berbicara. Reliabilitas kuesioner 0.936. Reliabilitas test awal adalah 0.759 dan reliabilitas test akhir adalah 0.799. Data dianalisa secara statistik dengan Paired Sample T –test. Untuk kesadaran ketepatan berbicara siswa, nilai T (6.074) adalah lebih tinggi daripada T-table (2.060) dengan alpha level 0.000 atau lebih rendah daripada 0.05 ($\alpha < 0.05$). Untuk kemampuan ketepatan berbicara nilai T (26.820) adalah lebih tinggi daripada T-table (2.060) dengan alpha level 0.000 atau lebih rendah dari 0.05 ($\alpha < 0.05$). Penemuan tersebut mengindikasikan strategi ketetapan berbicara siswa dapat menjadi sebuah solusi untuk meningkatkan ketepatan berbicara siswa.

Kata Kunci: ketepatan berbicara, peningkatan kesadaran, strategi.

Abstract: This research aimed to find out wheter consciousness-raising strategy could improve the students' speaking accuracy consciousness and performance or not. The research used one group pre test-post test design. 26 students of English department at Lampung University became the sample. The researcher used questionnaire and speaking test. The reliability of the questionnaire was 0.936. The reliability of the pre-test was 0.759 and the reliability of the post-test was 0.799. The data were analyzed statistically by using Paired Sample T -test. For the students' speaking accuracy consciousness, the T-value (6.074) is higher than the T-table (2.060) with alpha level 0.000 or lower than 0.05 ($\alpha < 0.05$). For the students' speaking accuracy performance, the T-value (26.820) is higher than the T-table (2.060) with alpha level 0.000 or lower than 0.05 ($\alpha < 0.05$). The findings indicate that consciousness- raising strategy can be a solution to improve the students' speaking accuracy.

Keywords: consciousness-raising, speaking accuracy, strategy.

INTRODUCTION

Speaking is the verbal use of language and a medium through which human beings communicate each other (Fulcher, 2003). It is the most demanding skill that people need to communicate in everyday situations. Generally, speaking is the ability to express something in a spoken language. The mastery of speaking skill is a priority for many second and foreign language learners. Generally speaking competence mainly covers speaking accuracy and fluency. Speaking accuracy indicates the extent to which the language produced conforms to target language norms (Yuan & Ellis, 2003), which involves the correct and acceptable use of vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation (Harmer, 2007) while speaking fluency refers to the ability to produce the spoken language without undue pausing or hesitation (Skehan, 1996).

Unfortunately, in many cases of language learning, error making performance very often occurs when students produce written or spoken English. In spoken English this condition automatically interferes their speaking accuracy and may hinder effective communication. This is the reason why raising students' consciousness on speaking accuracy should actually be one of the main teachers' concerns.

Recent years have witnessed a bulk of research considering the role of consciousness-raising activities on learners' ultimate comprehension and production elements of language enterprise. Nakatani (2005) explored the influence of consciousness giving on

young Japanese adults' use of oral communication. The findings revealed that the learners in the experimental group who received consciousness produced longer sentences and used more achievement strategies. Ahmadi, Ghafar Samar, and Yazdanimoghaddam (2011) explored the effectiveness of the C-R as an input-based task and the dictogloss as an output-based task on the instruction of English requestive downgraders. The results of the immediate and delayed post-test on the production and perception measures revealed that both tasks had a significantly positive effect on the participants' use of English requestive downgraders. In a recent study, Barekat and Mehri (2013) compared the effectiveness of C-R activities and C-R with feedback activities. The obtained results demonstrated that the instruction was beneficial for both experimental groups, and that both groups outperformed the control group.

Those findings show that to create effective learning, teachers should provide consciousness-raising activities and feedback as an integral part of the activities to ensure their students' successful learning. Considering the importance of improving speaking accuracy as the most demanding skill for students of English major to develop, this research attempted to find out if there is any significant difference in the students' speaking accuracy consciousness and if there is any significant difference in the students' speaking accuracy performance after the implementation of consciousness-raising strategy.

METHODS

The research used one-group pre-test and post-test design. It was conducted at Lampung University. The sample consisted of 26 ELT students. The instruments for the research were questionnaire and speaking test. Questionnaire was used to find out the students' consciousness on their speaking accuracy before and after the implementation of consciousness-raising strategy. Table of specification was provided to achieve the construct validity of the questionnaire. The reliability of the questionnaire was very high reliability (0.936).

Speaking test was the instrument used to measure the students' speaking accuracy performance before and after the implementation of consciousness-raising strategy. The test took the form of picture narrating. To achieve the content validity of the speaking test, the test was composed based on the indicators in the syllabus of higher education curriculum and to achieve the construct validity, the test measured the students' speaking accuracy. The reliability of the pre-test was 0.759 and the reliability of the post-test was 0.799. It means the raters had substantial agreement. Then the data of the two speaking tests were analyzed and evaluated by two raters. In evaluating the data, the raters referred to the speaking accuracy rating scale by Harris (1974).

The researcher compared the average score (mean of pre-questionnaire /pre -test and post-questionnaire/post- test). Then the data were analyzed by using Paired

Sample T-test of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS).

The researcher implemented consciousness- raising strategy with the following procedures:

Step 1: Drawing student's attention to the target language.

The purpose of this step was to draw the students' attention to the target language

Step 2: Building up students' knowledge of the rule or rule initiation.

The purpose of this step was to build up the students' knowledge of the rule initiation on the target language.

Step 3: Noticing.

The purpose of this step was to gear the students' noticing to the target language within the usage.

Step 4: Hypothesis-making.

The purpose of this step was to give the students an opportunity to demonstrate their competence in the target language through rule elicitation.

In this step the researcher gave corrective feedbacks in form of explicit correction with meta-linguistic explanation, elicitation, meta-linguistic cue, and body language to the students when necessary.

Step 5: Checking the hypothesis.

The purpose of this step was to familiarize the students with the rules of target language in use through rule practice or exercises.

Step 6: Confirming the hypothesis.

The purpose of this step was to check the students' comprehension of the target language.

RESULT

The result shows that before the implementation of

consciousness-raising strategy, the mean score of the students' speaking accuracy consciousness in pronunciation was 2.01, the mean score of the students' speaking accuracy consciousness in grammar was 2.00, and the mean score of the students' speaking accuracy consciousness in vocabulary was 2.13. After the implementation of consciousness-raising strategy, the data show that the mean score of the students' speaking accuracy

consciousness in pronunciation was 2.84, the mean score of the students' speaking accuracy consciousness in grammar was 2.88, and the mean score of the students' speaking accuracy consciousness in vocabulary was 2.97.

The students' consciousness in their speaking accuracy before the implementation of consciousness-raising strategy can be seen the following table:

Table 1. Students' Consciousness in their Speaking Accuracy before the Implementation of Consciousness-raising strategy

	Statement	Rarely	Occasionally	Fairly often	Almost always	\bar{X}	SD
Pronunciation							
1	I pay attention on my sound, intonation, rhythm what I am saying.	3.8 (1)	76.9 (20)	19.2 (5)	0 (0)	2.15	.46
2	I can predict the sound, intonation, rhythm that I am going to produce.	11.5 (3)	69.2 (18)	15.4 (4)	3.8 (1)	2.11	.62
3	I am able to detect what sound, intonation, rhythm that I am producing when speaking.	34.6 (9)	46.2 (12)	19.2 (5)	0 (0)	1.84	.73
4	I sense what sound, intonation, rhythm that I am producing when speaking.	15.4 (4)	65.4 (17)	19.2 (5)	0 (0)	2.03	.59
5	I anticipate the sound, intonation, rhythm that I am going to say.	26.9 (7)	46.2 (12)	26.9 (7)	0 (0)	2.00	.74
6	As I speak I quickly adjust my pronunciation if I realize that it is not correct.	23.1 (6)	65.4 (17)	7.7 (2)	3.8 (1)	1.92	.68
7	I know how to produce accurate sound, intonation, and rhythm when speaking.	15.4 (4)	65.4 (17)	19.2 (5)	0 (0)	2.03	.59
8	I notice the	34.6	34.6	30.8	0	1.96	.82

	difference in sound, intonation, and rhythm when speaking.	(9)	(9)	(8)	(0)		
9	I can use the pronunciation features (sound, intonation, and rhythm) in different situations.	34.6 (9)	57.7 (15)	7.7 (2)	0 (0)	1.73	.60
10	I speak carefully to make sure that I pronounce accurately.	23.1 (6)	34.6 (9)	34.6 (9)	7.7 (2)	2.26	.91
Grammar							
1	I pay attention on my grammar what I am saying.	42.3 (11)	30.8 (8)	26.9 (7)	0 (0)	1.84	.83
2	I can predict the grammar that I am going to use.	15.4 (4)	65.4 (17)	19.2 (5)	0 (0)	2.03	.59
3	I am able to detect what grammar that I am using when speaking.	23.1 (6)	53.8 (14)	23.1 (6)	0 (0)	2.00	.69
4	I sense what grammar that I am using when speaking.	30.8 (8)	46.2 (12)	23.1 (6)	0 (0)	1.92	.74
5	I anticipate the grammar that I am going to say.	26.9 (7)	53.8 (14)	19.2 (5)	0 (0)	1.92	.68
6	As I speak I quickly adjust my grammar if I realize that it is not correct.	15.4 (4)	69.2 (18)	11.5 (3)	3.8 (1)	2.03	.66
7	I know how to produce accurate grammar when speaking.	15.4 (4)	80.8 (21)	3.8 (1)	0 (0)	1.88	.43
8	I notice the difference in grammar when speaking.	19.2 (5)	65.4 (17)	15.4 (4)	0 (0)	1.96	.59
9	I can use the grammar in different situations.	7.7 (2)	73.1 (19)	15.4 (4)	3.8 (1)	2.50	.61
10	I speak carefully to make sure that I speak with correct grammar.	15.4 (4)	50.0 (13)	26.9 (7)	7.7 (2)	2.26	.82
Vocabulary							
1	I pay attention on my vocabulary what I am saying.	11.5 (3)	57.7 (15)	23.1 (6)	7.7 (2)	2.26	.77
2	I can predict the	76.9	0	63.1	0	2.23	.42

	vocabulary that I am going to use.	(20)	(0)	(6)	(0)		
3	I am able to detect what vocabulary that I am using when speaking.	11.5 (3)	61.5 (16)	26.9 (7)	0 (0)	2.15	.61
4	I sense what vocabulary that I am using when speaking.	15.4 (4)	57.7 (15)	26.9 (7)	0 (0)	2.11	.65
5	I anticipate the vocabulary that I am going to say.	15.4 (4)	61.5 (16)	23.1 (6)	0 (0)	2.07	.62
6	As I speak I quickly adjust my vocabulary if I realize that it is not correct.	26.9 (7)	61.5 (16)	7.7 (2)	3.8 (1)	1.88	.71
7	I know how to use accurate vocabulary when speaking.	26.9 (7)	65.4 (17)	7.7 (2)	0 (0)	1.80	.56
8	I notice the difference in vocabulary when speaking.	15.4 (4)	65.4 (17)	15.4 (4)	3.8 (1)	2.07	.68
9	I can use the vocabulary in different situations.	7.7 (2)	61.5 (16)	30.8 (8)	0 (0)	2.23	.58
10	I speak carefully to make sure that I speak with correct vocabulary.	57.7 (15)	0 (0)	38.5 (10)	3.8 (1)	2.46	.58

The data show that before the implementation of consciousness-raising strategy, the students' speaking accuracy consciousness in grammar got the lowest mean score (2.00) while the students' speaking accuracy consciousness in vocabulary got the highest mean score (2.13). And by referring to the students' speaking accuracy

consciousness mean score before the implementation of consciousness-raising strategy, it can be said that the students' speaking accuracy consciousness was considerably low.

The students' consciousness in their speaking accuracy after the implementation of consciousness-raising strategy can be seen the following table:

Table 2. Students' Consciousness in their Speaking Accuracy after the Implementation of Consciousness-raising Strategy

	Statement	Rarely	Occasionally	Fairly often	Almost always	\bar{X}	SD
Pronunciation							
1	I pay attention on my sound, intonation, rhythm what I am saying.	0	15.4 (4)	84.6 (22)	0 (0)	2.84	.36

2	I can predict the sound, intonation, rhythm that I am going to produce.	0 (0)	19.2 (5)	69.2 (18)	11.5 (3)	2.92	.56
3	I am able to detect what sound, intonation, rhythm that I am producing when speaking.	0 (0)	38.5 (10)	53.8 (14)	7.7 (2)	2.69	.61
4	I sense what sound, intonation, rhythm that I am producing when speaking.	3.8 (1)	23.1 (6)	65.4 (17)	7.7 (2)	2.76	.65
5	I anticipate the sound, intonation, rhythm that I am going to say.	3.8 (1)	11.5 (3)	73.1 (19)	11.5 (3)	2.92	.62
6	As I speak I quickly adjust my pronunciation if I realize that it is not correct.	0 (0)	26.9 (7)	65.4 (17)	7.7 (2)	2.80	.56
7	I know how to produce accurate sound, intonation, and rhythm when speaking.	0 (0)	34.6 (9)	50.0 (13)	15.4 (4)	2.80	.69
8	I notice the difference in sound, intonation, and rhythm when speaking.	0 (0)	34.6 (9)	42.3 (11)	23.1 (6)	2.88	.76
9	I can use the pronunciation features (sound, intonation, and rhythm) in different situations.	3.8 (1)	30.8 (8)	53.8 (14)	11.5 (3)	2.73	.72
10	I speak carefully to make sure that I pronounce accurately.	3.8 (1)	15.4 (4)	53.8 (14)	26.9 (7)	3.03	.77
Grammar							
1	I pay attention on my grammar what I am saying.	0 (0)	26.9 (7)	57.7 (15)	15.4 (4)	2.88	.65
2	I can predict the grammar that I am going to use.	7.7 (2)	19.2 (5)	57.7 (15)	15.4 (4)	2.80	.80
3	I am able to detect what grammar that I am using when speaking.	3.8 (1)	30.8 (8)	53.8 (14)	11.5 (3)	2.73	.72
4	I sense what grammar that I am	3.8 (1)	23.1 (6)	65.4 (17)	7.7 (2)	2.76	.65

	using when speaking.						
5	I anticipate the grammar that I am going to say.	0 (0)	19.2 (5)	57.7 (15)	23.1 (6)	3.03	.66
6	As I speak I quickly adjust my grammar if I realize that it is not correct.	7.7 (2)	23.1 (6)	46.2 (12)	23.1 (6)	2.84	.88
7	I know how to produce accurate grammar when speaking.	3.8 (1)	30.8 (8)	65.4 (7)	0 (0)	2.61	.57
8	I notice the difference in grammar when speaking.	3.8 (1)	19.2 (5)	65.4 (17)	11.5 (3)	2.84	.67
9	I can use the grammar in different situations.	0 (0)	15.4 (4)	53.8 (14)	30.8 (8)	3.15	.67
10	I speak carefully to make sure that I speak with correct grammar.	3.8 (1)	7.7 (2)	57.7 (15)	30.8 (8)	3.15	.73
Vocabulary							
1	I pay attention on my vocabulary what I am saying.	3.8 (1)	11.5 (3)	50.0 (13)	34.6 (9)	3.15	.78
2	I can predict the vocabulary that I am going to use.	0 (0)	15.4 (4)	61.5 (16)	23.1 (6)	3.07	.62
3	I am able to detect what vocabulary that I am using when speaking.	0 (0)	15.4 (4)	65.4 (17)	19.2 (5)	3.03	.59
4	I sense what vocabulary that I am using when speaking.	3.8 (1)	26.9 (7)	46.2 (12)	23.1 (6)	2.88	.81
5	I anticipate the vocabulary that I am going to say.	3.8 (1)	15.4 (4)	65.4 (17)	15.4 (4)	2.92	.68
6	As I speak I quickly adjust my vocabulary if I realize that it is not correct.	3.8 (1)	23.1 (6)	61.5 (16)	11.5 (3)	2.80	.69
7	I know how to use accurate vocabulary when speaking.	7.7 (2)	23.1 (6)	53.8 (14)	15.4 (4)	2.76	.81
8	I notice the difference in vocabulary when speaking.	3.8 (1)	26.9 (7)	53.8 (14)	15.4 (4)	2.80	.74
9	I can use the vocabulary in different situations.	3.8 (1)	23.1 (6)	46.2 (12)	26.9 (7)	2.96	.82
10	I speak carefully to	3.8	0	53.8	42.3	3.34	.68

	make sure that I speak with correct vocabulary.	(1)	(0)	(14)	(11)		
--	---	-----	-----	------	------	--	--

The data show that after the implementation of consciousness-raising strategy, the students' speaking accuracy consciousness in pronunciation got the lowest mean score (2.84) while the students' speaking accuracy consciousness in vocabulary got the highest mean score (2.97). The data show after the implementation of consciousness-raising strategy, the mean score of the students' speaking accuracy consciousness increased. And by referring to the students' speaking accuracy consciousness mean score after the implementation of

consciousness-raising strategy, it can be said that the students' speaking accuracy consciousness was considerably good.

The researcher used Paired Sample T-test to find out if there was any significant difference in the students' speaking accuracy in pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary. The hypothesis was analyzed at significant level of 0.05 in which the hypothesis is approved if alpha level is lower than 0.05 ($\alpha < 0.05$). The result of T-test for each aspect is presented below:

Table 3. T-test Result of Pre-questionnaire and Post-questionnaire for the students' Pronunciation Consciousness

		Paired Differences				t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower				Upper
Pair 1	Pronunciation_Pretest - Pronunciation_Posttest	-8.34615	7.35360	1.44216	-11.31634	-5.37597	-5.787	25	.000

Table 4. T-test Result of Pre-questionnaire and Post-questionnaire for the Students' Grammar Consciousness

		Paired Differences				t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower				Upper
Pair 1	Grammar_Pretest - Grammar_Posttest	-8.80769	7.53137	1.47702	-11.84968	-5.76571	-5.963	25	.000

Table 5. T-test Result of Pre-questionnaire and Post-questionnaire for the Students' Vocabulary Consciousness

		Paired Differences				t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower				Upper
Pair 1	Vocabulary_Pretest - Vocabulary_Posttest	-8.46154	7.12309	1.39695	-11.33862	-5.58446	-6.057	25	.000

Table 6. T-test Result of Pre-questionnaire and Post-questionnaire for the Students' Speaking Accuracy Consciousness

		Paired Differences				t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
Pair	Pre_test - Post_Test				Lower				Upper
1		-25.61538	21.50363	4.21721	-34.30089	-16.92988	-6.074	25	.000

Table 3 shows that the T-value (5.787) is higher than the T-table (2.060) with alpha level (0.000) or lower than 0.05 ($\alpha < 0.05$) so that H_1 is accepted. In other words, there is a significant difference in the students' consciousness in pronunciation after the implementation of consciousness-raising strategy. It means the students' consciousness in pronunciation improves significantly after the implementation of consciousness-raising strategy.

Table 4 shows that the T-value (5.963) is higher than the T-table (2.060) with alpha level (0.000) or lower than 0.05 ($\alpha < 0.05$) so that H_1 is accepted. In other words, there is a significant difference in the students' consciousness in grammar after being treated with consciousness-raising strategy. It means the students' consciousness in grammar improves significantly after the implementation of consciousness-raising strategy.

Table 5 shows that T-value (6.057) is higher than the T-table (2.060) with alpha level (0.000) or lower than 0.05 ($\alpha < 0.05$) so that H_1 is accepted. In other words, there is a significant difference in the students' consciousness in vocabulary after being treated with consciousness-raising strategy. It means the students' consciousness in

vocabulary improves significantly after the implementation of consciousness-raising strategy

The researcher used Paired Sample T-test to test to find out if there was any significant difference in the students' speaking accuracy in general. The hypothesis was analyzed at significant level of 0.05 in which the hypothesis is approved if alpha level is lower than 0.05 ($\alpha < 0.05$).

Table 6 shows that the T-value (6.074) is higher than the T-table (2.060) with alpha level (0.000) or lower than 0.05 ($\alpha < 0.05$) so that H_1 is accepted. In other words, there is significant different in the students' speaking accuracy consciousness after the implementation of consciousness-raising strategy. It means the students' consciousness in their speaking accuracy improves significantly after the implementation of consciousness-raising strategy.

The researcher used Paired Sample T-test to test to find out the significance of the strategy effect on the students' speaking accuracy in general and in each aspect. The hypothesis was analyzed at significant level of 0.05 in which the hypothesis is approved if alpha level is lower than 0.05 ($\alpha < 0.05$).

Table 7. T-test Result of Pre-test and Post-test for the Students' Pronunciation Accuracy

		Paired Differences				t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower				Upper
Pair 1	Pronunciation_Pretest - Pronunciation_Posttest	-.76923	.25420	.04985	-.87190	-.66656	-15.430	25	.000

Table 8. T-test Result of Pre-test and Post-test for the Students' Grammar Accuracy

		Paired Differences				t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower				Upper
Pair 1	Grammar_Pretest - Grammar_Posttest	-1.01923	.33108	.06493	-1.15296	-.88550	-15.697	25	.000

Table 9. T-test Result of Pre-test and Post-test for the Students' Vocabulary Accuracy

		Paired Differences				t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower				Upper
Pair 1	Vocabulary_Pretest - Vocabulary_Posttest	-.92308	.27175	.05329	-1.03284	-.81332	-17.321	25	.000

Table 10. T-test Result of Pre-test and Post-test for the Students' Speaking Accuracy Performance in General

		Paired Differences				t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower				Upper
Pair 1	Skore_Pretest - Skore_Posttest	-17.94615	3.41189	.66913	-19.32425	-16.56806	-26.820	25	.000

Table 7 shows that the T-value (15.430) is higher than the T-table (2.060) with alpha level (0.000) or lower than 0.05 ($\alpha < 0.05$) so that H1 is accepted. In other words, there is a significant improvement in the students' pronunciation after being treated with consciousness-raising strategy. It means the students' accuracy in pronunciation improves significantly after the implementation of consciousness-raising strategy.

Table 8 shows that the T-value (15.697) is higher than the T-table (2.060) with alpha level (0.000) or lower than 0.05 ($\alpha < 0.05$) so that H1 is accepted. In other words, there is a significant improvement in the students' grammar after being treated with consciousness-raising strategy. It means the students' accuracy in grammar improves significantly after the implementation of consciousness-raising strategy.

Table 9 shows that the T-value (17.321) is higher than the T-table (2.060) with alpha level (0.000) or lower than 0.05 ($\alpha < 0.05$) so that H1 is accepted. In other words, there is a significant improvement in the students' vocabulary after being treated with consciousness-raising strategy. It means the students' accuracy in vocabulary improves significantly after the implementation of consciousness-raising strategy.

Table 10 shows that the T-value (26.820) is higher than the T-table (2.060) with alpha level (0.000) or lower than 0.05 ($\alpha < 0.05$) so that H1 is accepted. In other words, there is a significant improvement in the students' speaking accuracy after being treated with consciousness-

raising strategy. It means the students' speaking accuracy performance improves significantly after the implementation of consciousness-raising strategy.

DISCUSSION

The results of the research indicate that the students' speaking accuracy consciousness is significantly raised after the implementation of consciousness-raising strategy. The improvement in the students' speaking accuracy consciousness cannot be separated from the teaching strategy that the researcher applied which had the students experienced each phase of language consciousness which is adapted from the theory of language acquisition. The researcher fostered the students' speaking accuracy consciousness through the strategy which included three major points of consciousness – attention, noticing and understanding. The students' speaking accuracy consciousness was boosted through the practice of target language to show they recognized the general principle, rule, or pattern of the target language. The improvement in the students' speaking accuracy consciousness also might occur because the students were provided with the conditions which allowed them to be aware of the target language through given experiences.

The findings of the research are in line with the previous studies regarding the implementation of consciousness-raising tasks to increase learners' consciousness in language learning. Take for example, Mohamed (2004) examines learners' perspectives of the effectiveness of

consciousness-raising tasks. The finding suggests that CR tasks (both deductive and inductive) are effective learning tool to raise learners' awareness of linguistic forms. In another study Fatemipour and Hemmati (2015) evaluate the applicability of three consciousness-raising (CR) tasks involving three techniques of at a particular vocational college. This study reveals that the nature of CR leads learners to be aware of their learning process of the target language. Iskandar and Heriyawati (2015) investigate the implementation of grammar consciousness-raising activities for the students' grammatical competence. This study suggested that implementing grammar consciousness-raising activities could make students aware of language forms that encourage them to learn language.

The second research question addressed the improvement of the students' speaking accuracy performance after the implementation of consciousness-raising strategy. The findings in this research indicate a statistically significant effect on their speaking accuracy performance as a result of the strategy. Through the strategy, the students are guided to consciously understand what is being learned. They are assisted to uncover gaps in their knowledge. The researcher draws the students' attention to the target language intentionally to the level of understanding the target language.

However individual differences cannot be ignored to the different outcome of the process. The students as an individual possibly

pay attention and notice the target language differently. More attention they pay, more noticing they gain which results in more understanding to the target language they achieve. As Schmidt (1990) claims that learners learn most if they notice most, and learners who pay attention most may notice most.

Some previous studies support the findings of the research. Take for example, Sadeghi (2012) investigates different approaches in grammar teaching and compare the traditional approaches with Consciousness-Raising (CR) tasks. The data analysis shows that using CR tasks in grammar teaching is significantly more effective than the traditional approaches. Idek an Fong (2015) evaluate the applicability of three consciousness-raising (CR) tasks involving three techniques of CR (identifying, classifying, and hypothesis-building/checking), this study suggests that effective CR tasks can promote better grammar learning and enhance learners' opportunity of being proficient in English. Iskandar and Heriyawati (2015) investigate the implementation of grammar consciousness-raising activities for the students' grammatical competence. The findings showed that the students who were taught using grammar consciousness-raising activities had significant difference on their grammatical competence.

Those findings confirm that consciousness-raising strategy plays an important role in improving speaking accuracy performance covering pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary.

CONCLUSION

Some conclusions are drawn dealing with consciousness-raising strategy to improve ELT students' speaking accuracy consciousness and performance as follows:

1. The improvement in the students' speaking accuracy consciousness might occur because the students are provided with the conditions which allow them to be aware of the target language through given experiences.
2. The improvement in the students' speaking accuracy performance is likely to happen because the strategy takes some procedures that guide the students to consciously understand what is being learned in the process of their learning.
3. Apparently, consciousness-raising strategy can foster student autonomy in learning target language since it creates student-centered classroom. Consciousness-raising strategy can also promote cooperative learning as they are encouraged to actively search for rules in the target language and to be able to draw conclusions from the rules.

The researcher would like to propose some suggestions as follows:

1. Consciousness-raising strategy can be used as an alternative solution to develop students' speaking accuracy consciousness and performance. Teachers are recommended to make some adjustments to the treatment procedures by considering their students' speaking accuracy problems.
2. It is also recommended to apply the strategy to improve other English skills such as listening, reading, and writing since the researcher believes that consciousness-raising strategy as

a pedagogical device can be used very broadly to other English skills.

REFERENCES

- Ahmadi, A., Ghafar Samar, R., and Yazdanimoghaddam, M. 2011. Teaching requestive downgraders in L2: How effective are input-based and output-based tasks? *IJAL*, 14(2), 1-30.
- Fatemipour, Hamidreza and Hemmati, Shiva. 2015. Impact of Consciousness-Raising Activities on Young English Language Learners' Grammar Performance. *English Language Teaching*; Vol. 8, No. 9. Canadian Center of Science and Education.
- Fulcher, G. 2003. *Testing Second Language Speaking*. New York: Pearson
- Harmer, J. 2007. *The practice of English language teaching* (4th ed). Longman
- Harris, David. 1974. *English as a Second Language*. New York. Mc. Graw-Hill.Inc.
- Ideka, Sirhajwan and Fong, Lee. 2015. The Use of Consciousness-Raising Techniques in Teaching the Verb 'be' to Students of Vocational Colleges. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 208 111 – 121. Elsevier Ltd.
- Iskandar, Joni and Heriyawati, Dwi Fita. 2015. Grammar Consciousness-raising Activities and their Impact on Students' Grammatical Competence. *JEELS*, Volume 2, Number 1.

- Mohamed, N. 2004. Consciousness-raising tasks: a learner perspective. *English Language Teaching Journal*, pp. 228-237.
- Nakatani, Y. 2005. The effects of awareness raising training on oral communication strategy use. *Modern Language Journal*, 89(1), 76–91.
- Sadeghi, Fatemeh . 2012. The Effect of Grammar Consciousness-Raising Tasks on EFL Learners Performance. *International Journal of Linguistics*, vol. 4, No.3.
- Skehan, P. 1996. Second language acquisition research and task-based instruction. In J. Willis, & D. Willis (Ed.), *Challenge and Change in Language Teaching* (pp. 17-30). Oxford: Heinemann. *English Language Teaching* Vol. 7, No. 2; 2014 117.
- Schmidt, R. 1990. The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11: 129 – 158.
- Yuan, F. & Ellis, R. 2003. The effects of pre-task planning and on-line planning on fluency, complexity and accuracy in L2 monologic oral production. *Applied Linguistics*, 24(1), 1-27.