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This study investigates the effects of shadowing, the oral repetition of what is said right after the language spoken, on L2 listening and speaking abilities of Korean middle school students. It also examines whether shadowing has a positive effect on students’ affective aspects in terms of self-confidence, preference, and perception. The experiment was conducted with 108 middle school students in Gwangju. The participants were divided into three groups, listening only, shadowing only, and listening plus shadowing, and received six weeks of treatment. The data collection consisted of the result of listening tests, speaking tests and questionnaires. The results showed that listening plus shadowing had a positive effect on L2 listening abilities compared to listening only techniques. The results also showed that there was no positive effect of shadowing on L2 speaking abilities. In addition, the results indicated that shadowing increased students’ self-confidence in using English, their shadowing preferences, and the positive perception about the efficacy of shadowing on English speaking skills improvement. This paper therefore argues that shadowing techniques need to be considered as an effective supplementary technique for practicing English listening skills in EFL middle school context.

I. INTRODUCTION

Imitation of sounds is one of the natural stages everyone experiences in the early days of acquiring one’s first language. Adults also often repeat themselves as do their conversational partners. Shadowing, the oral repetition of what is said by a listener right after the speaker, is something natural we all do either consciously or unconsciously at different times in our lives.

According to Kurz (1992), shadowing has been explicitly used as an exercise to
enhance simultaneous interpreters’ timing, and short-term memory skills before they start translating. In Korea, it has been also used in interpreters training, and recently it is increasingly being implemented in English classes for listening or speaking skill practice.

Listening and speaking are simultaneously required in a shadowing task. According to Richards (2005), teaching L2 listening in the past was equated with answering listening comprehension questions. However, comprehension of content is not the only purpose of L2 listening practice. It would be worthy to develop the means of promoting more active participation by listeners in the listening process. From a speaking skill perspective, on the other hand, shadowing techniques have been recommended by many advanced English learners as an excellent strategy to improve one’s speaking skills (Osborne, 2003). Moreover, there have been growing needs for teaching suprasegmentals in speaking classrooms because inappropriate intonation and stress can easily result in communication breakdown (Pickering, 2001; Hahn, 2004).

Shadowing for developing L2 listening abilities has been examined in a few empirical researches (Yoon-Ha Choi, 2007; Sue-Kyoung Kim, 2008; Sung-Kyu Park, 2005); however, the role of shadowing in improving English speaking skills has largely been unexplored (Trofimovich & Gatbonton, 2006). Recently Sue-Kyoung Kim (2008) made a valuable attempt to find a link between shadowing and L2 speaking abilities, but the result only invites us to make inferences due to its incomplete data collection. Therefore, this study aims to investigate the effect of shadowing as a potential teaching technique of second language listening and speaking. The research questions to be answered in this study are:

1. Does shadowing have a positive effect on improving L2 listening abilities of Korean middle school students?
2. Does shadowing have a positive effect on improving L2 speaking abilities of Korean middle school students?
3. Does shadowing have a positive effect on affective aspects of Korean middle school students?
II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Shadowing

Children do not acquire a language from mere exposure to language evidence. Brown (2000) stated the surface-structure imitation as “echoing” (p. 38), which is a particularly salient and essential strategy in early language learning to acquire phonological aspects of a language. Repetition, or imitation, has also been investigated extensively in many researches, but the role of imitation has been controversial in language acquisition contexts (Bohannon & Stanowicz, 1989; Brown, 2000; Gass & Selinker, 2001). Behaviorists in the 1950s claimed that simple or exact imitation was the primary means of language learning. Critics later argued that imitation could not account for the rich, generative language behavior of children. Following the 1970s, researchers kept working on the issue of imitation in their fields; most of them have focused on different facets of imitation independently.

Shadowing has been defined by many researchers in a number of ways. Marslen-Wilson (1973) defined shadowing as a task in which a participant is required to repeat speech as he or she hears it. He clarified the definition saying that when the shadower is presented with a sentence, he or she will start to repeat it before having heard all of it. Lambert (1990) suggested a more technical definition, saying that “shadowing is a paced, auditory tracking task which involves the immediate vocalization of auditorily presented stimuli in the same language, parrot-style, of a message” (p. 17). Nye and Fowler (2003) further suggested differentiating shadowing from imitation. In a shadowing task, participants are asked to repeat the utterances they hear as quickly as possible. Then, the participants will usually articulate focusing on both a speaker’s regional dialect and his or her vocal mannerisms. Through imitation, on the other hand, a shadower’s utterances will tend to reproduce phonetic or non-phonetic aspects of the target utterance suppressing personal speech habits.

Two types of shadowing are defined by Norman (1976): “phrase shadowing” and “phonemic shadowing” (p. 18). When phrase shadowing, the words are slightly delayed behind the words of the input, in that semantic chunks are the boundaries of the latency. However, in phonemic shadowing, each sound is repeated at the same time as the shadower hears it without waiting for the completion of the phrase of the input.

Shadowing techniques have been used in various fields. It has been extensively used by cognitive psychologists as means of studying speech perception, selective attention, and word recognition (Cherry, 1953; Goldinger, 1998; Nye & Fowler, 2003). Cherry (1953), for example, analyzed a listener’s ability to focus on one of two speech
messages when mixed and played to both ears, and when unmixed and played to different ears. The subjects shadowed a primary message while rejecting a second one. Cherry found that when two unmixed audio messages were played to different ears, listeners could not report much about the message in the rejected ear. Shadowing also has been frequently used as a training method for beginning interpreters who first need to learn to listen and speak simultaneously in the same language before beginning to interpret from one language to another (Kalina, 2000; Lambert, 1989).

2. Cognitive Aspects of Shadowing

The importance of attention and noticing has been largely emphasized in second language acquisition theories. Schmidt (2001) claimed that attention is essential to learning, arguing that “people learn about the things that they attend to and do not learn much about the things they do not attend to” (p. 30). Robinson (1995) defined noticing as what is detected and then activated, as a result of the allocation of attentional resources. He argues that different task demands stimulate different types of further cognitive processing.

Output, on the other hand, has been explored as it promotes noticing. Swain (1993) stated that producing the target language serves as a “trigger” (p. 249), which causes the learner to pay attention to the problematic parts. In an empirical study, Izumi, Bigelow, Fujiwara, and Fearnow (1999) compared a group that was given output opportunities and subsequent exposure to relevant input to a group that received the same input just for a comprehension purposes. A significant improvement was found in the output group which suggested the importance of extended opportunities to produce output and receive input in effecting language learning.

Goldinger (1998) claimed that “shadowing is based on perceptual-cognitive processes” (p. 256). It involves attention and retention of material in short-term memory. As described by Murphey (2001), shadowing increases the learners’ attentional allocations to process more input than just listening does. He claims that

[Shadowing] makes a shadower hear everything twice providing more neural weight to the utterance from hearing it, producing it, and again hearing it from oneself. This involvement and awareness to do this demand more effort. Thus, it is reasonable to assume it makes a more lasting impression on the mind which may very well augment further processing through noticing. (p. 146)

Thus, repeating what we hear may promote a deeper level of processing than just listening, which leaves us relatively uninvolved.

Some studies support the claim of Goldinger (1998) and Murphey (2001). Tommola and
Hyona (1990), for example, measured mental load during three language processing tasks of listening, speech shadowing, and simultaneous interpreting using pupillary response. The pupillary dilation reflected that a simple listening task showed the lowest dilation level, a simultaneous interpreting task was associated with the highest dilation level, and a shadowing task fell between the two. Towell and Dewaele (2005) also noted that simultaneous tasks of listening and speaking are expected to overload the working memory.

Because heavy mental loads are predicted especially for beginners, shadowing has been recommended for intermediate or advanced learners (Morley, 1991). One possible way of reducing such burden from beginning level learners could be providing text as a support for shadowing. Even though the issue of using text while listening has been widely controversial, the benefits of bimodal input in language learning have been supported by substantial literature (Bird & Williams, 2002; Borràs & Lafayette, 1994; Vanderplank, 1988). In Bird and Williams’ study (2002), for example, the advantage of bimodal presentation over text or sound alone was noticeable when the sound input was ambiguous in a single mode. Vanderplank (1988) also stated that using subtitles could lead to the development of a “chunking ability” (p. 275) in both reading and listening, which in turn may release spare capacity for conscious language learning.

3. Affective Aspects of Shadowing

Many researchers in second language acquisition have studied learners’ affects, which include such factors as emotion, self confidence, or attitude toward language learning (Gass & Selinker, 2001). Krashen (1982) claimed that a learner’s affective filter needs to be lowered in order for optimal language learning to occur. If the affective filter is raised, the learner cannot process linguistic input, and consequently fails in language acquisition. Among learners’ affective factors, it has been claimed that “no successful cognitive or affective activity can be carried out without some degree of ... self confidence” (Brown, 2000, p. 145).

Learning a new language sometimes creates a feeling of insecurity. This wavering insecurity can develop inhibition about exposure of self-identity (Brown, 2000). While shadowing, however, learners are supposed to imitate the speaker, and this simple mimicry does not evoke fear of too much exposure of self-identity. In accordance with this idea, Murphey (2001) noted that shadowing “allows learners to participate on the peripheral simply by using the words of others” (p. 148).

without text to examine the role of text while shadowing. In her study, the group who were presented the text during shadowing showed significant increases in English speaking preference than the shadowing only group. She noted that text may have played an important role in lowering the affective filters of language learners, particularly for beginning level learners. Another study done by Marl Sun Park (2003) also reported that participants who practiced shadowing showed more positive attitude toward listening in English after six months of shadowing in English.

4. Shadowing for Listening

Purdy (1997) defined listening as “the active and dynamic process of attending, perceiving, interpreting, remembering, and responding to the expressed needs, concerns, and information offered by other human beings” (p. 8). Interpreting listening input is always accompanied by syntactic and semantic analyzing of the text by a listener. Marslen-Wilson (as cited in Bailly, 2003) focused on the relationship between speech shadowing and comprehension, and asserted that shadowers “were syntactically and semantically analyzing the material as they repeated it” (p. 11).

Shadowing involves speaking at the same time as listening. That is, perception and production are simultaneously activated during shadowing. Theories of speech perception generally agree that there exists a link between perception and production (Mitterer & Ernestus, 2008). In accordance with this claim, shadowing has been suggested as a listening activity which can sensitize learners to a kind of “blurring” (Ur, 1984, p. 42). Ur (1984) claimed that repeating models of intonation and stress patterns is a useful exercise, because students tend to hear the sentences as they think they ought to be pronounced, and can benefit from having the accuracies in their own imitations pointed out and corrected.

Concerning the influence of shadowing on L2 listening skills, Todaka (2007) employed shadowing as one of the activities in a summer intensive program. After the program, the seven participants’ mean score of the TOEIC listening went up by 123.6 points from the pre-tests. A questionnaire asking about the important factors in improving English skills was handed out to the members, and they commented that shadowing was the second most important contributing factor.

There have been several empirical studies showing a positive influence of shadowing on L2 listening skills. For example, Ishihara (as cited in Sung-Kyu Park, 2005) investigated the correlation between shadowing performance and listening comprehension achievement, and a significant correlation was observed between the two variables (r = 0.639). In Marl Sun Park’s (2003) study, 76 Korean high school students participated in her experiment. They were assigned to two groups: 38
students to a listening group, and 38 students to a shadowing group. After six months of shadowing treatment, the experimental group who received shadowing instruction showed statistically significant higher achievement on a listening comprehension post-test.

However, a previous study done by Gerver (as cited in Lambert, 1990) demonstrated that simultaneous listening and speaking can hinder recall of the information listened to while speaking. He noted that this hindrance is because shadowing involves a rather incidental process of message transformation from an auditory mode to a vocal mode.

5. Shadowing for Speaking

Knowing how to produce the sounds, stress patterns, rhythmic structures, and intonation of the language is a basic skill of L2 speaking. In pronunciation pedagogy, suprasegmentals are commonly accepted as a crucial factor for communication (Hahn, 2004; Nunan, 1991; Pickering, 2002). These suprasegmentals are teachable and learnable through explicit instructions, which consequently lead to significant improvement of comprehension and production (Pennington and Ellis, 2000).

Several studies pointed out that practicing suprasegmentals led to a better pronunciation. Acton (1984) showed practical results with regard to shadowing. In his empirical research on fossilized pronunciation, he utilized tracking for defossilization and noted that “it is an intense experience, one that eventually forces learners to focus on intonation contours, stress and rhythm, independent, to some degree, of the lexical content. With practice, the ability to attend to both form and content develop” (p. 77).

In Osburne’s study (2003), fifty advanced ESL learners were asked to engage in retrospective protocols while attempting to monitor and improve their L2 pronunciation. They were found to heavily utilize imitation strategy by about one third of the participants (34%) while segmental phonology such as syllable structure, sub-syllabic units, or even individual sounds was used less than expected (6%, 2%, and 26% respectively). From these results, it could be concluded that imitation is a valuable technique to improve one’s pronunciation.

Beyond the pronunciation level, shadowing has also been recommended as a practice for general speaking skills. Nunan and Miller (1995) suggested using echoing, or shadowing, by which learners mimic prosodic features of their speech in order to invite learners’ interest in practicing story retelling. For discussion skills improvement, it has been advised to use shadowing as a means of peer evaluation (Green, Christopher, & Lam, 1997). They argue that shadowing can be used for empathy building because learners begin to understand how others think and express
themselves.

With respect to Korean learners, Su-Kyoung Kim (2008) sought the positive effect of shadowing on Korean middle school learners’ listening and speaking abilities, but the speaking part of the study was partially completed because of unsuccessful data collection. The study used the Versant test as a speaking ability measuring instrument, but only a few participants did take both the pre- and the post test. It was insufficient to show any effects of shadowing on middle school students’ speaking performances based on those small data available.

III. METHOD

1. Participants

Three classes of 116 first grade students from a coed middle school in Gwangju Metropolitan City participated in this study. However, eight students among these were excluded because they were absent for the listening post-test. Only 108 students remained for the analysis of L2 listening proficiency improvement.

After a diagnostic test had been administered, three treatment groups were assigned to three intact classes. Class 6 was assigned as the Listening plus Shadowing Group (LS), where learners listened first and then shadowed. Class 7 was assigned as the Shadowing Only Group (SO), where learners simultaneously listened and shadowed. Class 8 was assigned as the Listening Only Group (LO), where participants listened without shadowing.

For the analysis of the speaking proficiency improvement, pre- and post-speaking tests were conducted. The speaking tests were conducted individually through phone calls. Among the 108 participants, 101 students took the speaking pre-test and 84 students took the speaking post-test. Only 83 students took both pre- and post-tests for speaking. Therefore, 83 students remained for the analysis of the speaking proficiency improvement of this study.

Most of the participants started to study English when they were around eight years old, which means they had started to study English before they were taught English in the third grade as part of the public curriculum. They were taught by the same English teacher who had 6 years of English teaching experience in middle schools. For six weeks, each group was given five minutes of treatment, three times a week.
2. Materials

1) Listening Test

For a listening diagnostic test and a listening post-test, TOSEL Junior was used. Test of the Skills in the English Language (TOSEL) is a standardized test which measures Korean learners’ English proficiency and was developed and administered by the Korea Educational Broadcasting System. TOSEL Junior is particularly designed for Korean learners who are in the upper grades in elementary school and at the beginning level in middle school.

The listening section in TOSEL Junior consists of three parts. Part A is made up of ten questions where students choose the correct response to the questions that the speaker asks. Part B is composed of fifteen questions where students listen to a short talk or dialogue and choose the most appropriate retelling choices. Part C is comprised of five questions where students listen to a conversation and choose the best response to what the last speaker says.

Two units of the listening section of TOSEL Junior were used for the listening diagnostic test and for the listening post-test. The total number of questions in each test was thirty, and each question was given one point. The maximum score that students could achieve was thirty.

To compare the level of difficulty between the diagnostic test and the post-test, a pilot test was conducted in two classes from another school in Gwangju Metropolitan City on the same day in September, 2008. Two intact classes which showed the most similar mean scores on a previous English listening test administered by the Ministry of Education, were selected for the comparison (Class A M=77.9; Class B M=78.7). They did not participate in the main experiment. Class A took the diagnostic test, and Class B took the listening post-test (Class A M=18.1, SD=4.6; Class B M=17.9, SD=7.0). In order to see whether the scores from the two classes were significantly different between Tests, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was employed. There were no significant differences between the Tests, F=0.018, p < 0.893.

2) Speaking Test

For the speaking pre-test and post-test, the Junior SET Level II of the Versant test was conducted to evaluate the participants’ speaking proficiency. The Versant test is a computer-assisted and telephone operated test of oral production skills of non-native English speakers. This test was developed by Ordinate Corporation, a subsidiary company of Harcourt Assessment. According to Ordinate (2004), the Versant test is a valid test
measuring a test-taker’s phonological ability in addition to the discourse and overall oral production ability. The correlation between the Versant test scores and scoring that was done by human raters was reported as 0.97. Further, this ten-minute test correlates with the Test of Spoken English (TSE) offered by Educational Testing Services (ETS) at 0.88, indicating a very high degree of correspondence between the machine-scored Versant test and the human-scored TSE (Townshend & Todic, 2000).

The Junior SET Level II of the Versant test is particularly developed for the students of upper elementary or middle school levels. This test has four sections: Test-takers are asked to read aloud, repeat sentences, say words, and answer questions following the instruction over the telephone for 10 minutes. The maximum score that students could achieve was 150.

3) Questionnaire

In order to identify the participants’ perception on shadowing in English, a survey was conducted at the beginning and end of the experiment. For the first survey, 17 modified items from the Background Questionnaire (Sue-Kyoung Kim, 2008) were employed. Participants were asked to provide information about whether they had stayed in English speaking countries, the amount of time they spent studying English outside of class, their perception on L2 listening and speaking, their perception on the effectiveness of shadowing, and their anxieties and preferences toward shadowing.

For the end survey, 14 items were adapted from Changes in Anxieties and Preferences (Sue-Kyoung Kim, 2008) in order to collect information about whether the participants gained self-confidence after the treatment. The participants’ perception on the effectiveness of shadowing, and anxieties and preferences toward shadowing were asked again to check if there had been any change from the pre-survey responses. Both questionnaires were presented in Korean to ensure that the participants would not have trouble understanding them.

4) Teaching Materials

For teaching materials, six listening passages were chosen from the Internet. All the speakers in the listening materials were native speakers of English with an American accent. Each listening passage was approximately 111 words long and one minute in length.

To determine the level of difficulty of the language in each listening passage, the Flesch-
Kincaid Grade level was used. By randomly measuring six middle school English textbooks out of thirteen, it was found that Flesch-Kincaid Grade level of the first grade middle school English textbooks ranges from 4 to 6. Therefore, the readability of the transcript of the listening passages for this study ranged from grade 4 to 6. (See Appendix A).

3. Procedure

Before the treatment began, the participants completed the background questionnaire and took the listening diagnostic test of thirty items for fifteen minutes. Then the students individually took the speaking pre-test at their homes, after the teacher gave instructions in the classes about how to take the Versant test over the telephone. In addition, a warm-up session preceded the actual treatment with a sample listening passage, whose Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level was 4. During this session, the subjects in LS and SO practiced shadowing under the teacher’s instruction while those in the LO listened to the same material.

The experiment was conducted three times a week for six weeks, from October to December in 2008. For the first five minutes of each class, SO shadowed a listening passage five times, while LO just listened to the passage five times. In the case of LS, they listened to the passage for about three minutes, and then shadowed the same passage for about two minutes. One listening passage was used for three class periods. Thus, the participants listened to or shadowed the same passage fifteen times.

Table 1 shows how the treatment for this study was conducted. All the groups were under the same conditions except that they were given different treatment. While SO shadowed a listening passage five times, the participants could refer to the transcript while they were shadowing. The teacher advised the participants to continue shadowing, even if they could not understand the text, and to do shadowing instead of reading the text aloud. Sometimes in the later stages of the treatment, the students were recommended to close their eyes to facilitate shadowing instead of reading aloud.

LO was asked to listen and write the words they could hear in order to maintain the

---

1 Flesch-Kincaid Grade level measures readability of a text indicating the school grade a native speaker would have to have reached to be able to understand the text. The lower the score on a scale from 0 to 12, the easier it is to understand the text.

2 Transcripts were provided because SO was supposed to shadow from the very first attempt of listening which would be particularly challenging as they were not familiar with the speech. Shadowing itself is a cognitively difficult task because both aural and oral skills are simultaneously required (Tommola & Hyona, 1990).
students’ concentration under the listening only circumstance. The transcript was distributed to the participants before the fifteenth attempt of every third session, so that they could compare their own memos with the original transcript while they were listening the final time.

LS first listened to the passage three times and then shadowed it twice, or listened twice and shadowed three times, resulting in eight times of listening and seven times of shadowing over three class periods. The transcript was available to the participants only while they were shadowing.

After the six weeks of treatment, the listening post-test and the post-survey were administered in order to determine whether there were any improvements in L2 listening comprehension ability and any changes in their perception. The test and survey took 15 minutes each. The post-speaking test was taken by the participants in their homes over the telephone in the same manner as the pre-speaking test. Interviews with the instructor and two students from each group were carried out after the completion of test.

### TABLE 1
Sequence of Instruction for Each Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Shadowing only</th>
<th>Listening only</th>
<th>Listening plus shadowing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>T introduces the topic, and the new vocabulary. (The transcript is provided to Ss.)</td>
<td>T introduces the topic, and the new vocabulary. (The transcript is NOT provided to Ss.)</td>
<td>T introduces the topic, and the new vocabulary. (The transcript is NOT provided to Ss.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st to 5th</td>
<td>Ss shadow the text. Ss may refer to the transcript.</td>
<td>Ss listen to the text to get the gist. Ss write down the words they hear.</td>
<td>1st to 3rd Listen Ss listen to the text to get the gist. Ss write down the words they hear. 4th to 5th Listen (The transcript is provided.) Ss shadow the text. Ss may refer to the transcript.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrap-up</td>
<td>T checks the Ss’ understanding of the text. (Transcripts are collected.)</td>
<td>T checks the Ss’ understanding of the text. (Transcripts are collected.)</td>
<td>T checks the Ss’ understanding of the text. (Transcripts are collected.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T: teacher, S: student
4. Data Analysis

An analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was employed to test the effect of shadowing on L2 listening ability. The dependent variable was the listening post-test score, and the independent variable was Group. The covariates were the listening diagnostic test score and the time that the subjects had spent on listening outside the class, which was collected in pre-survey. The rationale for employing the ANCOVA was to control statistically any initial differences in the participants’ diagnostic test scores that might have confounded differences in the post-test performance among the groups. The time spent outside of the class on improving listening could also have affected the relationship between the treatment and the post-test scores.

Next, in order to investigate the effect of treatment on L2 speaking ability, an ANCOVA was performed. The dependent variable was the speaking post-test score, and the independent variable was Group. The covariates were the speaking pre-test score and the time that the subjects had spent on speaking outside the class.

Last, the data from the surveys were analyzed in three ways. For the post-only question about the gained self-confidence in using English, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was employed. The dependent variable was self-confidence, and the independent variable was Group. For the pre-post surveys of changes in the participants’ preferences and perceptions toward shadowing, an analysis of variance with repeated measures (Repeated Measures ANOVA) was conducted. The within-subjects variable was Time (Pre vs. Post) and the between-subjects variable was Group. For the participants’ shadowing preferences and for the reasons of their perceived efficacy of shadowing, percentages and multiple responses were analyzed from the data of the three groups.

The alpha level was set at 0.05 for the analysis of covariance, the analysis of variance with repeated measures, and the analysis of variance.

IV. RESULTS

1. Shadowing and English Listening Ability

The participants took a listening post-test in the fourth week of December, 2008, when the treatment finished. The post-test scores of the three groups were analyzed using an ANCOVA to determine any overall difference among the treatment groups. It showed significant group difference for the dependent variable. Descriptive statistics and the results of ANCOVA are reported below.

Table 2 describes the mean scores of the listening post-test by Group. Shadowing
Only Group scored a mean of 16.7 out of 30, and the average of Listening Only Group was 15.0 out of 30. For Listening plus Shadowing Group, the mean was 16.7 out of 30.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 presents the complete source table for ANCOVA. As can be seen, the covariate of listening diagnostic test score was found to be a statistically significant factor in the test of L2 listening ability, while the time spent in studying English listening did not affect the listening ability. Overall statistically significant differences were found between the groups, F = 3.593, p < .031.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variance</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Test</td>
<td>995.704</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>995.704</td>
<td>72.124</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Time</td>
<td>20.189</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.189</td>
<td>1.462</td>
<td>.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>99.204</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49.602</td>
<td>3.593</td>
<td>.031*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>1421.966</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>13.805</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2489.407</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  ** p < .01

In order to determine which group showed a significant difference among the three groups, pairwise comparisons were conducted. Table 4 reports the listening post-test score differences among groups. As can be seen in Table 4 and Figure 1, LO and LS were significantly different in their listening post-test scores. That is, the listening post-test
scores of LS were significantly higher than the scores of LO after they had received treatment (LS > LO).

2. Shadowing and English Speaking Ability

The number of subjects for the analysis of L2 speaking proficiency improvement was relatively smaller than those for the L2 listening ability analysis because the speaking test was conducted over a telephone in their own home. Thus, the test scores of only 83 students who took both pre- and post-speaking tests were analyzed to investigate whether there was any significantly different effect of Shadowing Only or Listening plus Shadowing treatment compared to Listening Only treatment. An ANCOVA was performed. The covariates were the speaking pre-test score and the time that the subjects had spent on speaking outside the class.

**TABLE 5**
Descriptive Statistics of Speaking Post-test Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>101.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>101.8</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100.9</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 6**
ANCOVA for Speaking Post-test Scores by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variance</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>21928.419</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21928.419</td>
<td>201.559</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking time</td>
<td>16.423</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.423</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>363.305</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>181.652</td>
<td>1.670</td>
<td>.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>8485.935</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>108.794</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31207.229</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05 **p < .01
Table 5 shows the descriptive statistics of L2 speaking post-test. The mean of SO was lower than those of LO and LS, which scored almost the same. However, as can be seen in Table 6, the summary table of ANCOVA for speaking post-test scores, there was no main effect for Group. There was not any statistically significant difference among the groups, $F=1.663$, $p < .196$. The treatment in three groups was not different in their effects.

3. Shadowing and Affective Aspects

1) Self-Confidence

In the post-survey, the participants in each group were asked whether they had experienced improvement in self-confidence in using English, and their responses were collected using a five-point Likert scale (1= Strongly disagree; 5= Strongly agree). An ANOVA was employed to test any differences in their answers among the groups. The dependent variable was the participants’ self-confidence and the independent variable was Group. Table 7 reports the descriptive statistics of gained self-confidence in using English by groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 8**
ANOVA for Gained Self-Confidence in Using English by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variance</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>16.130</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.065</td>
<td>6.897</td>
<td>.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>122.786</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1.169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>138.917</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  **p < .01

The result of ANOVA for self-confidence in Table 8 suggests that there was a statistically significant difference among the groups, $F=6.897$, $p < .002$. In order to determine which group was significantly different from the others, pairwise comparisons for the differences among Groups were conducted (see Table 9).
As can be seen in Table 9, the gained self-confidence of LS in using English after the treatment was much higher than that of LO (LS > LO). Moreover, SO showed a relatively higher increase in self-confidence in using English than LO did (SO > LO). However, the difference in the gained self-confidence between LS and SO was not statistically significant (LS = SO). Thus, it can be suggested that after six weeks of instruction, the groups which had received shadowing treatment, regardless of the listening phase, gained more self-confidence than did the group which had not been instructed with shadowing.

2) Preferences

The effect of shadowing on middle school learners’ preferences were analyzed in two ways: English listening and speaking preferences, and shadowing preferences. First, in order to determine whether the treatment had an influence on the changes of the participants’ preferences toward listening and speaking in English, their responses were collected using a five-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly disagree; 5 = Strongly agree) in the pre- and the post-survey. The data was analyzed employing Repeated Measures ANOVA. The participants’ preferences toward English listening and English speaking in the pre- and post-survey responses are illustrated in Table 10 across the groups.
Table 11 reports the complete source table for Repeated Measures ANOVA for English listening preference. As can be seen, there was no main effect or interaction for Group and Time. Therefore, it can be suggested that the increases in English listening preference was not statistically significant.

The results of the Repeated Measures ANOVA for the English speaking preferences are also presented in Table 12. As with the listening preferences, there was no significant difference found between pre- and post-surveys of English speaking preference among the three groups.

Secondly, to investigate any effect of treatment on the students’ preferences for shadowing in English, the participants were also asked whether they like English shadowing or not (1=Yes, 0=No) in the pre- and the post-survey. The number of respondents who answered ‘yes’ in the survey is described by Time and Group in Table 13 and Figure 2.
As can be seen, the number of students who responded that they liked shadowing increased from 31 in the pre-survey to 53 in the post-survey, out of 108 participants in total. Particularly in LS, 15 more students reported shadowing preference in the post-survey than in the pre-survey. Seven more students in SO also answered they like shadowing in the post-survey. However, in LO there was no change between pre- and post-survey responses.

3) Perceptions on the Effectiveness of Shadowing

First, the results for the analysis of the participants’ perception on the effectiveness of shadowing on L2 listening and speaking improvement are presented, and then the multiple reasons for their perception follow.

In the pre- and the post-survey, the participants were asked to answer whether they believed that shadowing would be helpful in improving English listening and speaking proficiency. The answers were collected using a six-point Likert scale (1 = Never; 6 = Very much).

Table 14 shows the perceived effectiveness of shadowing on listening and speaking proficiency improvement. As can be seen, most of the participants perceived that shadowing would be helpful in developing English listening and speaking skills.
TABLE 14
Descriptive Statistics of Perceived Effectiveness of Shadowing on English Listening and Speaking Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to determine whether these positive perceptions on the effectiveness of shadowing have any significance across the treatment groups, the data was analyzed employing Repeated Measures ANOVA.

Table 15 reports the results of the Repeated Measures ANOVA for the perceived effectiveness of shadowing on English listening ability improvement by Time and Group. As can be seen, no main effect or interaction was found for Time and Group. Therefore, it can be suggested that the treatment did not affect the participants’ perception toward the effectiveness of shadowing on English listening ability improvement.

TABLE 45
ANOVA with Repeated Measures for Perceived Effectiveness of Shadowing on English Listening Ability Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variance</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td>.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time x group</td>
<td>4.082</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.041</td>
<td>3.060</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>70.043</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1.190</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.595</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>169.194</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1.611</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05
Likewise, the complete source table for the Repeated Measures ANOVA for the perceived effectiveness of shadowing on speaking proficiency improvement can be seen in Table 16. The table indicates that there was a main effect for Time. There were statically significant differences between the perceptions in the pre-survey and in the post-survey, \( F=5.693, p<0.019 \). It seemed that more participants felt shadowing as an effective way of improving English speaking skills after they received treatment.

In order to ascertain the reasons why participants felt shadowing to be helpful in improving English listening and speaking skills, multiple responses were analyzed from the data. Among the 108 participants, 89 respondents (82.4%) answered shadowing to be an effective way to improve listening skills. The major reasons of their positive perception are: “It enhances the recognition of pronunciation and intonation,” and “it indicates which part I missed while listening.” Figure 3 illustrates the reasons why participants perceived shadowing as helpful for improving English listening skills.

**FIGURE 3**

Reasons of Positive Perception on the Effectiveness of Shadowing on English Listening Skills

*Why Shadowing is Helpful for English Listening?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>N of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It enhances the recognition of the pronunciation and intonation.</td>
<td>44 (40.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It can indicate which part I missed while listening.</td>
<td>38 (35.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It helps memorizing key words and expressions.</td>
<td>30 (27.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My simultaneous voice provides more listening practices.</td>
<td>12 (11.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the other hand, 94 respondents out of the 108 (87.1%) answered that shadowing is helpful for English speaking skills improvement, as shown in Figure 4. The major two reasons why they felt shadowing improved speaking skills were: “I can practice speaking repeatedly,” and “I can acquire native speakers’ pronunciation and intonation as I mimic them.” Figure 4 shows the reasons of their perception and the number of respondents.

**FIGURE 4**
Reasons of Positive Perception on the Effectiveness of Shadowing on English Speaking Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why Shadowing is Helpful for English Speaking?</th>
<th>N of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I can practice speaking repeatedly.</td>
<td>60 (55.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can acquire NSs’ pronunciation and intonation as I mimic them.</td>
<td>38 (35.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It increases my concentration on the speech.</td>
<td>30 (31.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It helps memorizing key words and expressions.</td>
<td>19 (27.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**V. DISCUSSION**

1. Effects of Treatment on English Listening Ability

The first research question was to examine whether shadowing is effective for helping middle school students to improve their listening ability. The results in Table 2 showed that the listening post-test mean of LO scored lower than those of the other two treatment groups—SO and LS. This finding could suggest that employing shadowing in English listening instruction has positive effects on helping learners for improving their English listening abilities.

The reasons for the improved listening scores of the group which practiced shadowing could be various. First, shadowing treatment may have increased the learners’ concentration on the language input more than the listening treatment did. The listening material used in this experiment was a stream of speech; it was not a mere word by word or sentence by sentence repetition. Because students could not imitate the speech without concentrating on the listening input, participants in LS and SO had probably listened more attentively to reproduce the sounds.

Moreover, this attentive listening could have served as a trigger to notice the gap between the target speech and the learners’ own capacity for processing. This claim is based on a previous study by Schmidt (1990), who has drawn attention to the role of
noticing in language learning. He explained that a learner’s language is developed only through intake, which is a part of input that a learner notices. By noticing the mismatching parts, learners who did shadowing may have tried harder to understand the problematic parts than the learners who only listened.

Another reason for the shadowing groups’ outperformance in English listening may be attributed to the enhanced ability to follow tone, intonation patterns, and stress. Many English learners have difficulty in proper understanding of spoken English because of the English system of stress, intonation and rhythm (Ur, 1984; Brown, 2009). Nunan (1991) also pointed to suprasegmentals as more crucial factors which influence listening comprehension than individual segments do. Undoubtedly, learners in SO and LS would have focused on intonation and stress as they shadowed, where as LO would have just listened to understand the meaning. This raised awareness of English intonation and stress may facilitate understanding of foreign text. This explanation fits well with the claim of Nunan and Miller (1995) that learners’ awareness of tone, intonation pattern, stress, and pronunciation can be raised through shadowing activity.

These explanations are consistent with the survey results, in that 84.4% of the respondents perceived shadowing as a helpful technique to improve their L2 listening ability. The main reasons agreed by the respondents were: “shadowing enhances recognition of the pronunciation and intonation of English,” and “shadowing can indicate which parts I missed while listening.”

There is desire to know which technique among shadowing only, listening only, and listening plus shadowing would be most effective in improving the L2 listening ability. As presented in Table 4, the results indicate that significant differences in the listening post-test scores were found between LS and LO (LS > LO). These research findings suggest that among the three treatments, listening plus shadowing was most effective, and listening only was the least effective technique.

Further, between LS and SO, LS can be inferred to have outperformed SO. The reason for this higher achievement of LS over SO could be attributed to the lighter processing load of LS. According to Ur (1984), shadowing is a complex performance where language perception and production are carried out in parallel and under severe time pressure. It is highly demanding for beginning shadowers to mimic what they have just heard. Consequently, auditory stimuli tend to be processed just in short term memory, thus cognitive resources could be less devoted to other tasks such as analysis or understanding (Bohannon & Stanowicz, 1989). In this study, SO was supposed to start shadowing as soon as they first encountered the text. LS, on the contrary, was given time to listen for two to three times before they started shadowing, thus they might have understood the listening materials better than SO did. According to an interview with two of the participants from SO, they said that the shadowing was overwhelming for many of the participants in their
group. Especially, students with low levels of proficiency were said to have struggled in shadowing even though the transcripts were provided. The teacher also mentioned in the interview that participants in LS seemed to follow the script more easily than those in SO.

2. Effects of Treatment on English Speaking Ability

The second research question for this study was to examine whether shadowing practices have positive effects on Korean middle school students’ L2 speaking ability improvement. The results, as presented in Table 6, show that there were no significant differences in terms of L2 speaking ability after six weeks of treatment.

One possible explanation for the lack of treatment effect for the participants who did shadowing can be the duration of time. All the participants, including the participants in LS and SO, were supposed to follow their school’s curriculum, so only five minutes per class were spared for the shadowing treatment. However, shadowing is not a simple task, especially for beginning level learners. Numerous repetitions until the auditory stimuli automatically elicit reproduction would be necessary to acquire English stress, intonation, or rhythm. Because shadowing might not be a productive task for beginning learners to be effective within a short period of time, Morley (1991) highly recommends using imitative speaking practice especially with advanced or intermediate students.

Little empirical research has been done to directly investigate the effectiveness of shadowing on English speaking ability, while a few studies have been conducted to examine how effective shadowing is on L2 listening ability of Korean secondary school learners (Sung-Kyu Park, 2005; Yoon-Ha Choi, 2007; Sue-Kyoung Kim, 2008).

When the students were asked the question whether they perceived shadowing as effective for English speaking, 82.4% of participants felt that shadowing was effective. Their positive response rate increased at the post-survey. The first reason they mostly agreed was the repetitive practices of speaking, and the second reason was acquisition of suprasegmentals. Although statistical significance was not found among the groups in the speaking test scores, most learners felt that shadowing is a helpful way of practicing stress and intonation of English through repeated practices. Therefore, for L2 speaking ability improvement, shadowing may be a supplementary technique which enables learners to repetitively practice speaking, thus positively affecting the learners’ perception of shadowing toward L2 speaking.

3. Effects of Treatment on Affective Aspects

The third research question was to uncover whether shadowing has a positive effect on
middle school students’ affective aspects in using English. As shown in Table 9, the learners’ self-confidence in using English was enhanced most in LS, followed by SO. The differences were statistically significant, thus it can be suggested that shadowing has a positive influence in learners’ self-confidence in using English.

Regarding the preference, the subjects did not show significantly higher English listening or speaking preference after they received treatment. One possible reason could be that the short treatment duration would have not been enough to affect the general preferences toward basic skills such as listening or speaking in English. However, as can be seen in Table 13 and Figure 2, the number of respondents who answered that they like shadowing seemed to have increased after the treatment, especially in LS and SO.

In terms of learner’s perception, shadowing seemed to be perceived as an effective way of improving L2 listening and speaking ability. The majority of the participants (listening: 82.4%, speaking: 87.1%) agreed that shadowing may be helpful in improving L2 listening and speaking abilities. In particular, their perceptions toward shadowing efficacy on L2 speaking significantly changed in a positive way after they received treatment.

From these results, it can be suggested that learners who experienced shadowing treatment were generally affected positively in their self-confidence and perception. Krashen (1982) proposed that affective filters of language learners should be lowered if the language could be successfully learned. In this research, the affective filters of the participants seemed to have lowered because their self-confidence was heightened and their preferences tended to have positively changed. These reduced affective filters might have induced the perception of the effectiveness of shadowing toward speaking to be greater.

One more possible reason might be due to the feeling of security while choral shadowing. Brown (2000) noted that insecure feelings in language learning could evolve into inhibitions to protect a fragile ego. The shadowing activity in this study was done chorally as a whole class and even the transcript was provided as a support. Therefore, learners could have positive perception on the efficacy of shadowing even though they were adolescent beginning level learners. This idea is consistent with Murphey’s (2001) claim that learners while shadowing are allowed to participate peripherally just by using the words of other people.

VI. CONCLUSION

From the findings of this study, several implications in regard to the teaching of L2
listening can be drawn. One implication is that the listening instruction may need some change to focus more on acquisition. As can be seen in Tables 5 and 6, the listening posttest scores of LS were higher than those of LO after the six weeks of treatment. The way of teaching listening in LO, as shown in Table 1, mostly involved students to comprehend the listening text. Generally English listening classes seem to largely focus on the comprehension of the meaning. However, according to Richards (2005), “listening as comprehension [and] listening as acquisition” (p. 86) are the two purposes of listening practice. He recommended that using noticing activities with a listening text and exploiting it further with restructuring activities would facilitate listening as acquisition. The listening plus shadowing that was used in this study can be one way of exploiting a listening text, which consists of comprehension first and then acquisition. Therefore, English teachers should incorporate listening activities that can improve students’ L2 listening acquisition.

Another implication is that shadowing can be used as a valuable tool to enhance self-confidence in using English. The participants who practiced shadowing in LS and SO reported to have gained much self-confidence in using English, and more of them came to like shadowing. If English teachers employ shadowing on a regular basis in their English classes, it will help students to build self-confidence in using English, and this may contribute to lowering affective filters in their English use. Two interviewees in LS and SO group commented, “I want to have a shadowing session in regular English classes to polish my intonation and accent,” and “I like shadowing because I feel my pronunciation is getting better.” These responses suggest that regular shadowing practices might have potential benefit in the improvement of L2 speaking ability in the long run.

Furthermore, shadowing might not be effective when it is solely used to improve L2 speaking ability. In this study, no interactive activity followed the shadowing. Shadowing is relatively artificial and is not a real-life communicative task. Bailey (2005) rightly points out that “rigidly controlled practice does not necessarily prepare learners for the spontaneous, fluid interaction that occurs outside the English classroom” (p. 18). Therefore, it would be appropriate to support shadowing with constructive tasks to contribute to general L2 speaking ability improvement.

Lastly, when implementing shadowing, listening for gist as a pre-activity seems to be necessary to first help learners process the passage in a top-down approach. Otherwise, shadowers may be busy trying to understand the content and concentrate on discrete aural information while shadowing. This cognitive burden may discourage beginning leveled learners, who are not ready for its challenging nature; thus, probably resulting in unsuccessful language acquisition. In an interview with a low level SO participant, it was mentioned that the level of listening text was so difficult for some of the students to follow that they just pretended to do shadowing with fake
lip movements. As with tasks that are too difficult, repetitive drills with an easy text on an uninteresting topic would not be tolerated by tiresome bored learners. Therefore, English teachers should consider the level of learners and their interest, select materials with an appropriate speech rate and length, then provide necessary support such as texts or advance listening.

There is a limitation that needs to be addressed in regards to the present study. The duration of the treatment for this study was not long enough to examine the effect of shadowing on L2 speaking ability. The treatment for each group was done three times a week for six weeks. Each treatment time lasted merely five minutes.

From the limitation, the necessity for further research arises. In order to ascertain the effects of shadowing in depth, an experiment with a longer period needs to be conducted. Furthermore, shadowing in a foreign language learning context has not been examined diversely in Korea. Many of the shadowing studies have been conducted often in the L2 translation field and have focused only on listening comprehension improvement. Therefore, replication studies on shadowing with differing participants such as high school students or adults, or focusing on speaking ability improvement would yield interesting results which might shed a light on the effects of shadowing in a foreign language learning context.
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**APPENDIX A**

Sample Teaching Material

As a kid, I always liked Halloween. I liked dressing up in a costume that I pick out at the store or, more often, we made out of odds and ends at home. The best part was going trick-or-treating. Some years, I went with my brothers and sisters. When I got a little older, I went with my friends. We would go to the houses in our neighborhood and knock on our rings the doorbell. When the door opened, we would yell, "Trick or treat!" We never played tricks and always got treats. The neighbors would put some candy and chocolate bars in our bags. We would go home at the end of the night and eat them to our hearts' content.

Word count: 122       Words per sentence: 12       Flesch-Kincaid Grade level: 5


Applicable levels: Secondary education
Key words: shadowing, echoing, imitation, tracking
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