Teaching Pronunciation to an Adult Japanese L2 Learner through Shadowing

Safumi Kamiyama
1. Introduction

In order to address the rapid advances of globalization, the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT, 2011) stated five proposals and specific measures for developing proficiency in English or Lingua Franca for international communication. English classes must be shifted from lecture-style class toward student-centered class by emphasizing speech. This directive was readily adopted by the nutrition college I work for. Accordingly, the English reading classes I teach must be switched from grammar translation method to developing communicative competence by emphasizing pronunciation along with reading skills. Thus, my goal in teaching pronunciation is establishing intelligibility and comprehensibility in order for students to go beyond the threshold level required in Communicative Language Teaching (Celce-Murcia, Brinton, Goodwin, & Griner, 2012, p. 9).

Recently I have faced challenges in classes, where adult students have more difficulties producing unfamiliar sounds than young students. Lenneberg (1967) claimed that there might be physiological constraints due to the brain lateralization. However, many researchers suggest that it is in fact possible for adults to learn L2 pronunciation. For example, Avery and Ehrlich (2012) pointed out that the reason adult learners have problems producing new sounds is that they have never exercised their mouths in the particular way required to pronounce certain English sounds. Additionally, the idea of brain atrophying is erroneous because the brain has flexibility or plasticity throughout its life (Diamond, 1988). Moreover, drawing on Inhelder and Piaget’s (1958) theory of cognitive development, which maintains that after puberty individuals have the ability to consciously construct abstract theories, Krashen (1975) offered a pedagogical implication in which teaching a rule with feedback is beneficial for adults (p. 220). On the other hand, Schumann (1975) and others emphasized the importance of non-linguistic factors such as psychological and sociocultural factors. Thus, if the teacher incorporates into courses activities that can build more confidence and enables adults to examine their personal goals, it is possible that the disadvantages faced by adult learners could be counteracted (Celce-Murcia et al., 2012, p. 18). For example, an imitation technique, such as shadowing, can build students’ confidence in producing new sounds (Davis & Rinvolucri, 1990). All this suggests that teachers can do much to improve adult learners’ English proficiency.

This is a case study in which I taught a Japanese adult student pronunciation focusing on (a)
grammatical endings of past forms of verbs \( /t/, /d/, \) and \( /ə/ \), (b) flap \( [ɾ] \), and (c) a suprasegmental aspect, rhythm. The comprehensive purpose of this study was to help the participant read aloud intelligibly with smooth rhythm, enhance her motivation, and develop self-regulation through shadowing.

2. Literature Review

In this section, shadowing, segmentals vs. suprasegmentals, segmentals concerning grammatical ending of regular past tense and flapping, and suprasegmentals concerning rhythm are discussed from the viewpoint of teaching Japanese adult learners, drawing on the recent research and literature on these areas.

2.1. Shadowing

Lambert (1992) defined shadowing as “a paced, auditory tracking task involving immediate vocalization of auditorily presented stimuli, \( i.e. \) word-for-word repetition, \( i.n \) the same language, parrot-style, of a message presented through headphones” (p. 266). Originally, this technique was an interpreting exercise. Today, in Japan, shadowing is viewed as an effective activity to be incorporated into the English language program. Recent studies show that shadowing is not considered as a simple repetition of an utterance by a listener.

According to Tamai (1997), shadowing is as a highly cognitive activity in which learners track the heard speech and vocalize it as clearly as possible while simultaneously listening. As Hamada discussed (2014), input by shadowing is often depicted as being connected to the working memory model proposed by Baddeley (2007). Through phonological coding, learners can form the native-like phonological representation in their phonological loop. Shadowing reinforces learners’ phonological coding and their phonological perception, particularly by training the phonological loop, which is a part of the working memory. Learning starts from controlled processing, where the phonological loop processes and stores incoming linguistic information, which is remembered for only a few seconds in phonological Short-term memory, but can be retained as working memory through subvocal rehearsal. Through repeated practice, controlled practice becomes automatic (Kadota, 2007). This further processing has been described as a stage of intake (Gass, 1988;
Intake enables learners to encode linguistic information into long-term memory (Doughty & Williams, 1998). Thus, shadowing requires learners to increase their attentional allocations (Torikai, 2003) and enables them to process more input than they could through just listening, because they hear twice: hearing the initial utterance and their own production (Murphey, 2001, p. 146).

From the viewpoint of cognitive factors written above, shadowing can facilitate learners’ subsequent language development. Many researchers have pointed out that shadowing improved learners’ listening skills (Hamada, 2014; Kadota, 2007; Tamai, 2002). Meanwhile, there is on-going research into the strategies of shadowing and its effect on speaking skills. Someya (1998) claimed that shadowing improved the sense of prosody: rhythm, intonation, and accent of speech. Murphey (2001) found that shadowing helped learners to speak fluently and express their private speech (p. 143). Methods in the laboratory-training paradigm such as High Variability Phonetic Training (HVPT) demonstrated that perception abilities can be transferred to production levels (Saito, 2013); however, considering the increasing requirement for teaching pronunciation, more research on shadowing in usual learning situations should be conducted. Thus, this case study investigates the effect of shadowing activities on pronunciation of an adult English learner in a one-to-one teaching situation.

According to Murphey (2001), from the viewpoint of sociocultural theory, there are several concepts from Vygotsky’s (1934) sociocultural theory that are relevant to shadowing: (a) the social or interactive nature of language acquisition and concept formation; (b) the idea of regulation as the learner passes from other-regulation to self-regulation; and (c) the zone of proximal development (ZPD), which refers to the distance between what a learner can do with help and without help, and scaffolding (p. 147). This theory also applies to adults learning L2. In this way, shadowing involves more factors than a simple repetition of an utterance so that shadowing can be an intellectual imitation (Gredler, 2012). Keeping ZPD in mind, the teacher should provide appropriate utterances which learners can be differently attuned to at different level of development (Murphy, 2001).

To perform shadowing effectively, the teacher should consider the following three points. The most important point is to consider the level of difficulty when selecting materials. Kadota and Tamai (2005) pointed out that, for shadowing, less challenging materials at the i - 1 or i - 2 level are preferable. Recently, Hamada (2012) examined 59 university students and concluded that using
materials of a combination of two levels of difficulty improved learners’ listening comprehension skills more than using materials of similar difficulty levels. Drawing on Krashen’s (1985) second language acquisition (SLA) theory, he found that the more challenging materials used were at the \( i + 1 \) level while the less challenging ones were at the \( i - 1 \) level. This choice matches the concepts of ZPD because the teacher can be aware of the learner’s level of development while stretching the learner’s limits. The second point the teacher should consider is to set objectives that can provide learners with scaffolding. The third point is that the teacher should give ample feedback and encouragement to develop self-regulated learning (Jonsson, 2012).

2.2. Segmentals vs. Suprasegmentals

The traditional domain of teaching pronunciation of L2 has been concerned with the segmental and suprasegmental features of the spoken language. Integrating both into the teaching situation remains a current concern (Burgess & Spencer, 2000). Particularly for Japanese, learning segmentals is an essential prerequisite for acquiring suprasegmentals.

As Avery and Ehrlich (2012) pointed out, the sound system of Japanese and English differs remarkably in both segmentals and suprasegmentals. For example, Japanese has a five-vowel system, while English has a continual variation of vocal chords for vowels. Japanese is a syllable-timed language, while English has a stress-timed rhythm. Japanese has open syllable types, while English has closed syllable types. In addition, English has a wide configuration of consonant clusters. As a result, English consonant clustering often presents a challenge for Japanese whose language has a strict CV pattern with no consonant clustering (Celce-Murcia et al., 2012). Considering these differences, here, I discuss grammatical endings of the regular past tense and flap [ɾ] as a feature of segmentals, and then, discuss rhythm as a feature of suprasegmentals.

2.2.1. Segmentals: Acquisition of Grammatical Endings of Regular Past Tense and Flap [ɾ]

First, grammatical endings, suffixes adding grammatical information such as regular past tense or number to nouns or verbs, have predictable rules. For example, Avery and Ehrlich (2012) listed the rules of the regular past tense as follows: (a) If a verb ends with /t/ or /d/, the past tense is pronounced /d/; such as wanted or handed, (b) If a verb ends with a voiced sound, the past tense is pronounced /d/; such as bagged, and (c) If a verb ends with a voiceless sound, the past tense is pronounced /t/,
such as backed (pp. 47-48). By examining the phonetic characteristics of sounds surrounding the past tense endings, learners can make the choice of /əd/, /d/, or /t/.

However, the fact that Japanese does not have the phonemes such as /t/ and /d/ causes Japanese learners to drop them frequently. Moreover, Japanese predominantly has an open syllables system, which causes learners to encounter difficulty pronouncing word-final consonants, including grammatical endings (e.g., kissed). If they can perceive the difference between [kʰɪstʰ] and epenthesis, [kisuto], they can produce [kʰɪstʰ] correctly. The inability to produce these sounds is often interpreted as a grammatical problem, but that is not always the case; thus, teachers should integrate the sound system with grammar in order for each learner to internalize grammatical endings.

Celce-Murcia. et al. (2012) provide strategies for teaching these grammatical endings. Teachers should explain the rules governing the grammatical endings. Learners should first recognize the distinct /d/, /t/, and /əd/ sounds orthographically rather than phonetically, and then, they should perform consciousness-raising activities, such as predicting pronunciation activities (p. 413). As Saito (2013) pointed out, it is beneficial for adult learners to learn through explicit instruction.

Second, a flap or a tap [ɾ] is a voiced allophone of /t/ and /d/ that occurs in such words as data, pudding, and started. The sound of [ɾ] is an apico-alveolar tap, which is articulated at the tooth ridge like a /d/, but it is much shorter than a /d/. Here, like Celce-Murcia et al. (2012), I do not differentiate between a flap and a tap. The same term flap is used to refer to both a flap and a tap and the same symbol [ɾ] is used for both of them. More importantly, a flap is a positional variant, which occurs between a stressed vowel and a weakly stressed vowel. In rapid speech, the flaps occur not only in a word, but also in a sentence. For example, the italicized t’s of the following sentence are usually pronounced as flaps: “I got a charge out of that” (Avery & Ehrlich, 2012, p. 42).

A local dialect affects flapping. Compared to British English speakers, North American English speakers tend to use flaps [ɾ]. Moreover, the occurrence of flaps is one of the major differences between North American English and British English. North American English speakers share exactly the same pronunciation for pairs such as the following: writer/rider, latter/ladder, while British English speakers distinguish a flap [t] from a flap [d] (Avery & Ehrlich, 2012, p. 41, Celce-Murcia et al., 2012, p. 452). Flaps are frequent in the spoken language. It is claimed in many books for pronunciation practice published in Japan that mastering flaps is one of the most important ways to improve pronunciation. As Avery and Ehrlich (2012) state, “the ability to recognize words that
contain flaps is very important in improving students’ comprehension of natural speech” (p. 43).

Celce-Murcia et al. (2012) made several suggestions for teaching flaps [r]. The teacher should explain the pronunciation of [r] explicitly and demonstrate it exaggeratedly, using such pairs of words as *putting vs. pudding, latter vs. ladder, and bitter vs. bidder*. If students want to learn North American English pronunciation, the teacher should emphasize that these pairs are “homophones” or words that sound the same (Avery & Ehrlich, 2012, p. 42) and have the students practice producing the sound of these pairs. The teacher can have intermediate learners perform an analysis activity in which they repeat the heard speech while paying attention to flaps (Celice-Murcia et al., 2012, p. 90).

2.2.2. Suprasegmentals: The Acquisition of English Rhythm

As Avery and Ehrlich (2012) point out, Japanese L2 learners have difficulty in producing English rhythm. Japanese is a syllable-timed language, where rhythm is dependent upon the number of the syllables (CV), while English is a stress-timed language, where a rhythm is dependent upon the number of the stresses (Celce-Murcia et al., 2012). For example, in English, the phrase *BILL WORKS HARD* and the phrase *BILL’s been WORKing HARD* take roughly the same amount of time to say.

As Avery and Ehrlich (2012) explain, stress-timed language is strongly related to the vowel reduction process. Schwa (/ə/) is the most common reduced vowel in English. Japanese L2 learners often fail to produce proper rhythm because they miss the sound system of the vowel reduction necessary for English rhythm. The word *consider*, which contains a flap [r], is a good example. If they can identify the difference between [kʰənsɪɾ] and [konsida], they can produce [kʰənsɪɾ] properly. In addition, Japanese indicates the stressed syllable in pitch, while in English stress is indicated by three variables: length, pitch, and loudness. Japanese can also have difficulty in acquiring the acoustic properties of the English stress system. Teachers should emphasize the length and loudness aspects of English stress. When learners do not produce utterances with the appropriate rhythm, the results can cause incomprehension or annoyance on the part of the listeners (Avery & Ehrlich, 2012, p. 189).

Avery and Ehrlich (2012) suggest that when teaching rhythm, teachers should explicitly explain how vowels are reduced, or unstressed, such as chocolate, every, and history, and demonstrate the /ə/ sound in an exaggerated way. In teaching rhythm, as Kadota (2007) points out, teachers should
prepare texts where the stressed syllables are highlighted. In order to ensure that learners have perceived the characteristic rhythm of English, “the teacher has them tap out the stressed syllable at regular intervals” (Avery & Ehrlich, 2012, p. 189).

I have discussed several important issues concerning the English sound system relevant to the learning context for Japanese adult learners. Next, I describe a case study, whose aim was to investigate the following questions:
1. Do shadowing activities with Focus-on-Forms improve the participant’s speech production in terms of grammatical endings, flapping, and smooth rhythm?
2. Does shadowing lead the participant to improve reading aloud intelligibly with smooth rhythm, enhance motivation, and develop self-regulation?

3. Methods

3.1. The Participant

The participant, Sayuri (pseudonym), is a Japanese 51 year-old woman. At the time of the study, she was a student majoring in nutrition and attends English reading class. She graduated from university with a bachelor degree in English literature 30 years ago. She had 10 years of formal English education, which included basic knowledge of the English sound system. After graduation, she became a homemaker. She lived in London for two years because of her husband’s business; however, she seldom had opportunities to interact with native English speakers during that time. Since returning to Japan, she has not had any chances to use English. Her listening and speaking proficiency is low-intermediate; she is able to understand some information from sentence-length speech and can handle a limited number of uncomplicated communication tasks (ACTFL, 2012). Her motivation to learn about food in English is high.

3.2. Instrumentation

In this case study, five texts were selected as the reading materials. The contents of the five texts were all related to her major, nutrition. Moreover, two texts were chosen from a children’s book, Little House in the Big Woods (Wilder, 1971), because Sayuri had watched the series of Little House in the Big Woods on TV as a child. These materials were related to her intrinsic interest, so they were
potentially motivating for her. In respect to the level of difficulty, which is crucial for successful shadowing, drawing on the findings of Hamada (2012) and the concept of Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory (1934), I chose the materials at a combination of two levels of difficulty. Three of the more challenging texts were from a course textbook, *A Taste of English: Food and Fiction* (Minami, Motoyama, & Taguchi, 2013). The other less challenging texts were from *Little House in the Big Woods* (Wilder, 1971). In Session 1, I checked whether the material I selected was at an appropriate level. The more challenging texts were used for Sessions 3 and 5, and the less challenging ones for Sessions 2 and 4. I employed the readability index calculator program to get a Flesch-Kincaid readability grade and used Tom Cobb’s vocabulary profiler to check the vocabulary composition of the texts. The results are shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of words</th>
<th>Session 1</th>
<th>Session 2</th>
<th>Session 3</th>
<th>Session 4</th>
<th>Session 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flesch-Kincaid Grade level</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flesch-Kincaid Readability score</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1 words (1-1,000)</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2 words (1,001-2,000)</td>
<td>78.85%</td>
<td>74.27%</td>
<td>72.34%</td>
<td>76.06%</td>
<td>74.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic words</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
<td>12.86%</td>
<td>6.81%</td>
<td>7.22%</td>
<td>6.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off list words</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
<td>1.89%</td>
<td>2.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off list words</td>
<td>12.31%</td>
<td>12.86%</td>
<td>19.15%</td>
<td>16.73%</td>
<td>16.35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3. Procedures

Instruction took place over five 60-minute sessions. Each session was held once a week between February 10 and March 10. In Session 1, I explained shadowing and the goal of the activity: The participant will be able to read aloud intelligibly with smooth rhythm and good pronunciation. The purpose of Session 1 was to administer the pretest. A relaxation exercise, *listen and imitate*, was conducted as a warm-up. Next, Sayuri listened to the passage twice while shadowing in a low voice. She then took a comprehension test. After practicing shadowing several times, her speech was recorded as a pretest and transcribed after the class. Based on the pretest results, the objectives of
the study and the texts for the following sessions were selected.

From Session 2 to Session 5, the same procedures were applied. The five-step procedure recommended by Kadota (2007) was used as a reference (see Table 2). In step 1, the participant listened to the passage twice while mumbling. Then, in step 2, vocabulary learning activities and comprehension check were practiced before shadowing. According to Hamada’s (2014) findings, these activities significantly improved learners’ listening comprehension skills. In addition, being familiar with the target passage could ease her anxiety, which consequently lowers the psychological burden of shadowing. In step 3, first, I explained the sound system of grammatical endings, flap [ɾ], and English rhythm explicitly. Next, Sayuri performed consciousness-raising activities. She repeated after me on each pause (chunk) several times until she felt confident. If she made an error, I provided a recast and offered encouragement to support her (Firth, 2012). Next, she practiced prosody parallel reading, where she shadowed while paying attention to the three target points. In step 4, she practiced content parallel reading, where she shadowed the passage focusing on its content. In this step, she read the passage and put some feeling into it. In step 5, the Sayuri’s speech was recorded for analyses; she also evaluated herself by listening to the recording.

Table 2. Shadowing Procedure Used in the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Instructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Listen to the passage twice while mumbling the text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Vocabulary learning activities and comprehension check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Phonological check (Consciousness-raising: grammatical ending, flap, and rhythm) Prosody parallel reading three times (shadow while reading the text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Contents parallel reading twice (shadow while reading the text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Record and self-evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4. Analyses

Sayuri self-evaluated herself in each session, using an evaluation sheet that included a 5-point Likert scale concerning intelligibility on the following four points: the grammatical endings, flap [ɾ], rhythm, and reading aloud smoothly. After listening to the recording, she rated the four points by
circling a number: 1=Extremely bad, 2=Bad, 3=Satisfactory, 4=Good, to 5=Extremely good.

I also rated Sayuri’s speech. I am Japanese, and my native language is Japanese. I majored in nutrition and English drama and have taught English at the nutrition college for 13 years.

The participant’s speech was transcribed using IPA phonetic symbols, focusing on three points: grammatical endings, flap [ɾ], and stressed syllables. I calculated the percentage of correct reproduction of these three points. The degree of smoothness in the reading aloud performances was evaluated using the following 5-point Likert scale: 1=Incomprehensible, 2=Difficult to comprehend, 3=Comprehensible, 4=Fairly easy to comprehend, 5=Easy to comprehend.

4. Results

The pretest indicated several problems with Sayuri’s pronunciation. I negotiated the two aspects of the sound system I would work with her, and set three objectives. The first concerned getting Sayuri to articulate the grammatical endings precisely. On the whole, her pronunciation was good, and she paid attention to the distinction between /l/ and /ɾ/. However, she did not open and move her mouth enough. Thus, as might be expected of Japanese learners, she had some difficulty in pronouncing vowels and consonants, which were not a part of the sound inventory of Japanese. Above all, she often dropped grammatical endings of the regular past tense of verbs. Her inability to produce the sound /t/, /d/, and /ɾd/ can be interpreted as a grammatical problem in spite of her overall good grammatical competence.

The second objective was to get Sayuri to articulate the sound of flap [ɾ] smoothly. In Step 1 of the shadowing procedure, she did not have much trouble keeping up with the heard speech; however, she stammered a few times. I observed that she attempted to notice linking and flaps in the speech. She made an effort to produce native-like speech, and was strongly interested in pronouncing flap [ɾ]. She made a choice to practice flap [ɾ] of her own accord.

The third objective was to help Sayuri develop more natural English rhythm in speech. She was good at linking, such as in the phrases in America and in addition; however, her intonation was flat, and her rhythm was monotonous, as is the case with many Japanese L2 learners who fail to produce appropriate English rhythm. She had difficulty perceiving and producing the vowel reductions necessary for proper English rhythm. Moreover, she articulated the stressed syllables just by
indicating them using pitch, ignoring the length and loudness. Thus, I determined to focus on rhythm and its relationship with linking.

Next, I examined if the text was appropriate for Sayuri. I found that she was able to comprehend the text and explain grammar points without difficulty after comprehending the meaning of a few unknown words. She was interested in the content of the text. Moreover, the speed of the CD was slightly slow at 135 words per minute so that she was able to follow the speech. I decided to select the other four texts, based on the level of the text used in Session 1.

The results of Sayuri’s self-evaluations throughout the sessions ranged from 2 to 5, with a mean of 4.0 (see Figure 1). As shown in the Figure, Sayuri perceived herself to have made considerable progress from Session 1 to Session 5.

![Figure 1. Participant’s self-evaluation for her own speech](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Session 1</th>
<th>Session 2</th>
<th>Session 3</th>
<th>Session 4</th>
<th>Session 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical endings (%)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flap [ɾ] (%)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm (%)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smooth reading aloud</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Session 2, the text selected was included in *Little House in the Big Woods*, which contains many natural North American sounds, such as flap [ɾ] and linking. The Flesch-Kincaid grade level of this text was slightly lower than that in Session 1. As a result, the pronunciation of flap [ɾ] improved; the
text contained more than 15 flaps, so she could practice producing the flap quite a few times. The pronunciation of grammatical endings also improved; however, judging from the result of self-evaluation, she was not satisfied with her production. She monitored her speech several times, and asked me to give more recasts. As for rhythms, she paused in the proper places and read stressed syllables slightly louder and longer than the unstressed syllables.

In Session 3, her pronunciation of the flaps and grammatical endings improved. After Session 2, she practiced moving her mouth smoothly. However, her rhythm was not as good as it had been in Session 2. The text was more challenging than that of the previous session, and the rate of the three-syllable words was higher by 6.5%. She stammered when producing words such as *camomile*, *exhaustion*, and *antioxidant*.

In Session 4, I selected an easier text than the one used in Session 3. Flap [ɾ], such as in *attic*, *cut off*, and *out in*, was pronounced well. In addition, grammatical endings, such as in *chopped*, *seasoned*, and *molded*, were articulated distinctly. She moved and opened her mouth briskly, and she tried to imitate the sounds precisely and was able to repeat using almost the same rhythm as the CD. When she made errors, I recast the incorrect sounds with a questioning attitude. As her self-evaluation indicated, she gained greater self-efficacy in her speech.

In Session 5, Sayuri took the posttest. Her performance was almost perfect. She only made a few errors by dropping pronouncing /t/ as in *helped*. She was satisfied with her speech. Thus, through shadowing, Sayuri was able to pronounce grammatical endings of past forms and a flap [ɾ], and read aloud with good speed and smooth rhythm with stressed syllables louder and longer. Moreover, this procedure helped to enhance her motivation and develop self-regulation.

5. Discussion

In this session, I discuss how shadowing promoted an adult learner’s development of L2 speech production. First, the participant came to pay attention to segmental factors. Training to promote the sounds through shadowing activities raised her awareness of the difference between her utterance and the heard speech and enabled her to make progress in producing the target sounds. Remarkably, it seemed easier for her to improve flap [ɾ] than grammatical endings. The sound [ɾ] was originally a familiar sound for Japanese. According to Price (1981) and Vance (1987), the Japanese /ɾ/ is
phonetically more similar to flap [ɾ] in American English than it is to either [l] or [ɹ]. In addition, practicing this sound was her choice. Thus, acquiring flap [ɾ] triggered her intrinsic motivation to practice segmental sounds. In addition, repeating shadowing several times in a session must have increased the capacity of phonological memory. According to the findings of O’Brien, Segalowitz, Freed, and Collentine (2007), shadowing helps to develop accurate speech production. Moreover, as Sato’s (2013) findings showed, form-focused instruction of grammatical endings along with flap [ɾ] with recast seems to have accelerated her perceptual and productive acquisition of these segmental sounds.

Second, shadowing also helped to develop her suprasegmental factor, rhythm. In Session 1, Sayuri read aloud in a flat monotone. In Session 2, I chose an easier text and she performed shadowing activities by using a handout with stressed words in red and bold face. In listening while speaking in a low voice, she paid attention to stressed syllables, on her own adding large circles to the handout, and clapped with the beat from stressed element to stressed element. As stress placement in English is a rule-governed aspect (Celce-Murcia, et al., 2012, p. 199), once she comprehended it, she was able to improve her rhythm with practice. As Hamada (2012) pointed out, this kind of successful experience with a less challenging text could help learners gain self-efficacy, which is a strong influential factor on motivation. In addition, although she eagerly concentrated on shadowing, she did not show fatigue; on the contrary, she enjoyed it.

Third, as I mentioned above, I had developed shadowing activities for an adult learner drawing on Vygotsky’s (1934) sociocultural theory. I carefully chose the material appropriate to the participant’s level. I negotiated with her and set the three objectives with scaffolding in mind. I was able to build a rapport with her by providing recasts and encouragement, which worked to reduce language anxiety (Dörnyei, 2011). By self-evaluating, she developed the ability to self-monitor, which involved listening critically and, in speaking, anticipating problem areas and confirming whether production had been accurate (Firth, 2012). She gradually achieved self-efficacy and self-responsibility. This case study started with other-regulation, but ended with self-regulation.
6. Conclusion

This case study was designed to help an adult Japanese L2 learners to improve her ability to produce English sounds and rhythm through shadowing. Throughout five sessions of shadowing activities, the participant made great efforts and showed progress. I found out that using shadowing activities with form-focused instruction developed the participant’s speech productions in grammatical endings of regular past tense, flapping, and rhythm. It also led her to improve reading aloud intelligibly with smooth rhythm, enhanced motivation, and developed self-regulated learning.

I would like to point out several points that future studies along this line should examine. First, for obtaining a more detailed description of the relationship between shadowing and production, we need studies with more participants at various stages in their L2 development and more sessions. Second, to examine acquisition, we need measures based on spontaneous speech tasks rather than in controlled tasks. Third, to obtain more practical findings, we need to explore whether shadowing can be incorporated into classroom activities in which various ages’ students participate as well as into one-to-one sessions such as in this study.

To conclude, teaching pronunciation is an urgent necessity in my teaching situation. I did not have enough knowledge about the English sound system nor about teaching it. Through implementing this case study, I gained valuable knowledge about teaching pronunciation and also recognized what the most important attitude toward students should be when teaching it.

Note
(1) There are some linguists who differentiate between a tap and a flap by maintaining that a tap is “a brief contact of the tongue with the alveolar (as in data, consider)” and “a flap consists of the tongue tip brushing against the alveolar ridge (as in party, dirty);” however, Celce-Murcia et al. (2012) use the term flap to refer to both of these procedures (p. 80).
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