Shadow-Reading: Guidelines for a Socially-Mediated Approach to Reading in the Second/Foreign Language Classroom

Millie Commander
Inter American University of Puerto Rico
Metropolitan Campus

María C. M. de Guerrero
Inter American University of Puerto Rico
Metropolitan Campus

ABSTRACT

This paper describes shadow-reading, a pedagogical technique aimed at fostering reading comprehension and retention in second (L2) or foreign language (FL) classrooms. The technique is an adaptation of "conversational shadowing," a procedure which requires listeners to repeat what their interlocutors say in an attempt to remember the content of the interaction while also practicing and learning a target language. In shadow-reading, learners are arranged in pairs in the roles of Readers and Shadowers. Readers read from a text while Shadowers listen and then try to reproduce the text in various forms: repeating completely or selectively, interjecting interactive comments, summarizing orally, and retelling in written form. An empirical study was carried out to test shadow-reading and explore whether it helped students attain reading comprehension with the socially-mediated approach. A description of the steps taken in the implementation of the technique is provided. Several examples are also given to illustrate the shadowing behaviors learners engaged in. The benefits and uses as well as possible adaptations of the technique are discussed.

INTRODUCTION

The main purpose of this paper is to provide a description of *shadow-reading*, a pedagogical adaptation of "conversational shadowing," a dialogic behavior in which listeners repeat—partially, completely, or in modified form—what their interlocutors say (Murphey, 2001a). Shadow-reading combines conversational shadowing with summarizing as a means to foster socially-mediated reading comprehension and retention of written English texts. In this paper, we begin by presenting a rationale for using this technique and a brief report of our experience with it in the classroom and in two research studies. Then, we proceed to explain the procedures used in implementing this technique. We also offer some examples of the types of behaviors that occur in collaborative talk during shadow-reading. We end with a summary of the benefits and uses of the technique and with suggestions for the application of the technique in various L2 and foreign FL contexts.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Conversational Shadowing

Conversational shadowing is a technique based on a common human behavior in conversation, namely, the tendency to repeat what others or oneself says in conversation. Tannen (2007), who has found frequent use of spontaneous, automatic shadowing in conversation, believes that shadowing responds to a natural human drive to imitate and repeat (p. 98). Spontaneous shadowing can be partial or complete, exact or modified, silent or aloud. The following example of a conversation among three persons shows shadowing (underlined text) occurring automatically, with a short delay and a small modification:

DAVID   I don't know what … uh … port tastes like.
STEVE   Port is very sweet. Port is very rich.
                          |_
CHAD   <u>Port is very sweet. Very rich.</u> (Tannen, 2007, p. 94)

One of the most effective applications of this human phenomenon to language pedagogy has been Murphey's (2001a) conversational shadowing technique. Murphey suggests the technique may be used in dyadic interactions between L2 or FL learners and native speakers of the target language and between L2 or FL learners during which a listener repeats what his or her partner says. Murphey presents two modes of repetition in conversational shadowing, *complete* or *selective*. In *complete* shadowing, the listener repeats everything the speaker says whereas in *selective* shadowing the listener repeats only selected words or phrases. In classroom practice, the listener may repeat what the speaker says in three successive ways: first *out loud*, then in a *lower tone*, and finally *silently* (in the mind). During these repetition activities, learners may opt to interact by asking questions or making comments at any time. Murphey refers to this option as *interactive*.

To increase depth of processing, Murphey (2000, 2001a) recommends utilizing summarizing as a form of shadowing longer stretches of discourse. Murphey (2001b) believes that one of the benefits of shadowing and summarizing is that they act as tools of "recursion," that is, they encourage "repeated use of the same or similar language items, from simple repetition, to reformulation, to new production and novel use" (p. 132). Another benefit, according to Murphey (2001a), is that, in attempting to shadow what their interlocutors say, learners externalize language processing, thus showing partners how to make adjustments that may contribute to L2 acquisition. One such adjustment occurs, for example, when interlocutors segment or *chunk* their speech to a length that is appropriate for the listener to repeat. Lastly, Murphey (2001a), adopting a Vygotskyan perspective, contends that shadowing allows native speakers to fine-tune their input to a level that is sensitive to the learners' *zones of proximal development* (ZPDs), a construct described by Vygotsky (1978) which suggests that learners can perform certain tasks which are beyond their current developmental level if they are given strategic assistance from others.

Shadow-Reading

As English-as-a-second-language (ESL) college teachers, we used conversational shadowing to promote learner-learner oral interaction in the classroom, but this technique alone did not address the needs that our students had in reading, especially in the low proficiency levels. Students in the 21st century must develop high levels of literacy (Ogle & Correa-Kovtun, 2010) to comply with state standards and with contemporary demands in society. At the college level, even more expectations arise, especially for L2 learners, who must meet the demands of reading textbooks in English in content areas (Stone, 2013). Besides comprehending the literal meaning of a text, students need to summarize, analyze, synthesize, and evaluate texts.

Shadow-reading was thus developed as a modification of conversational shadowing and used as a technique to foster reading comprehension and retention of L2 texts because it offers students the opportunity to practice language in a text while also talking about a text as they construct, elaborate, and internalize concepts. It was designed to provide our students with a technique that could contribute to the enhancement of reading comprehension through a peer-mediated mode. Students, working in pairs, assumed the roles of oral *Reader* who orally read a text for a partner, designated as a *Shadower*, to repeat. This technique should not be confused with other "shadow reading" activities found in the literature and on the internet (see, for example, Anderson, 2009; Teaching Tips 11, n.d.). Anderson's (2009) shadow reading activity, for instance, is aimed at increasing the students' reading rate and fluency by having students listen to a recorded text, discuss what they hear, then listen to the recording with the text, and finally read along with the recording. Rather than focusing on reading rate and fluency, our application of shadowing is aimed at fostering the mutual construction of meaning by two readers while they deploy a text through multiple repetitions, summaries, retellings, and collaborative talk.

Supporting Research for Shadow-Reading in ESL

As of the present time, only one study that explores the relationship between shadowing and reading has been reported (Nakanishi & Ueda, 2011). The study compared the reading gains obtained by second language college students in Japan when completing extensive reading and when adding shadowing to the extensive reading tasks. The results revealed a slight improvement in the shadowing-plus extensive reading group. These students, however, did shadowing individually and not in pairs as the students did in our research. Other researchers have found that shadowing has had a positive impact on listening and oral reading fluency (Saito, Nagasawa, & Ishikawa, 2011; Wiltshier, 2007) and oral performance (Zakeri, 2014), but their studies have not focused on reading comprehension.

To have a better grasp of what students do while engaging in shadow-reading, we conducted a research project, results of which have been reported in two separate studies (Commander & Guerrero, 2013; Guerrero & Commander, 2013). Because the purpose of this paper is mainly to describe the procedures necessary to implement the technique, we will only briefly discuss here the scope and general findings of our empirical studies. For our research projects, we conducted and tape-recorded a shadow-reading session in which 26 Spanish-speaking, basic level ESL college learners participated. The session consisted of two phases: (1) an interactional phase where two learners, working collaboratively as a dyad, read aloud, shadowed, and summarized a story and (2) a non-interactional phase, where students individually produced written retellings of the story in immediate and delayed conditions. One of our studies (Guerrero & Commander, 2013) focused on the process of imitation that took place throughout both phases of the shadow-reading task. In this study, we viewed imitation from a Vygotskyan perspective,

that is, as a crucial, intentional, and creative mechanism of internalization and a major component of developmental activity in the ZPD (Vygotsky, 1978). A qualitative analysis of the data revealed the occurrence of various types of imitative behaviors, providing opportunities for internalization of the L2. In a separate study (Commander & Guerrero, 2013), we focused on the reading strategies that students resorted to while shadow-reading. A qualitative analysis of the interactions between students yielded two major types of reading strategies, classified as lower-level or comprehension-enabling and higher-level or comprehension-building strategies. A quantitative analysis showed significant statistical differences in favor of the shadow-reading technique when the written retellings of the shadow-reading participants were compared to those of another group that simply read the story silently on their own and did not engage in shadow-reading. Overall, the results of our research studies suggest that story comprehension and retention were fostered by the collaborative nature of the shadow-reading activity.

On the basis of our classroom experience and the results of our research, we formulated two questions to guide this paper:

1. How can shadow-reading be effectively implemented in the ESL classroom?
2. How do collaborative interactions that occur during shadow-reading mediate comprehension in reading?

The purpose of this paper, therefore, is to offer a detailed and clear description of the implementation of shadow-reading in the ESL reading class and provide examples of interactions between Shadowers and Readers that show the impact of collaborative construction of meaning on comprehension.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE TECHNIQUE

In this section we address the first question stated above; that is, we offer a detailed account of the procedures implemented in shadow-reading, based on those used in our studies. A much shorter account of the implementation of the technique can be found in (Commander & Guerrero, 2012). We begin by discussing training and specific classroom procedures to set up the technique before implementing it as an instructional routine.

Training

For students to perform shadow-reading well, we recommend previous training in three areas: oral reading fluency practice, shadowing of short sentences, and shadowing of longer connected discourse. Modeling by the teacher for all three areas must be provided at all times, especially for interactions which involve some type of conversational strategy. For example, clarification requests such as "Sorry. Could you say that again?" or confirmation checks such as "Did you say _?" need to be practiced. Furthermore, students also need modeling of how to ask referential questions based on the text whenever doubts or confusion arises: "What does _ mean?" A list of conversational prompts can be presented and practiced with students.

Oral Reading Fluency Practice

In shadow-reading, one of the partners, the Reader, has to read the text aloud while the other, the Shadower, without seeing the text, repeats. To master oral reading fluency, an important

skill for students to develop is chunking, that is, the ability to segment long utterances into shorter meaningful semantic and syntactic units.

In our research projects, three brief paragraphs were selected to practice oral reading fluency in three different sessions. Short paragraphs of an average of 42 words were taken from the students' English textbook to ensure familiarity with topics and language structures. The procedure for each session was as follows:

- First, students were introduced to the notion of chunking by the teacher's demonstration of reading aloud and slightly pausing after appropriate semantic and syntactic word groupings. An example of practice with chunking follows:

    TEXT: *She bought a new car for the first time.*
    CHUNKED SENTENCE: *She bought a new car//* (pause for semantic and syntactic integrity) *for the first time.*

    The teacher read the paragraph several times for the students to follow silently and notice pauses between phrases and grasp proper intonation. Explanations were provided for pauses when needed. The aim of this type of practice was to sensitize the students to the importance of segmenting text so that Readers could provide understandable text to Shadowers. Practice in pronunciation of troublesome words was also offered.
- Next, the students were asked to repeat after the teacher focusing on adequate pausing, intonation, and pronunciation.
- Then, students chimed in with the teacher as she read aloud, forcing learners to closely follow the teacher to imitate adequate chunking, intonation, and pronunciation. This step was repeated several times to provide enough practice in oral reading.
- Next, the students read the passage in unison without the teacher's guidance.
- After the oral reading practice, students were given the paragraph in dictation for further language practice. The students checked their dictation and made corrections if necessary.
- They then paired up with a partner to whom they read the paragraph orally to continue practicing oral reading and chunking and obtain some form of peer feedback.

Shadowing of Short Sentences

To introduce the students to the shadowing technique, we suggest showing Murphey's (2000) *Shadowing and Summarizing* video (although this is not indispensable). In the video, Murphey demonstrates how to apply shadowing and summarizing in an FL/L2 class as well as explains the theoretical rationale supporting the technique. In our study, after watching the video and discussing the technique presented in it, the teacher modeled the technique with several examples. Then the learners started having practice in shadowing short sentences. For this practice, each student wrote sentences with the help of the teacher and then read aloud these sentences for another student to shadow. Some of the prompts given to the students to write sentences were:

- three things I do every morning
- three fun things I like to do
- three facts about my family

Learners were grouped in pairs and assigned the roles of Reader or Shadower. Shadowers had to repeat each sentence read by the Reader following the complete and selective modes in the out loud, lower tone, and silent progression. Students were made aware of the need to use correct first or second person reference in repeating a partner's words. The following example was presented to the students as a model:

READER:	<u>I</u> brush my teeth.
SHADOWER:	<u>You</u> brush your teeth. (Out loud)
	<u>You</u> brush your teeth. (Lower tone)
	…………………….. (Silent)

Shadowers were reminded that, as they repeated, they also had to pay close attention to the ideas in the sentences in order to summarize them as a final step. Next, students exchanged roles so that Readers could become Shadowers to repeat the procedure.

Shadowing Longer Connected Discourse

The third area of training involved practicing shadowing with longer reading passages. We suggest using brief stories that can be divided in two main parts, each organized in paragraphs. In our study, we trained learners to shadow paragraph by paragraph, following the complete and selective modes in the three-way shadowing progression and then by summarizing each paragraph orally. Learners would alternate in their roles of Readers and Shadowers as they shadowed and summarized paragraphs this way. A final overall oral summary of the whole story was also required of both Readers and Shadowers. The students were reminded of the need to focus on meaning as they listened and as they shadowed, rather than repeat mechanically. Interrupting to clarify doubts, request repetition, paraphrase, or discuss content was encouraged. A written retelling of the text could be required in both the target and first language of the students.

The three areas of training described above appear to be essential preliminary activities for optimal use of shadow-reading in the L2 classroom. We strongly recommend giving students practice in these areas. The training phase is summarized in Figure 1 below.

Figure 1. Training Phase

Training	Instructional Procedures
Oral reading fluency practice with a short paragraph	• Read a short paragraph to students several times to model adequate pausing (chunking), intonation, and pronunciation while students follow text. • Require students to repeat chunked text which is modeled by teacher. • Ask students to chime in with the teacher as text is read aloud. • Have the students read the passage in unison without the teacher's guidance. • Dictate the selected text for further language practice and have the students check their dictation and make corrections if necessary. • Pair students with a partner to whom they read the paragraph orally to continue practicing oral reading and chunking.
Shadowing of short sentences	• Model writing of short sentences with prompts such as "three things I do every morning" so that each student has three sentences for shadowing practice.

	• Model the complete and selective shadowing technique with a student by following the out loud, lower tone, silent progression. Students are made aware of the need to use correct first or second person reference in repeating a partner's words. • Group learners in pairs and assign the roles of Reader or Shadower for Shadowers to repeat and summarize text read by Reader. • Have students exchange roles.
Shadowing longer connected discourse	• Select a short text organized in paragraphs and divide in two parts. • In pairs, have students shadow paragraph by paragraph, following the shadowing modes and progression. • Require summarizing of each individual paragraph. • Have students exchange roles. • Require a final overall oral summary of the entire text by both Readers and Shadowers.

Setting up the Class for Shadow-Reading

Selecting a Text

For shadow-reading, teachers should select a text appropriate to the students' level and particular class objectives. As mentioned earlier, a suitable text would be one that can be divided in two parts of comparable length, each with several paragraphs. The text could be part of a short story or novel or a simplified selection in an ESL textbook, always considering the grammatical complexity and manageable vocabulary in the chosen text. The step-by-step procedures and instructions offered here are based on "Lost and Found" (Heyer, 1987), a two-part story which we used in our research project (see Appendix A). Before starting, the students should be reminded that they can make interactive comments (ask questions, clarify meaning, provide assistance, etc.) to each other any time during the shadowing session. In addition, if written retellings are required, the teacher should announce: "After you finish Part I and II, you will be given a sheet to write down in English everything you remember from the entire reading selection."

Assigning Partners

The teacher pairs students with partners. Partner assignment would be up to the teacher so as to have students of the same or different proficiency work together. However, pairing students of similar proficiency levels could make students more comfortable and safe in the upcoming exchanges. Students sit with assigned partner facing each other.

Assigning Roles

The teacher assigns roles A and B. (In Part I of a text, one student, A, is the Reader, and the other student, B, is the Shadower. In Part II, roles are reversed: A is Shadower, and B is Reader.)

Instructions

The teacher provides a printed page with instructions (see Appendix B) to each pair to make sure students follow an orderly sequence of steps during the task. Instructions are also reviewed orally by teacher. A summary of the steps to set up the class for shadow-reading follows in Figure 2.

Figure 2. Setting up the Class for Shadow-Reading

Steps	Procedures
Text selection	• Select a text appropriate to the students' level and particular class objectives. • Be sure to have a text with two parts, comparable in length.
Partner assignment	• Select same or different proficiency level partners. • Assign Reader and Shadower roles.
Instructions	• Provide a printed page with instructions and review orally.

Actual Use of Shadow-Reading in Class

After adequate training has been offered and the class has been set up for shadow-reading, the technique can then be used with a variety of texts as part of the reading class. Figure 3 below summarizes the entire process.

Figure 3. Implementing Shadow-Reading in Class

Complete Shadowing	Selective Shadowing	Summarizing	Retelling (if required)
Partner A reads each sentence in each separate paragraph of Part I of the text, chunking if necessary.	Partner A reads each sentence in each separate paragraph of Part I again, chunking if necessary.	Partner B orally summarizes each individual paragraph after shadowing each one.	Each student is required to independently write in English a retelling of the shadowed text immediately after finishing the shadowing session.
Partner B performs complete shadowing out loud, then softer, and finally, silently.	Partner B shadows selectively, that is, only repeating what he or she considers important to remember while following the shadowing out loud, then softer, and finally, silently.	When all paragraphs in Part I have been shadowed and individually summarized, Partner B summarizes all of Part I.	Several days after the completion of the shadowing session, students are required to write a delayed retelling of the shadowed text in English and in their first language.

When Part I is completed, Partner A and Partner B switch roles to then shadow Part II of the text. The same procedure completed in Part I is followed for Part II. After completing the procedure, students take turns summarizing the *entire* text orally. This final summary serves the purpose of helping students identify and retain the most important ideas in the text.

Assessing Shadow-Reading

In our research, written retellings were used for two purposes: to stimulate readers' recall of what they had read and to provide teachers with a measure of reading comprehension. This step is not required, but it helps teachers evaluate what and how much of a text has been retained and understood.

Immediate Retelling

A sheet was given for Immediate Retelling with the instruction for students to write, in the target language (English), everything they remembered from the text. No specific time limit was established. Students were reminded that they would be asked to write something about the story (Delayed Retelling) in a few days (we suggest 3 to 5 days).

Delayed Retelling

After the selected time span, students wrote what they remembered from the story in both the target language and their first language (Spanish). The first language is required only if the teacher knows this language in order to give the students the opportunity to express their ideas perhaps more efficiently without dealing with the difficulty of the target language.

Analysis of Retellings

Retellings can be used to qualitatively or quantitatively analyze the content of reading that is recalled after shadow reading. Analysis of immediate and delayed recalls can help distinguish how information is processed and stored in short-term memory and how it is processed and selected for permanent storage in long-term memory. In our studies, we only performed a quantitative analysis to obtain a numerical score, and we used a rubric (Appendix C) to measure the students' degree of retention and comprehension of the essential information in the text that was shadowed.

MEDIATING COMPREHENSION THROUGH COLLABORATIVE INTERACTIONS

The second question addressed in this study focuses on the collaborative interactions that occurred during shadow-reading and how they contributed to mediate comprehension of the text. In order to analyze interactive behaviors between Readers and Shadowers in our research on shadow-reading (Commander & Guerrero, 2013) we identified episodes of interaction in which the learners clarified doubts, corrected themselves or their partner, reformulated and elaborated text, among other behaviors. These interactive behaviors contributed to either solving language-related problems in the comprehension of a text or to discussing idea-related situations in a text (Commander & Guerrero, 2013). Typically, the interactions were found to take place within a

collaborative frame: (1) a comment, question, or correction by one of the interlocutors when difficulties, doubts, or incongruences arose during the reading; (2) feedback, negotiation, modification, or corrections by partner to address the situation; and (3) a resulting behavior or change based on the comment and/or feedback. It is assumed that the comment and feedback facilitated the comprehension of the text and gave way to the construction of meaning because of the mutual assistance that occurred between the learners. Swain (2000) refers to similar interactions as collaborative dialogue, a tool of cognitive activity which leads to knowledge building of language as students use the target language, processing it more deeply and pushing knowledge to output more than what individual processing of input does. Swain analyzes the importance of deeper processing of language in collaborative dialogue as conducive to the fulfillment of various roles in output: noticing, hypothesis testing, and reflection. The first role, noticing, could also occur in shadow reading as learners have to produce output in the required repetition tasks, and they become aware of a gap between what they want to express and their competence to do so. Therefore, if the oral utterance cannot be repeated because of a perceived, "noticed" difficulty, some type of interaction between the interlocutors could occur to address the problem. If the learner tries to complete or correct a repetition through several attempts, hypothesis testing, a second role of output, could be taking place. A possible result of this action would be deeper lexical and syntactic processing as well as the construction of meaning of the text. Finally, when the learner's output is produced, and the interlocutor responds to it, a learner can reflect on the response and modify it if necessary, a process which fulfills the third role of output and can result in the appropriation of the changes.

Examples of Students' Interactions during Shadow-Reading

The following excerpts, taken from the data in our studies, are offered here to illustrate the types of interactions that teachers might expect from students during the various steps of a shadow-reading session: *other- and self-correction*, *chunking*, *inferencing, syntactic reformulation, paraphrasing,* and *commenting on content and macrostructure of text.* These episodes are examples of interactions that resulted in some resolution or modification of an aspect of the reading task at hand. The first two excerpts are examples of complete shadowing (i.e., repeating everything as in the model), and they illustrate other- and self-correction, chunking, and inferencing. (R=Reader; S=Shadower)

Excerpt 1

R   (reads text out loud) The Miller family adopt Bob
S   (out loud repetition) The Miller family <u>adopted</u> Bob (*Other-correction occurs as a result of noticing the mispronunciation of <u>adopted</u> by the Reader.*)
S   (soft voice repetition) The Miller family adopted Bob
S   (silent shadowing)
R   (reads text out loud) and the Garland family <u>adopted</u> Eddy *(Self-correction occurs also as a result of noticing the Shadower's previous correction.*)
S   (out loud repetition) and the Garland family adopted Eddy
S   (soft voice repetition) and the Garland family adopted Eddy
S   (silent shadowing)

In Excerpt 1, the Reader mispronounces the verb *adopted* (drops the *-ed* ending); the Shadower notices the error and self-corrects the pronunciation in his repetition. The Reader then also notices the correction and self-corrects. From then on, both learners produce the word "adopted" correctly. This excerpt shows how the learners' modifications helped solve a language-related problem while reading the text.

In Excerpt 2 below, another dyad is also working in the complete shadowing mode. This excerpt includes samples of *chunking* and *inferencing*.

Excerpt 2

R (reads text out loud) Later Bob and Eddy find out that they have another sibling.
S Can you repeat please? (request for assistance)
R Later Bob and Eddy find out (*Chunking* provided to simplify shadowing.)
S (out loud repetition) Later Bob and Eddy find out (results in correct shadowing)
R that they have another sibling
S (out loud repetition) they … oh, jeez … Can you repeat please? (request for assistance)
R that they have another sibling
S (out loud repetition) that they have another sibling (results in correct shadowing)
S (soft voice repetition) that they have another sibling
S (silent shadowing)
R (reads text out loud) His name is David Kellman.
S (out loud repetition) His name is David … oh, my God, this is the brother of the Bob and Eddy. (*inferencing* in comment)
R Yeah … it's the brother (acceptance of inference)
S OK, OK (affirmation of inference)

The Shadower, possibly having problems in shadowing a long line of text, asks the reader to repeat. The reader chunks the line into two segments, making repetition easier. The difficult word *sibling* is also involved, and this may be causing lack of comprehension for the Shadower. However, the interactive comment at the end, where the idea of *sibling* is paraphrased as *brother*, is indicative that the Shadower has achieved understanding through *inferencing*. The inference is acknowledged by the Reader and reaffirmed by the Shadower. This episode shows how some collaborative interactions between the learners result in attainment of meaning and not just the solving of a language problem.

In the next example in Excerpt 3, we illustrate a student's *selective* shadowing without collaborative interaction. S*elf-correction* and *syntactic reformulation* are identified.

Excerpt 3

R (reads text out loud) Bob [majlər] … Bob Miller [mɪlər] is happy at his new school. (*self-correction* of pronunciation)
S He's happy at his new school. (*syntactic reformulation* of *Bob Miller,* a proper noun, to *He,* its correct pronoun.)
R (reads text out loud) "Hi Bob," they say.
S They say Hi to Bob. (*syntactic reformulation* while keeping meaning)

First, it can be observed that the Reader self-corrects the pronunciation of *Miller*, thus solving a language-related problem. Then the Shadower varies the syntax in the text two times. First, he correctly uses the pronoun *he* to substitute the proper noun *Bob Miller*. Then, he changes direct speech ("*Hi Bob," they say*) to indirect speech (*They say Hi to Bob).* In both instances the meaning of the text is kept. Syntactic processing of this sort shows that in selective shadowing, if a Reader goes beyond mere repetition of selected words and is able to restate ideas in another way, he is processing the text at a higher level.

Excerpt 4 below provides an instance of *summarizing*, in this case, an oral summary of the entire Part I. In this excerpt, as the Shadower summarizes, the partner intervenes. The interaction thus turns collaborative, as both partners prompt each other and jointly contribute to produce an oral version of the text.

Excerpt 4

S   Bob have a new school. He is friendly. The friends say, "Hi Eddy." He doesn't understand and …

R   (interrupts) He doesn't understand because the people call Eddy, you know.

S   Another school. Uhmm … she, he look like Eddy … same color hair, same feet, same color hair.

R   (interrupts) Talk to me about curious who is Eddy … Bob look Eddy. He have the same color feet and …

S.   They also have the same birth, curly hair. (Both laugh.) Oh my God.

R   (interrupts) He in the finish … he knew who is Eddy … call to Eddy … he see the difference, you know, the same color, the same hair, the same feet.

S   Yeah.

The summary in Excerpt 4 contains several of the main ideas in Part I of the text, comments about the content, and supplying of information by the Reader as if prompting his partner to continue summarizing. More importantly, the summary also displays instances of paraphrasing, self-correction, and adaptations to the learner's own level of L2 development, all evidence of the process of intelligent and transformative—rather than meaningless and mechanical—imitation that Vygotsky (1978) claimed is fundamental in learning. Towards the end, the Shadower hints having made an inference by reacting with a laugh shared with the Reader and says, *"Oh my God"* as a way of revealing the discovery of information not stated in the text. The Reader, who has appropriated the Shadower's role with constant interruptions, states the inference in his own words to which the Shadower shows agreement. The collaborative nature of the interaction aids in the construction of the inference.

BENEFITS/USES OF THE TECHNIQUE

Following are some of the benefits and uses of shadow-reading that we have derived from applying it in the ESL classroom as well as from our empirical research on the technique.

- Shadow-reading is mostly beneficial in the reading class because of its socially-interactive nature, which promotes the joint construction of meaning. In fact, verbalized interaction between learners is one of the essential components for the success of the strategy because

it involves "speaking as mediation" in the comprehension of written texts (Appel & Lantolf, 1994, p. 437). The interaction in shadow-reading encourages the activation of learners' respective ZPDs. As a peer-mediated activity, shadow-reading provides affordances for mutual assistance, as both Reader and Shadower correct each other, help each other understand, and produce text. Students have the opportunity to solve language-related problems and to mutually build comprehension as they share inferences, elaborations, and conclusions. Shadow-reading also promotes transformative imitation, an essential mechanism for internalization of the L2 or FL. Therefore, talk that takes place during peer-led discussions of a reading text helps readers explore, create, shape, and refine comprehension as they capitalize on language as a mediator.

- Shadow-reading fundamentally relies on repetition. We believe that repetition, that is, persistent exposure to language models and learners' repetitive attempts to meaningfully imitate these models, contributes greatly to the effectiveness of the technique. Listening to text that a partner reads in order to repeat requires attention to the language and ideas for adequate reprocessing and production of the input. In addition, the multiple times that the segments are repeated promote retention of the ideas and offer intensive practice with the language. In the role of Readers, students have to provide good models for Shadowers to be able to grasp ideas and repeat meaningfully. To do this, Readers frequently need to chunk sentences into manageable units that make sense, with adequate pauses and clear phonological enunciation. Chunking requires awareness of syntactic, semantic, and phonological aspects of language to handle a text accurately and fluently. As Shadowers, students are required to listen attentively, discriminate and articulate sounds, repeat with clarity and understanding, and internalize L2 segments for later use (in summarizing and retelling phases).
- Oral summarizing is another key ingredient of shadow-reading that contributes to its success. In summarizing, learners need to state the gist of a text as they paraphrase it in their own words. In doing so, they create a new version of the text as they process it at a deeper level, clarify any confusing parts, appropriate ideas, and re-verbalize them in condensed form.
- Written retelling benefits both teachers and students. As a measure of comprehension, retellings allow teachers to examine whether students can identify main ideas and supporting details rendering an accurate recall of essential information. Students also benefit because retelling gives them yet another opportunity to process and internalize the language and thus engage in "output" for learning, as Swain (2000) contends.

POSSIBLE ADAPTATIONS

One of the advantages of the technique described here is that is can be adapted to suit the needs and characteristics of specific classrooms. Some aspects of shadow-reading which may undergo modification are the following:

- Texts of different length can be used. The one presented in this paper is fairly long because it is a complete story in two parts. There is no reason the technique cannot be applied to shorter pieces or to just one part of a story text.
- Texts do not necessarily have to be of the narrative type. Other genres may be applied. In fact, shadow-reading may be utilized in content-based language courses, where there is a strong focus on the subject to be learned and a prevalence of expository texts. The

technique seems ideal for understanding, discussing, and memorizing content as well as learning the L2.

- The procedures for repetition may be simplified. Our system was designed to ensure frequent and varied opportunities for reproducing a text, and thus it involves three modes: complete, selective, and interactive shadowing. Complete shadowing in turn is done in three ways: out loud, softly, and silently. Teachers may experiment with less variation in repetition. However, we strongly recommend not omitting the interactive mode of shadowing because of its crucial role in providing social mediation.

- Shadow-reading may be implemented with L2 or FL readers of all ages and proficiency levels, from beginning to advanced. The ability to repeat with understanding and to summarize or recall an L2 or FL text presents challenges at all levels, even the most proficient. The key resides in selecting appropriate texts that are attuned to the learners' developmental potentials.

Millie Commander is a professor of English and Linguistics in the graduate and undergraduate programs of TESL at Inter American University, Metropolitan Campus, in Puerto Rico, where she teaches courses in L2 reading, writing, methodology, acquisition, and linguistics. Her research interests include reading processes in L2 language reading, vocabulary development, and Vygotskyan theories in reading. She has published articles in Language Teaching Research and Reading in a Foreign Language.

E-mail: mvcommander@yahoo.com

María C. M. de Guerrero is a retired professor from Inter American University of Puerto Rico, Metropolitan Campus, where she taught ESL and TESL courses for over 30 years. Dr. Guerrero has done research on second language learning primarily from a sociocultural theory perspective. Her publications include articles in journals such as Applied Linguistics, Issues in Applied Linguistics, Language Teaching Research, and The Modern Language Journal. She has also published the book Inner speech - L2: Thinking Words in a Second Language and has contributed chapters in Vygotskian Approaches to Second Language Research, Language Development over the Lifespan, Feedback in Second Language Writing, and Elicited Metaphor Analysis in Educational Discourse.

E-mail: mcmdeguerrero@gmail.com

REFERENCES

Anderson, N. J. (2009). ACTIVE reading: The research base for a pedagogical approach in the reading classroom. In Z. Han & N. J. Anderson (Eds.), *Second language reading research and instruction: Crossing the Boundaries* (pp. 117-143). Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Appel, G., & Lantolf, J. P. (1994). Speaking as mediation: A study of L1 and L2 text recall tasks. *The Modern Language Journal, 78*(4), 437-452.

Commander, M. & Guerrero, M. C. M. de. (2012, Summer). Shadow-reading in the ESL classroom: A brief report. *PeerSpectives, 9*, 8-11. Retrieved from https://peerspectives.files.wordpress.com/2010/04/shadow-reading1.pdf

Commander, M., & Guerrero, M. C. M. de. (2013). Reading as a social interactive process: The impact of shadow-reading in L2 classrooms, *Reading in a Foreign Language, 25*(2), 170-191.

Guerrero, M. C. M., de & Commander, M. (2013). Shadow-reading: Affordances for imitation in the language classroom. *Language Teaching Research, 17*(4), 433–453. doi:10.1177/1362168813494125

Heyer, S. (1987). *True stories in the news.* White Plains, NY: Longman.

Murphey, T. (2000). *Shadowing and summarizing* [NFLRC video #11]. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center.

Murphey, T. (2001a). Exploring conversational shadowing. *Language Teaching Research, 5*(2), 128-155.

Murphey, T. (2001b). Tools of recursion, intermental zones of proximal development, and critical collaborative autonomy. *JALT Journal, 23*(1), 130-150.

Ogle, D., & Correa-Kovtun, A. (2010). Supporting English-language learners and struggling readers in content literacy with the "Partner Reading and Content, Too" routine. *The Reading Teacher, 63*(7), 532–542.

Saito, Y., Nagasawa, Y., & Ishikawa, S. (2011). Effective instruction of shadowing using a movie. In A.Stewart (Ed.), *JALT2010 Conference Proceedings*. Tokyo: JALT.

Stone, R. J. (2013). *A teacher's guide to academic reading: Focusing on the academic reading demands of ESL Learners* (Master's thesis, Brigham Young University). Available from All Theses and Dissertations. Paper 3882.

Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 97-114). New York: Oxford University Press.

Tannen, D. (2007). *Talking voices. Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse.* 2nd ed. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Teaching tips 11. (n.d.). *Developing Teachers.com.* http://www.developingteachers.com/tips/pasttips11.htm

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society. The development of higher psychological processes.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wiltshier, J. (2007). Fluency through shadowing–What, why, and how? In K. Bradford-Watts (Ed.), *JALT2006 Conference Proceedings*. Tokyo: JALT.

Zakeri, E. (2014). The effect of shadowing on EFL learners' oral performance in terms of fluency. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*, *2*(1), 21-26.

APPENDICES

Appendix A. Story Text

Lost and Found*****

Part I

Bob Miller is happy at his new school. The students are friendly. "Hi, Bob!" they say. But some students say, "Hi, Eddy!" Bob doesn't understand. He asks another student, "Why do some students call me Eddy?"

"Oh, that's easy to explain," the student says. "Eddy Garland was a student here last year. Now he goes to a different school. You look like Eddy. Some students think you're Eddy."

One day Bob meets Eddy Garland. The student is right. Bob looks like Eddy. Bob and Eddy have the same color eyes and the same smile. They have the same dark, curly hair. They also have the same birthday and are both adopted.

Part II

Bob and Eddy realize that they are twin brothers. When the boys were born, the Miller family adopted Bob, and the Garland family adopted Eddy. No one told the boys that they had a brother.

Later Bob and Eddy find out that they have another sibling. His name is David Kellman. Bob and Eddy meet David. He looks like Bob and Eddy. He has the same color eyes and the same smile. He has the same dark, curly hair. Also, he has the same birthday and is adopted too.

Why does David look like Bob and Eddy? Why does he have the same birthday? You can probably guess. Bob, Eddy, and David are triplets.

*Storyline based on Heyer's (1987) *True Stories in the News*; original text was modified in grammar, vocabulary, and organization to adapt to students' level of proficiency.

Appendix B. Shadow-Reading Task

Instructions for Students

1. Partners and roles
- A reading partner will be assigned to you. Sit facing each other.
- Partner A will be *reader* and Partner B will be s*hadower*.

2. Following instructions
- Follow instructions on this page.
- Call teacher if necessary.

3. Shadow-reading of Part I
- Partner A reads orally and Partner B shadows. *Interaction* can take place at any moment.
- Follow this sequence for each paragraph:
  a. Partner A reads each sentence; chunking is sometimes necessary.

b. Partner B shadows out loud, in low voice, and silently.

c. Partner A reads each sentence again.

d. Partner B shadows selectively each sentence, then summarizes paragraph.

4. Summarizing of Part I

- Partner B summarizes ALL of Part I.
- Call teacher when finished with Part I.

5. Part II

- Reverse roles for Part II. (Partner A will be *shadower* and Partner B will be *reader*.)
- Follow same sequence as in Part I.
- Call teacher when finished with Part II.

6. Important

- After you finish Part I and II, you will be given a sheet to write down in English everything you remember from the entire reading selection.
- Next week you will be asked something based on the selection that you read today.

Appendix C. Raters' Rubric for Assessing Written Retellings

Rating	Description	Score
Excellent	Well-developed retelling with accurate recall of essential information	4
Good	Fairly developed retelling with satisfactory recall of information	3
Average	Loose development of retelling with some inaccuracies in recall of information	2
Poor	Incomplete, disjointed or vague development of retelling, missing essential content with serious inaccuracies in recall of information	1
No attempt	Failure to retell information	0