

Gordon, J., Darcy, I., & Ewert, D. (2013). Pronunciation teaching and learning: Effects of explicit phonetic instruction in the L2 classroom. In J. Levis & K. LeVelle (Eds.). *Proceedings of the 4th Pronunciation in Second Language Learning and Teaching Conference*. Aug. 2012. (pp. 194-206). Ames, IA: Iowa State University.

PRONUNCIATION TEACHING AND LEARNING: EFFECTS OF EXPLICIT PHONETIC INSTRUCTION IN THE L2 CLASSROOM

[Joshua Gordon](#), Indiana University

[Isabelle Darcy](#), Indiana University

[Doreen Ewert](#), University of San Francisco

This classroom-based study investigated how explicit instruction influences the acquisition of L2 phonological features, and how their production contributes to comprehensible speech in L2 learners. Three groups of ESL learners ($n=30$) received pronunciation instruction during three weeks (25 minutes/day, 3 days/week) using the same teaching sequence within a communicative methodology (Celce-Murcia, Brinton, & Goodwin, 2010; Hinkel, 2006). Groups differed in the type of explicit instruction received: two experimental groups received explicit instruction either on suprasegmental or segmental features. A combination of these features was presented orally to the third group without explicit instruction. Pretest and posttest recordings indicate that only the explicit group trained on suprasegmentals improved its comprehensibility scores significantly from pretest to posttest. An analysis of classroom-treatment recordings demonstrates that explicit phonetic instruction that makes learners notice L2 features (i.e., explicit presentation of contents, guided analysis and practice, and corrective feedback) can be beneficial for L2 learners in the development of comprehensible speech. The results also corroborate a major role of prosody in enhanced comprehensibility (e.g., Derwing, Munro, & Wiebe, 1998; Munro, 1995) and a call for more explicit phonetic instruction within a communicative methodology (e.g., Celce-Murcia et al., 2010).

Different pronunciation studies have demonstrated the benefits of explicit phonetic instruction in pronunciation learning (e.g., Lord, 2005; Saito & Lyster, 2012a, 2012b). However, the effects of instruction targeting segmentals or suprasegmentals in comprehensibility (e.g., Derwing, Munro, & Wiebe, 1998) or the application of laboratory training studies to classroom instruction (e.g., Pennington & Ellis, 2000) has not been investigated in large intensive language programs where the implementation of pronunciation instruction is sometimes limited. This classroom-based study investigated how explicit instruction influences the acquisition of second language (L2) segmentals or suprasegmentals, and how their production contributes to comprehensible speech in L2 learners in a large intensive language program. The study was implemented in three intact English as a second language (ESL) classes where learners received explicit instruction in either segmentals or suprasegmentals, or no explicit instruction. This treatment implementation took place during three weeks (three days, 25 minutes each day), and the results suggest a major role of prosody in enhancing comprehensibility in learners even when instruction is limited to small periods of time in class. Additionally, a qualitative analysis of the classroom-treatment implementation demonstrated that explicit phonetic instruction that guides learners to notice L2 features—and the ambiguities that could arise in production as a result of errors—could be beneficial in the development of comprehensible speech. We first present some background information that motivated our study as well as our methodology followed by our discussion and conclusions for pronunciation teaching.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Nonnative pronunciation is perceived in the production of both segmentals and suprasegmentals in L2 speech, it contributes to the perception of foreign accent, and it may lower intelligibility or comprehensibility in speech (Kang, Rubin, & Pickering, 2010; Munro & Derwing, 2008; Trofimovich & Baker, 2006). Additionally, nonnative production of suprasegmentals appears to be more detrimental than segmental errors in L2 comprehensibility and intelligibility perception (see Field, 2005; Kang, et al., 2010). To help L2 learners with these problems, training studies have proven to be beneficial in speech perception/production. For instance, high variability training studies have shown improvement in learners in both perception and production of segmentals and suprasegmentals (see Bradlow, Akahane-Yamada, Pisoni, & Tohkura, 1997; Wang, Spence, Jongman & Sereno, 1999; Wang, Jongman & Sereno, 2003). Additionally, Pennington and Ellis (2000) demonstrated that directing learners' attention to and raising their awareness of prosodic features of the L2 during training improved their interpretation of sentence meaning. These results are significant because they call for a stronger role of phonetic explicitness in L2 pronunciation instruction in classroom settings.

In pronunciation teaching, explicit phonetic instruction has demonstrated positive benefits (Lord, 2005) and instruction on suprasegmentals appears to yield better improvements in comprehensibility as opposed to instruction on segmentals only (see Derwing, et al., 1998). Moreover, researchers have also pointed out that L2 learners might not necessarily put into practice in spontaneous speech what they learn under controlled tasks (Celce-Murcia, Brinton, & Goodwin, 2010; Bowen, 1972). This is why a communicative component in pronunciation instruction has been advocated to develop fluent and comprehensible L2 speech (see Celce-Murcia, et al., 2010; Hinkel, 2006).

In spite of the research evidence, one of the real challenges in instruction is to bridge the gap between theory and practice given the disconnection between research in L2 phonology and the real practices in the classroom (see Derwing & Munro, 2005; Levis, 1999). It is also the case that in pronunciation teaching, the communicative framework has often been perceived as incompatible with explicit pronunciation instruction (Darcy, Ewert, & Lidster, 2012; Derwing & Foote, 2011) – even though explicit instruction is necessary to develop accuracy, which is a key factor in communicative competence.¹ Additionally, only a few studies have tried to apply the findings of laboratory phonology research to L2-classroom practices (see Derwing et al., 1998). Therefore, more research that integrates the findings from laboratory studies into real, time-constrained L2 pronunciation instruction—within a communicative methodology—is necessary, given the potential benefits it could bring to learners in the development of comprehensible L2 speech.

THE CURRENT STUDY

Given the importance of comprehensible speech in pronunciation instruction at present (Levis, 2005, 2006),² we investigated the development of comprehensibility in L2 learners through

¹ Accuracy, or “grammatical competence” in the syntactic and phonological levels is one of the cornerstones of communicative competence. See Savignon (2000) for a review of communicative competence in language teaching.

² *Comprehensibility* refers to a listener's estimation of difficulty in understanding an utterance produced by an L2 speaker, and it is usually measured using some form of scale (Munro, Derwing, & Morton, 2006). Levis (2005, 2006) explains that both *intelligibility* and *comprehensibility* are related terms. Intelligibility, in the broad sense given by Levis (2006), refers to the listeners' ability to understand speech and “is not usually distinguished from

explicit phonetic instruction within a communicative methodology. The study was guided by the following research questions:

1. Does short-term, explicit pronunciation instruction increase comprehensibility more than nonexplicit instruction?
2. Does instruction in suprasegmental features increase comprehensibility more than instruction in segmental features?

The details of instruction and the measurements of comprehensibility in speech through a pretest and a posttest are explained in the next sections.

Participants

Three intact intermediate speaking classes (Level Six out of seven institutional levels) in an intensive English program at a large American university participated in the study (see Table 1). Thirty students distributed among these three classes were the potential participants in the study. Native speakers of American English also participated in the study in three different ways. First, two speakers (male and female) prepared the pre and posttest sentences used as prompts. Second, another group of 10 speakers recorded the same sentences as the learners, in the same conditions, for comparison purposes. These speakers recorded the sentences only once. Finally, an additional group of 12 speakers participated in the comprehensibility rating of the learners' productions after the posttest. These raters were graduate students in linguistics or language teaching.

Table 1

L2 Learners and L1 English Participants

| Participants | Group | Condition | <i>n</i> | TOEFL Score |
|--------------|----------------|--------------------------|----------|-------------|
| Speakers | 1. L2 Learners | Suprasegmental | 12 (4) | 499.41 |
| | 2. L2 Learners | Segmental | 8 (4) | 514.22 |
| | 3. L2 Learners | Nonexplicit | 10 (4) | 484.85 |
| | 4. L1 Speakers | Baseline | 10 (4) | |
| Listeners | L1 Speakers | Comprehensibility rating | 12 | |

Note: Numbers in the fourth column represent the original number of students in each class as well as the actual number of students (in parentheses) who were included in the final analyses.

Instruction

This study followed a pretest-posttest experimental design. The two treatment groups (i.e., suprasegmental and segmental groups hereafter) received treatment during three weeks, three days per week, and 25 minutes each day (total: 225 minutes of instruction). To implement a communicative methodology, each lesson followed a presentation-practice-production sequence

closely related terms such as comprehensibility” (p. 252). However, for the purpose of this study, we will use the term *comprehensibility* as the main goal to attain in pronunciation instruction.

(Chamot, Barnhardt, El-Dinary, & Robbins, 1990). This was used so that teachers could introduce phonetic content explicitly, guide the students in controlled tasks, and then provide room for a communicative activity where learners could produce and put into practice each lesson's content.

Each experimental group received explicit phonetic instruction in either specific suprasegmentals (i.e., stress, rhythm, linking, reductions) or segmentals (i.e., vowels /i, ɪ, æ, ε/). We targeted these specific segmentals and suprasegmentals because pronunciation materials have pointed out the difficulty they pose for different L1 groups when learning English (see Avery & Ehrlich, 1992). The third group (i.e., nonexplicit group) did not receive explicit pronunciation instruction but engaged in the same practice and production activities of the two treatment groups. Table 2 presents the details of the treatment used.

Table 2
Classroom Treatment Description

| Stages and Techniques | Class 1 (n=12) Suprasegmentals | Class 2 (n=8) Segmentals | Class 3 (n=10) Nonexplicit |
|---|--|--|--|
| Presentation Visual aids Oral introduction of topic | Explicit instruction and analysis | Explicit instruction and analysis | Nonexplicit instruction, pronunciation practice announced |
| Practice Bottom-up skills, analysis, recognition & discrimination minimal pair drills, reading short passages | Rhythm, stress, reductions, linking. | Vowels /i, ɪ, æ, ε/ and articulation, vowel contrasts, minimal pairs | Classroom drills on words, phrases, and sentences; combination of the same materials as the other two groups |
| Production Top-down skills, fluency activities | Communicative tasks: Pair discussion, group discussion, role-plays, information-gap activities | | |

As seen in Table 2, the experimental groups received explicit phonetic instruction and analysis of content in the topic introduction stage. In contrast, the nonexplicit group only received an announcement that pronunciation would be practiced. For the practice stage, the experimental groups carried out different tasks, such as minimal-pair recognition and discrimination, or analysis of stress and rhythm in short passages and sentences. The nonexplicit group listened to and repeated words, phrases, and sentences during this stage.³ Finally, the three groups had similar production tasks such as pair and group discussions, role-plays, or information-gap activities. To measure the effects of instruction in the development of comprehensibility, we collected pre- and posttreatment speech samples from the L2 learners who participated in the study, which we later presented to a group of L1 English speakers in a comprehensibility-rating

³ These words, phrases, and sentences were taken from the materials used in the two experimental groups.

task.

All the treatment sessions were audio recorded, and one of the researchers sat in the three classes as a nonparticipant observer. The audio recordings were later broadly transcribed to analyze what happened in each class to verify implementation of the experimental design (see van Lier, 1988).

Pretest and Posttest

All the participants from the three classes were audio-recorded individually before and after treatment. The recordings took place in a sound-isolated booth in a psycholinguistics laboratory. The participants recorded sentences through a delayed-sentence repetition task using prompts previously recorded by two L1-speakers (male & female) of American English (see Trofimovich & Baker, 2006). There were 24 sentences for the pretest and 48 sentences for the posttest (i.e., the same 24 sentences from the pretest plus 24 new sentences for generalization purposes). These sentences were carefully designed to have at least a word with one of the four vowel sounds studied by the segmental group (i.e., / i, ɪ, æ, ε /), or function words (e.g., articles, prepositions) that could trigger vowel reduction—a key aspect in stress-timing and rhythm, which were studied by the suprasegmental group.

Given the classroom-based nature of this study, attrition was very high because of two factors. First, a high number of participants from the three L2-groups missed classes on a regular basis or enrolled later in the course, and second, the delayed-sentence repetition task was challenging for the majority of L2-learners and many sentences were simply not accurately produced. Because of these problems, for our final analysis we selected only speech samples from four participants from each of the three classes who completed the treatment sessions. Therefore, in the final analysis we only included (a) sentences that were produced by those L2 learners who completed the treatment in its entirety, and (b) sentences that were produced correctly in both tests. In order to have comparable numbers across groups, we only used sentences from four L1-English speakers (4 L2-participants x 3 groups = 12 participants + 4 L1-English speakers = 16 speakers). This gave us a total of eight pretest sentences and sixteen posttest sentences per participant to use in the comprehensibility-rating task (8 pretest + 16 posttest = 24 sentences per participants, totaling 384 sentences). These sentences were presented to a group of twelve L1-English listeners to be rated for comprehensibility. These raters were graduate students in linguistics or language teaching. In the rating task, six raters listened to half of the total amount of sentences and the other six raters listened to the other half to avoid fatigue. The raters listened to the sentences in a computer lab through high-quality headphones. Each sentence was rated using a 9-point Likert scale (1=*extremely easy to understand*, 9=*impossible to understand*) similar to the one used in other studies and which has proved to yield highly reliable ratings (see Derwing & Munro, 1997; Munro & Derwing, 1995). The results of this comprehensibility task are presented below together with a qualitative analysis of the implementation of instruction in class.

RESULTS

Quantitative

The inter-rater reliability coefficients (Cronbach's alpha) computed across all ratings given for each list were high (.92 and .92), which indicated very strong agreement (LeBreton & Senter, 2008). Learners obtained equal performance for repeated and new sentences at the posttest (no effect of *sentence type* [new vs. repeated] and no interaction with *group*, both $p > .05$), allowing us to collapse new and repeated sentences at posttest for the comparison with pretest ratings.

Table 3 shows the average rating obtained for each group at each time. Only the suprasegmental group significantly improved from pretest to posttest in comprehensibility, their mean rating being closer to the L1 speakers’.

Table 3

Average ratings for pretest and posttest for each group

| Group | Pretest | (SE) | Posttest | (SE) | Significant difference? |
|----------------|---------|------|----------|------|-------------------------|
| Suprasegmental | 4.2 | .39 | 3.6 | .38 | * |
| Segmental | 4.5 | .39 | 4.8 | .38 | * |
| Nonexplicit | 4.4 | .38 | 4.2 | .38 | >.05 |
| L1 Speakers | 1.1 | .38 | 1.1 | .38 | >.05 |

Note: SE is the standard error of the mean.

A global mixed effects model declaring the factors *test* (pretest and posttest), and *group* (suprasegmental, segmental, nonexplicit, L1-English speakers) was conducted with speakers, token, and raters as random effects. There was no main effect of *test* ($F_{1,1371} = 2.3, p > .1$), but a large effect of *group*, ($F_{3, 12} = 39.0, p < .001$), and a significant interaction of *group* and *test* ($F_{3, 2032} = 7.5, p < .001$) suggesting that the groups received different ratings at each time, and that this difference was modulated by the kind of treatment received. The interaction remained significant when restricting the analysis to L2 learners only ($F_{2, 1649} = 9.7, p < .001$), indicating that the performance at each test varied as a function of the treatment received.

Qualitative

It is important to stress that we provided the materials and lesson plans to the three collaborating teachers in this project, but their implementation in class was left to their own teaching preferences. We codified themes and categories using a comparative method (Glasser & Strauss, 1967; Richards, 2003). The analysis revealed important findings in terms of explicit versus nonexplicit instruction, such as clarifications of ambiguities caused by mispronunciations, and reinforcements of concepts through feedback and explanations.

One of the clearest differences between the experimental and nonexplicit groups confirmed that the level of explicit phonetic information given by the teachers to signal possible communication problems was higher in both experimental groups—as intended in our research design. For example, both teachers in the experimental groups introduced topics emphasizing the ambiguities that mispronunciations could create in meaning. Two passages presented in Appendixes 1a and 1b show the teachers introducing word stress and the contrast /i-ɪ/ in class. In contrast, the nonexplicit group did not receive this type of instruction, and the teacher only gave the students an announcement of pronunciation instruction followed by asking the students to listen and repeat, as shown in Appendix 1c.

It is also important to stress that teachers in the experimental groups were consistent in making learners aware of how mispronunciation could create communication problems not only when introducing content, but also in controlled and communicative tasks. This was not the case in the nonexplicit group where learners’ attention was not directed to these issues. Appendix 2a shows the teacher in the suprasegmental group instructing the students to carry out a conversation in

groups of three, but taking turns monitoring each other and paying special attention to prosodic aspects analyzed before. Similarly, Appendix 2b shows the teacher in the segmental group pointing out communication problems when mispronouncing /i-ɪ/ in a very common minimal pair. In contrast, even in communicative activities in the nonexplicit group, the teacher directed the students to carry out the task (like a conversation in groups), but there was no information about phonetic elements or feedback on the learners' pronunciation—as shown in Appendix 2c.

The teachers in the two experimental groups also reinforced content while the students worked in pairs or groups. This was done by providing feedback, making comprehension checks, or assisting the students individually when there were very specific problems with either segmentals or suprasegmentals. On the contrary, the students in the nonexplicit group did not receive this type of reinforcement. Instead, most of their attention during instruction was focused on meaning and not on any analysis of phonetic phenomena. Although the students in both experimental groups also had communicative activities where meaning was important—especially in regard to the differences in meaning that mispronunciations could create—the teachers also raised the students' awareness that these ambiguities in meaning can be the result of problems with the pronunciation of the vowels or suprasegmentals studied. These differences are seen in Appendices 3a and 3b, where the teacher in the suprasegmental group helps a student with the stress in a sentence while working in pairs (3a), or the teacher in the nonexplicit group asks the students to share comments on issues discussed previously—in terms of meaning but not on phonetic information (3b).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The quantitative analysis of the rating task and the qualitative analysis of the classroom implementation provide compelling evidence for the role of form-focused instruction for pronunciation in the communicative classroom. First, in the suprasegmental group, the explicit phonetic information regarding possible miscommunication issues that come up as a result of suprasegmental problems and directed feedback on production resulted in improved comprehensibility ratings. This was not the case in the nonexplicit group where the students only repeated words and phrases or had activities that emphasized fluency. This supports research which has shown that a lack of focus on form can develop fluency in learners but not necessarily accuracy in their production (see Lyster & Ranta, 1997) as well as research that indicates the positive effects of feedback in pronunciation instruction (e.g., Saito & Lyster, 2012a & b). Together, the evidence that directing learners' attention to prosodic forms enhances interpretation of sentence meaning (see Pennington & Ellis, 2000), and the evidence from this study that directing learners' attention to linguistic features that often obscure meaning improves production provide a strong rationale for the inclusion of components of explicit pronunciation instruction in the communicative classroom.

The differences in the comprehensibility ratings of the two experimental groups, however, raise questions of how best to introduce different types of pronunciation content. In general terms, the suprasegmental group appears to have had a more global, complex, and explicit analysis of the suprasegmentals content than the segmental group did with its content. The suprasegmental group analyzed rhythm, stress, linking, and reductions in words, phrases, sentences, and more complex discourse units such as short passages. On the other hand, the segmental group focused its analysis on only four vowel sounds, and this was primarily done in the meaning differences among lexical items. As demonstrated by previous research, this probably did not fully engage the attention capacity of learners in the segmental group by only focusing on the pronunciation

of those vowel sounds and not other global aspects that also affect speech perception (see Derwing et al., 1998; Schmidt, 2001). These differences may account for the ratings, but more controlled research will be necessary in the future in order to determine if this is an adequate analysis.

In conclusion, the results of this study point out that explicit phonetic instruction benefits L2 learners overall, which confirms previous results (e.g., Derwing et al., 1998; Levis, 1999; Lord, 2005). These results demonstrate that even adding only a relatively time-limited explicit pronunciation component in a primarily communicative classroom can lead to beneficial results in production for learners. In addition, the qualitative analysis demonstrates that complex classroom interactions of instructional focus and teacher implementation can make a difference in learner development, as demonstrated in the differences in explicitness between the experimental and nonexplicit groups in this study. Finally, although segmental instruction is indeed necessary and important, the difference in outcomes between the two treatment groups suggests that explicit suprasegmental instruction may give learners a faster improvement in comprehensibility rather than only focusing on a few vowel sounds.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Joshua Gordon is a doctoral candidate in the Department of Second Language Studies at Indiana University. He has taught ESL, EFL, and Spanish as a foreign language. His research interests include second language phonology and second language pedagogy, particularly the interface between both areas in the teaching and learning of pronunciation skills.

Affiliation: Indiana University

Address: 1021 E 3rd St, Memorial Hall 315. Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405.

Email: jgordonz@indiana.edu

Isabelle Darcy is Associate Professor in the Department of Second Language Studies at Indiana University, where she teaches graduate courses in methodologies for teaching pronunciation. She obtained a Ph.D. in Linguistics and Cognitive Science from the Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales in Paris (France) and from the Johannes Gutenberg University in Mainz (Germany), for which she was given an Outstanding Dissertation award. Her research focus is the acquisition of second language phonology, as well as native and nonnative speech perception and word recognition.

Affiliation: Indiana University

Address: 1021 E 3rd St, Memorial Hall 301. Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405.

Email: idarcy@indiana.edu

Doreen Ewert is Associate Professor and Director of the Academic English for Multilingual Students Program in the Department of Rhetoric and Language at the University of San Francisco. She has taught ESL/EFL learners, trained SL/FL teachers, and directed ESL programs for pre-matriculated and matriculated adult learners for several decades. She obtained a Ph.D. in Linguistics at Indiana University. Her work includes language curricular design and implementation, pre- and in-service language teacher development workshops and adult SL literacy development. Her research focus is on SL/FL reading and writing development, curriculum implementation, and teacher development.

Affiliation: University of San Francisco

Address: 130 Fulton St., Kalmanovitz Hall 205. University of San Francisco, San Francisco, CA 94117.

Email: dewert@usfca.edu

REFERENCES

- Avery, P., & Ehrlich, S. (1992). *Teaching American English pronunciation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bowen, J. D. (1972). Contextualizing pronunciation practice in the ESOL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 6, 83-94.
- Bradlow, A., Akahane-Yamada, R., Pisoni, D. B., & Tohkura, Y. (1997). Training Japanese listeners to identify English /r/ and /l/: Long-term retention of learning in perception and production. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 61, 977-985.
- Celce-Murcia, M., Brinton, D. M., & Goodwin, J. M. (2010). *Teaching pronunciation: A reference for teachers of English to speakers of other languages*. (2nd ed). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Chamot, A., Barnhard, S., El-Dinary, P., & Robbins, J. (1999). *The learning strategies handbook*. London: Longman.
- Darcy, I., Ewert, D. & Lidster, R. (2012). Bringing pronunciation instruction back into the classroom: An ESL teachers' pronunciation "toolbox." In J. Levis & K. LeVelle (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 3rd Pronunciation in Second Language Learning and Teaching Conference*, (pp. 93-108). Ames, IA: Iowa State University.
- Derwing, T. & Foote, J. (2011). 2010 National survey of pronunciation teaching: Deja vu. Paper presented at the Conference of the *Annual Association for Applied Linguistics*, Chicago, IL, March 26, 2011.
- Derwing, T. M., & Munro, M. J. (1997). Accent, intelligibility, and comprehensibility: Evidence from four L1s. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 1-16.
- Derwing, T. M., Munro, M. J. (2005). Second language accent and pronunciation teaching: A research-based approach. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39, 379-397.
- Derwing, T. M., Munro, M. J., & Wiebe, G. E. (1998). Evidence in favor of a broad framework for pronunciation instruction. *Language Learning*, 48, 393-410.
- Field, J. (2005). Intelligibility and the listener: The role of lexical stress. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39, 399-423.
- Glasser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. New York: Aldine.
- Hinkel, E. (2006). Current perspectives on teaching the four skills. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40, 109-131.
- Kang, O., Rubin, D., & Pickering, L. (2010). Suprasegmental measures of accentedness and judgments of language learner proficiency in oral English. *Modern Language Journal*, 94, 554-566.
- LeBreton, J. M., & Senter, J. L. (2008). Answers to 20 questions about interrater reliability and interrater agreement. *Organizational Research Methods*, 11, 815-852.
- Levis, J. M. (1999). Intonation in theory and practice, revisited. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33, 37-63.
- Levis, J. M. (2005). Changing contexts and shifting paradigms in pronunciation teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39, 369-377.
- Levis, J. M. (2006). Pronunciation and assessment of spoken language. In R. Hughes (Ed.) *Spoken English, TESOL and applied linguistics* (pp. 245-270). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Lord, G. (2005). (How) Can we teach foreign language pronunciation? On the effects of a Spanish phonetics course. *Hispania*, 88, 557-567.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 37-66.
- Munro, M. J. (1995). Nonsegmental factors in foreign accent: Ratings of filtered speech. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 17, 17-34.
- Munro, M. J., & Derwing, T. M. (1995). Foreign accent, comprehensibility, and intelligibility in the speech of second language learners. *Language Learning*, 45, 73-97.
- Munro, M. J. & Derwing, T. M. (2008). Segmental acquisition in adult ESL learners: A longitudinal study of vowel production. *Language Learning*, 58, 479-502.
- Munro, M. J., Derwing, T. M., & Morton, S. L. (2006). The mutual intelligibility of L2 speech. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 111-131.
- Pennington, M. C. & Ellis, N. C. (2000). Cantonese speakers' memory for English sentences with prosodic cues. *Modern Language Journal*, 84, 372-389.
- Richards, K. (2003). *Qualitative inquiry in TESOL*. New York: Palmgrave Macmillan.
- Saito, K., & Lyster, R. (2012a). Effects of form-focused instruction and corrective feedback on L2 pronunciation development of /r/ by Japanese learners of English. *Language Learning*, 62, 595-633.
- Saito, K., & Lyster, R. (2012b). Investigating pedagogical potential of recasts for L2 vowel acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46, 387-398.
- Savignon, S. J. (2000). Communicative language teaching for the twenty-first century. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed) *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.). *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 3-32). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Trofimovich, P. & Baker, W. 2006. Learning second language suprasegmentals: Effects of L2 experience on prosody and fluency characteristics of L2 speech. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 1-30.
- van Lier, L. (1988). *The classroom and the language learner*. New York: Longman.
- Wang, W., Jongman, A., & Sereno, J. A. (2003). Acoustic and perceptual evaluations of Mandarin tone productions before and after perceptual training. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 113, 1033-1043.
- Wang, W., Spence, M. M., Jongman, A., & Sereno, J. A. (1999). Training American listeners to perceive Mandarin tones. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 106, 3649-3658.

Appendix 1

a. Suprasegmental Group:

T: But, [teacher reading from the slide] syllables and words in English contain stress. This means that some syllables in a word, or some words in phrases and sentences are produced longer, louder, and higher. That's what I'm used to listening to, and I would need to hear that stress in order to understand the important information, ok? So, we're going to be learning about that, and... stress can make a difference in the meaning of words and phrases, so for example, if I say this, what is this??

Ss: record...

T: REcord, RE-cord [emphasizing the stress], so the stress is on the first syllable. RE-cord. I'm talking about this [pointing to the picture of a record in the slide]. If... I go over here and I say, re-CORD! re-CORD! then it's different. It means somebody talking into a microphone and recording their voice. So this one is actually a noun, and this one is the verb. Even though they're spelled exactly alike, the stress is different. Ok? And you'll learn as we go along that often with nouns, the stress is on the first syllable, and that same word if it's a verb, the stress shifts to the second one.

b. Segmental Group:

T: So the first one, um... (3s) *peel* like when you have an orange, the hard part on the outside that you don't eat, this is *peel* [teacher shows students the slide with pictures of an orange *peel* and a *pill*. She also emphasizes the vowel pronunciation]

Ss: peel [students repeat]

T: It makes you, feel, feel your, feel your lips going this way, peeeeeel! [teacher emphasizes the pronunciation]

Ss; peel, peel [students repeat]

T: Ok, this like medicine... one... little thing, is a... "pill" [teacher emphasizes the relaxed quality of the vowel sound]

Ss: pill [students repeat]

T: so your cheek should be relaxed, "pill"....

Ss: pill

T: so this one is pEEl [pil]

Ss: peel

T: Pill [pɪl]

Ss: pill

c. Nonexplicit Group:

T: All right, um... so most of this is kind of listen, listen and repeat, and then we'll have, um... some kind of group activity at the end, ok? Questions?

Ss: no

(...)

T: All right, ready?

Ss: [students mumble]

T: Ok, I'm going to read these words, ok? and then you just, um... repeat... right? so yeah,... Father...

Ss: Father...

(...)

T: Advantage...

Ss: Advantage

T: Actually I don't pronounce the "t," "advantage..."

Ss: Advantage...

T: [laughs] Playing...

Appendix 2

a. Suprasegmental Group:

T: So student A will talk, but student B will also try to ask questions and draw out information from student A. Ok, now student C, you're very important...

Ss: Ohhhhhh...

T: You're going to listen, to what student A says, and make sure that there are a few reductions. So, of course you will hear stress, but... try to think... is this person... [claps and exaggerates her voice] stressing every word, because we don't want that. Can you hear spaces between the stresses? I have a MEMORY, I have a MEMory [teacher claps], there's got to be real spaces. Ok, if possible, also listen for stress... and the use of rhythm groups... do you remember rhythm groups? Those are the pauses... 'I have a memory... it was when... I was two years old...' so, is there some pauses? Can you hear spaces, between the stressed words?? Ok, then you'll change roles, and everyone will have an opportunity to tell a story, and to monitor. Ok, so, do you understand? (3.s)

S?: Mmm-hmm

T: Who's person A??

Ss: (...)

T: you talk first, you help them talk, you listen [talking to the different members of a group], ok? you just talk for about a minute, and then we will hear your (...), just concentrate on (...), then you will talk... all right? And you will listen! Got it? [students work for the rest of the class on this. The teacher walks around helping groups when necessary.]

b. Segmental Group:

T: live

Ss: live

T: leave

Ss: leave

T: I gotta tell you, this is probably the most important pair [pointing at live, leave], many many many many times do you remember like in week 1, when you had to interview your classmates, and people would say 'where-do-you-leave?'"... and the other student is like... "I'm not leaving!"

Ss: [laughter]

T: you know? And there's also confusion and they say, you know, "Korea!" and they're like, like... 'cause the question, they don't know "where did leave?" or "where do you live?", so now you "live" [exaggerating] everything is relaxed, do it, now you 'live' in Bloomington. For Spring break maybe you... left.... well that's past tense anyway... but Summer vacation, after Spring II, before Summer I, maybe you'll "leave!" [exaggerating] to go home, but now you "live" [exaggerating], relaxed...

c. Nonexplicit Group:

T: All right, we have a little exercise, um... it is in pairs... (4.s) [puts the new slide on the projector], so in pairs, tell a classmate about your experience learning English in the United States. Make sure you provide enough details, so, um... you can explain the following issues: 'what things have been easy and which ones have been difficult... in learning English... so grammar, pronunciation, reading and writing... vocabulary.' 'Have you had a funny experience with the language? for example, pronouncing something inappropriately... you have?'

Ss: [laughter]

T: [laughs] yeah! 'What is something you always forget in English... you can share with your classmate... um... so let's work in... pairs...

[students work in pairs for about 8 minutes while the teacher walks around listening to the students' stories and helping them with vocabulary]

T: Ok... [students keep talking in groups and the teacher helps a girl with some vocabulary] ok, um... if your partner had a funny experience... learning English... you can share it the rest...

S?: Noooo!!!! [laughs]

All: [laughter]

T: Well if you're willing...

Appendix 3

a. Suprasegmental Group:

T: ...oh which one??, *She's a cool teacher, SHE's a cool teacher! She's a COOL teacher?? She IS a cool teacher*" Notice the difference in meaning [not able to understand] ... that means I'm stressing this, *She IS a cool teacher*, and it can be negative too, *She ISN'T a good teacher*. That means she is not a cool teacher. But, I'm trying to make it sound very positive, *She IS a good teacher, She IS a good teacher*. If this were here a contraction, it would be '*She's*' *She's a cool teacher, She's a cool teacher*. But I'm trying to make everybody understand that this is positive...

b. Nonexplicit Group:

T: Ok, so first we're just going to listen and repeat, ok? "*Good afternoon*"

Ss: "*Good afternoon*"

T: "*Pill*"

Ss: "*Pill*"

T: "*Rock and roll*"

Ss: "*Rock and roll*"

T: "*It is a life or death matter*"

Ss: "*It's a life or death matter*"

T: "*It is as cold as ice*"

Ss: "*It is as cold as ice*"

T: Good

T: "*She's one in a million*"

Ss: "*She's one in a million*"

T: What does that mean, uh?

S: Oh, uh she's very good.

T: Yes, she's special, she's unique. "*Do you have his address?*"

Ss: "*Do you have his address?*"