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ABSTRACT

This study used three instruments to examine the current state of the teaching of ESOL pronunciation. These instruments included a survey of 62 teachers, another survey of 508 ESOL students, and a comparative study of ten pronunciation textbooks in widespread use since 1990. The purpose of the study was to characterize the teaching of pronunciation at present through the voices of the teachers, the opinions of the students, and the content of the textbooks. The study also identified the approaches and types of activities being proposed by the experts and recommended additional activities as well as a rationale for their use.

The responses from the teacher survey indicated that there is little formal teaching of pronunciation in adult education programs although teachers deal with pronunciation mistakes in an incidental manner. Results from the student survey indicated that false beginner adult learners strongly favor practicing pronunciation and that they want their teachers to correct their mistakes.

The descriptive study of the textbooks showed three different tendencies: a traditional curriculum based on the sound and the word as the point of departure of the lesson, another based on the communicative context as the point of departure, and a third that proposed an integrative model, that is, listening, speaking, accuracy, and fluency where pronunciation accuracy is emphasized. There were discrepancies in the selection of phonetic symbols, use of metalanguage, and types of activities. There is a consensus on the importance of listening, the use of the tape recorder, and outside class activities.
At the onset of the study, the researcher hypothesized that teachers did not address pronunciation in their classes. The survey, however, indicated that in spite of the fact that pronunciation is not considered as part of the curriculum, it is addressed by the teachers at least in an indirect manner. The results of this study confirmed the fact that students enjoy practicing the sounds of the language. The comparative study of the pronunciation textbooks showed that 90% of the books are intended for intermediate or advanced learners, thus revealing a surprising lack of pronunciation materials for ESOL false beginners.
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CHAPTER ONE

NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE STUDY

Organization of the Study

The teaching of pronunciation has recently been revitalized after a process of “minimization” during the communicative boom. In the United States and particularly in Central Florida, there is a high percentage of adult ESOL students in the school population. This study is intended to be an aid to classroom practitioners teaching ESOL to adult learners.

Chapter one explains the nature of the study. This includes the statement of the problem and the purpose of the study. It then states the research questions and the limitations of the study. This chapter concludes with definitions of key terms.

Chapter two reviews literature addressing four major areas. The first looks at the role of pronunciation in methods and approaches used in teaching English. The second explores the teacher and pronunciation. The third examines the student and pronunciation. Finally, the fourth area reviews five comparative studies of textbooks in language teaching since one of the main aims of this study is to survey pronunciation textbooks.

Chapter three describes in detail the methods used to research this study. It explains how the surveys and comparative study were designed and carried out.

Chapter four presents the results of the data collected at participating schools, that is, the results of the teachers’ attitudes towards teaching pronunciation and the results of the students’ attitudes towards learning pronunciation. This chapter also reports the
results of the comparative study of ten textbooks. It includes charts and figures to better visualize the responses of the teachers and the students as well as the analysis of the textbooks.

Chapter five provides a summary and discussion of the findings. The first section is the discussion of the two surveys, and the second section highlights the comparison of the textbooks. The similarities and discrepancies among textbook authors with different methodological affiliations are assessed. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the usefulness of this study and a list of considerations and recommendations.

Statement of the Problem

Most people would agree that pronunciation is an integral part of learning a second language. However, pronunciation has become a neglected area in adult ESOL contemporary teaching. This lack of emphasis stems from three reasons: (a) communicative language teaching underestimated form and accuracy and pronunciation is both, (b) pronunciation textbooks are incomprehensible to the layman and false beginners because of the metalanguage of phonetics, and (c) most of the pronunciation books are directed to the intermediate and advanced learner.

Although most teachers recognize the need to raise the quality of students’ performance in English, students attending beginning adult ESOL classes seldom receive systematic training in the sound system, i.e., pronunciation, of the English language. Most of them function in society with some broken English that enables them to get a job. Others survive with below survival English, clueless as to how to pronounce the 24 consonant and the 17 vowel sounds of American English.
Another contributing factor to the neglect of pronunciation is the lack of terminal pronunciation goals. There are no standardized pronunciation tests, and implementing one would be difficult due to the variety of native accents or dialectal variations in the United States and the subjectivity entailed by the terms intelligibility or comprehensibility. (See Appendix A). The impossibility of measuring pronunciation effectively or of setting pronunciation standards for K-12 ESOL, Workplace ESOL, and English for Academic Purposes, among others, favors neglect.

By studying the present state of the teaching of pronunciation in Central Florida and exploring pronunciation books, the researcher believes she may contribute to the development of the field of pronunciation for adult ESOL students and educators.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to determine which approaches and activities are used to teach pronunciation to adult ESOL students. This is accomplished by examining three areas: 1) teachers’ attitudes towards teaching pronunciation, 2) students’ attitudes towards studying pronunciation and 3) pronunciation approaches and activities in current ESL/ESOL pronunciation textbooks. Some additional activities and the rationale for using them are suggested. This study is intended to assist adult ESOL instructors in the selection, implementation, and use of their materials and strategies.
Research Questions

This study considers the following questions:

1. What approaches or activities for teaching pronunciation are currently featured in ESL/ESOL curricula for adult students?

2. What aspects of pronunciation practice do ESOL adult learners favor?

3. What kinds of activities are featured in current ESL texts to improve pronunciation?

Limitations of the Study

This study deals with approaches and activities used in classroom instruction. It is the intent of the researcher to identify useful approaches and activities and to share them with ESOL teachers who teach adult learners. Since the universe of teaching pronunciation is complex and changing, this work cannot claim to be inclusive of all approaches, activities or techniques. It gives a representation of the movements of the pendulum in the field, and by no means, has purposefully omitted any specific textbook, approach, activity or technique.

This study in no way negates the effectiveness of approaches, activities and techniques of creative individuals that are not included in this paper. Instead, it can be a useful springboard for teachers who are searching ways to enhance their teaching and improve their curriculum designs. The information presented here should be shared among adult ESOL teachers to enhance the quality of the profession.
Definition of Terms

**Affective filter** - Filter that controls the amount of input the learner comes in contact with. It is affective because the factors which determine its strength have to do with the learner’s motivation, self-confidence and anxiety state.

**Articulatory phonetics** - The study of the physical production of speech sounds.

**Audiolingual method (approach)** - A method of second or foreign language teaching based on the notion of acquisition by habit-formation.

**Broken English** - A term that describes a way of getting messages across with certain fluency but without accuracy in the use of form. It lends to the fossilization of interlanguage patterns. It is characteristic of immigrant workers with little opportunity to learn English in school but who pick it up randomly in the environment.

**Communicative competence** - As defined by Hymes, the knowledge and ability involved in putting language to communicative use.

**Communicative language teaching** - As defined by Lightbown, CLT is based on the premise that successful language learning involves not only a knowledge of the structures and forms of a language but also the functions and purposes that a language serves in different communicative settings.

**Competence** - As defined by Chomsky, knowledge of the grammar form of a language as a formal abstraction and distinct form the behavior of actual use, i.e., performance.

**Consonant** - Sounds made with a narrow or complete closure in the vocal tract; the airflow is either completely blocked momentarily or restricted so much that noise is produced.
Critical period - According to some theorists, a period extending from about age two to puberty during which language must be acquired.

Direct method - A method of foreign language teaching that is based on the belief that the language should be learned as a child learns a native language, through direct contact with the language and direct association of word and object.

EFL - English as a Foreign Language (generally when taught in a country where the language is not the vernacular).

ESL - English as a Second Language.

ESOL - English to Speakers of Other Languages.

Fossilization – A lack of change in interlanguage patterns, even after extended exposure to or instruction in the target language.

Grammar translation method - A method of foreign language teaching that emphasized reading, writing and translation, and the conscious learning of grammatical rules, its primary goal being to develop a literary mastery of the target language.

International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) - A system for transcribing the sounds of speech that attempts to represent each sound of human speech (languages derived from Latin) with a single symbol (See Appendix B).

Intonation - The variation in pitch and stress which gives beat and rhythm to the tune the voice plays in ordinary speech.

L1 - First language, mother tongue or native language.

L2 - Second language or target language.

Minimal pair - A pair of linguistic forms that differs by only one element and contrast in meaning.
Performance - Chomsky’s term for actual language behavior as distinct from the knowledge that underlies it, or competence.

Phone - Any human speech sound.

Phoneme - The abstract element of a sound identified as being distinctive in a particular language.

Phonetics - The description of sounds of speech as physical phenomena, how they are produced, and how they are received, i.e., the study of the inventory and structure of the sounds of a language.

Phonology - The study of the abstract systems underlying the sounds of language.

Pitch - The auditory property of a sound that enables us to place it on a scale that ranges from low to high.

Pronunciation - The way in which a word should be spoken, how correctly one pronounces words.

Stress - The prominence given to certain sounds in speech.

Vowel - The uninterrupted flow of voice breath. In English the letters a, e, i, o, u and sometimes y as well as the 17 vowel sounds (See Appendix B).
CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Approaches and activities to teach pronunciation to adult learners of English are plentiful. This review begins by looking at the place of pronunciation in an evolution of methods and approaches for the teaching of English. It then looks at the teacher and pronunciation, i.e., what teachers in Florida are expected to know and what the teacher as ‘coach’ responsibilities are following Morley (2000). In addition, the study examines what students are expected to do in terms of pronunciation and their learner as ‘performer’ responsibilities following Morley (2000). It then reviews the Test of Spoken English and its demands on the learner. Finally, concepts such as error correction, intelligibility, age and motivation as well as their implications in the teaching of pronunciation are presented. This chapter includes a review of five comparative studies of textbooks in language teaching since a primary goal of this study is the comparison of pronunciation textbooks.

Pronunciation deserves further study since it has been de-emphasized and there are a number of contradictions in its teaching and learning. As Florez (1998) notes, “Pronunciation can be one of the most difficult parts of a language for adult learners to master and one of the least favorite topics for teachers to address in the classroom.”
The Place of Pronunciation in an Evolution of Methods or Approaches for the Teaching of English

Numerous treatments have been given to pronunciation and correction in the different methods or approaches that have been identified for the teaching of English as a foreign (EFL) or a second language (ESL) or to speakers of other languages (ESOL).

First, it is necessary to identify methods or approaches. Lado (1988) isolates 38 different methods:

1. Grammar-Translation (G-T)
2. Direct Method (DM)
3. Gouin action chain
4. Reading method
5. Basic English
6. Army Specialized Training Program, Intensive Language Program (ASTP)
7. Oral approach (OA)
8. Audio-lingual method (ALM)
9. Audio-visual method (AVM)
10. Programmed learning and teaching machines
11. Individualized instruction
12. Personalized instruction
13. Cognitive-code learning (CCL)
14. Second language acquisition (SLA)
15. The Silent Way
16. Delayed oral response
17. Total Physical Response (TPR)
18. Counseling Learning/Community Language Learning (CL/CLL)
19. Immersion
20. Bilingual approach
21. Notional/functional syllabuses
22. English for special purposes (ESP)
23. Suggestopedia
24. Accelerated learning
25. Rassias method, the Dartmouth Intensive Language Model (DILM)
26. Natural Approach
27. Foreign residence
28. Drama
29. Role-playing
30. Songs
31. Jazz
32. Games
33. Language lab
34. Cassettes
35. Video-cassettes
36. Computer-assisted instruction (CAI)
37. Eclectic method
38. Professional practice
Nine of the methods would be better described as audio visual techniques; two examples of which would be the language lab “method” and the jazz “method”. Lado himself describes those as technological aids or techniques but not methods. Needless to say, Lado’s summary of “methods” or ways in which English has been taught or learned for more than a century is one of the most comprehensive in the literature.

Whether these “methods” are considered approaches, methods, or techniques would always depend on their working definitions. An approach can be defined as a commitment to a particular theory about language learning, that is, an approach is much more flexible than a method and does not necessarily specify procedures. Antich (1973) defined a method as the systematization of the teaching activity that entails the systematization of the materials used in teaching. A technique is a particular, systematic way of presenting or teaching a linguistic material or of developing a skill.

Doggett (1994) identified the following eight approaches based on Larsen-Freeman (1968):

1. Grammar—Translation Method
2. Direct Method
3. Audio-Lingual Method
4. The Silent Way
5. Suggestopedia
6. Community Language Learning
7. Total Physical Response
8. The Communicative Approach
For the purposes of this study, the term “approach” has been chosen to mean ways of teaching, and the term “contents of teaching” has been chosen to designate the four skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing; three basic linguistic “materials”: pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary; two mediums: the spoken (dialogue or monologue) and the written language as well as communicative functions. The goals set plus the balance or combination of these components of the “contents of teaching” have been in the long run what has characterized methods, approaches, or techniques of teaching languages.

Nine of the most widely known and implemented approaches/methods will be analyzed. The analysis will determine the presence or the lack of the pronunciation component in each of the nine approaches/methods. It will also determine the role of correction in each particular case.

In the days of Grammar Translation, the main goal was to enable students to read literature in the target language. Grammar, vocabulary, reading and writing were emphasized while pronunciation, listening and speaking received relatively little attention. Needless to say, there was no room for oral error correction.

The Direct Method, whose goal was to enable learners to communicate in the target language, was the logical reaction to the Grammar Translation. It presupposed direct contact with the language and direct association of word and object. Grammar was taught inductively and vocabulary emphasized over grammar. Oral communication was considered fundamental, and reading and writing were based on oral practice. Pronunciation was emphasized, and the phonetic alphabet, which had just been invented,
was used in some Direct Method textbooks. Self-correction was encouraged (See Appendix C).

The Audio-Lingual Method was the result of American descriptive linguistics and behaviorist psychology. Language learning was habit-formation, thus, imitation, repetition of dialogues and drills to create the stimulus-response mechanism were the popular concepts of the period. Correct responses were strengthened by reinforcement. Pronunciation was taught from the early stages, and minimal pairs, repetition, and discrimination practices helped fix the habits. The language laboratory became the workshop of the language class for the fixation of the patterns learned by induction. Errors were corrected by the teacher, by peers, or by the stimulus-response mechanism in the recorded drills. The philosophy was to prevent the occurrence of errors or to predict them and control them. Lado’s *English Pronunciation* (1953) is a typical example of “pattern drills” lessons of this period. (See Appendix D). Other classic pronunciation textbooks of the era were Betty Jane Wallace’s *The Pronunciation of American English for Teachers of English as a Second Language* (1951) and M. Elizabeth Clarey and Robert J. Dixson’s *Pronunciation Exercises in English* (1947).

In the Audio-Visual Approach, particularly the French version, called the audio-visual structuro-global (AVSG or SGAV in French), pronunciation constituted a part of the class in the repetition phase. Prediction of errors based on the linguistic background of the learner was expected from the teacher. These teaching contexts were basically monolingual, which of course permitted that kind of practice. Students were expected to imitate - at the point of exhaustion - the recorded dialogues and follow the images for clarifying meaning. This was extremely demanding for the teacher, who had to play the
recorder, operate the projector and stimulate native like pronunciation in the learners. It was exhausting for both teachers and learners, yet, for some, it was like going to a movie and becoming an actor at the same time.

In the Silent Way Approach, whose goal was to use language for self-expression and to develop independence from the teacher, pronunciation was heavily emphasized. The followers of the approach believed that the sounds were integral and carried the melody of the language. Errors were considered inevitable as a natural and indispensable part of learning.

Suggestopedia, or Lozanov’s method, aimed at “desuggesting” or overcoming the students’ psychological barriers. Its main goal was to learn a foreign language at an accelerated pace for everyday communication. In line with a relaxed atmosphere, there was no room for immediate correction, teachers modeled instead. Suggestopedia stressed use rather than form. Vocabulary and some explicit grammar were emphasized, but there was very little time, if any, devoted to pronunciation.

In Community Language Learning, the goals were to learn communicatively and above all the learners took responsibility for learning. This non-defensive type of learning required the interplay of six elements: security, aggression, attention, reflection, retention, and discrimination. As students designed their syllabus in the beginning stages, pronunciation points were treated just as grammar or vocabulary based on students’ individual needs. Correction was done through modeling of correct forms in a non-threatening way.

The goals of Total Physical Response Approach were to eliminate stress and to provide an enjoyable learning atmosphere. Understanding preceded production, but as
oral modality is primary, pronunciation work was included, just as were grammar and vocabulary. Teachers only corrected major errors, since it was believed that fine-tuning might occur later.

The Communicative Approach has become an umbrella term for courses whose goals are to have students become communicatively competent, learners who can use language that is communicatively appropriate for a given social context. According to Richards (1986), there is in a sense, a ‘weak’ version of the communicative approach and a ‘strong’ version. The weak version which has become more or less standard practice in the last ten years stresses the importance of providing learners with opportunities to use their English for communicative purposes and attempts to integrate such activities into a wider program of language teaching. The ‘strong’ version of communicative teaching, on the other hand, advances the claim that language is acquired through communication, so that it is not merely a question of activating an existing but inert knowledge of language but rather of stimulating the development of the language system itself. The weak version could be described as “learning English to use it” and the strong version entails “using English to learn it” (1984:279).

From these two considerations in the “learning to use” weak version of the communicative approach, there is some space for pronunciation. Unfortunately, the correction phobia that the Communicative Approach brought with it, for the sake of lowering the affective filter or because it is believed that the target language will be learned best through the process of struggling to communicate, has affected the quality of the pronunciation component. The idea that meaning is paramount and structure and form play a secondary role has led to grammar-less and pronunciation-less courses.
Comprehensible pronunciation replaced native-speaker-like pronunciation. The problem has been the interpretation of the term comprehensible. Morley (1993) lamented that it was difficult for pronunciation to find its niche within the communicative curriculum. It seemed to have fallen by the wayside inside CLT. Nevertheless, Morley (1994) has expressed today there is a new look that follows the premise that intelligible pronunciation and global communicability are essential components of communicative competence.

The next section of this review of literature covers what teachers are expected to know, what students are expected to do, and what teachers and learners' responsibilities are.

The Teacher and Pronunciation: What Teachers Are Expected to Know

When analyzing the Study Guide for the Florida Teacher Certification Examination in English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) K-12, Section 3 Competency/Skills. 1. Knowledge of language principles, there are four aspects out of eleven devoted to the sound system of the English language. This guide reads:

1. Categorize basic concepts of phonology (e.g., stress, intonation, juncture, and pitch) as they apply to language development.
2. Determine phonemic characteristics (e.g., consonants, blends, vowels, diphthongs) in a given word.
3. Recognize methods of phonemic transcription (e.g., International Phonetic Alphabet and Traeger – Smith).
4. Recognize phonographemic differences (e.g., homophones and homographs).
The rest of the components refer to morphosyntactic phenomena. The eleven aspects constitute 11% of the test, thus the sound system component of the English language accounts for 4% of the examination (See Appendix E). These components also appear in the document “Florida Performance Standards for Teachers of English for Speakers of Other Languages” under Standard 10, indicators 1, 2, and 3 (See Appendix F).

If the examination reflects the bulk of knowledge, habits, and skills an ESOL teacher is to acquire, only 4% is related to pronunciation.

Paradoxically, Morley (2000) identified eleven roles for teacher as ‘coach’ responsibilities. The teacher’s role is that of a speech ‘coach.’ The teacher’s responsibilities, on the other hand, are threefold: assessment, syllabus design, and effective instruction. These are the teacher responsibilities in this role:

1. Conduct speech/pronunciation diagnostic analyses; chose and prioritize those features that will make the most observable impact on modifying the speech of each learner.

2. Help students set both long-range and short-term goals.

3. Design group program scope and sequence; design personalized programming for each individual learner in the group.

4. Assist learners in a teacher role as speech ‘coach’, facilitating learning in ways used by a voice coach or even a sports coach (i.e., monitoring, encouraging, supporting, modeling, demonstrating, cueing, setting manageable goals, setting and holding learners to high standards of performance, etc.).

5. Monitor learners’ speech production and speech performance at all times, and assess pattern changes, as an on-going part of the program.
6. Encourage student speech awareness and realistic self-monitoring.

7. Support each learner in his/her efforts, be they wildly successful or not so successful.

8. Develop a variety of instructional format, modes and activities including whole class instruction; small group work; individual one-to-one tutorial sessions; pre-recorded audio and video self-study materials; computer-assisted programs; etc. Overall, choose usefully functional speech tasks for the class, and provide appropriate activities for practice situated in real contexts or carefully chosen simulated contexts.

9. Develop a large repertoire of activities for imitative, rehearsed, and extemporaneous speech/pronunciation practice activities.

10. Structure in-class speaking and listening activities with invited native speaking (NS) and non-native speaking (NNS) guests participating.

11. Plan field trip assignments in pairs/small groups for real-world speaking practice.

These eleven topics reflect how speech and pronunciation can be integrated if teachers accept these responsibilities.

However, Derwing et.al. (1998), stated conclusively that it is unfortunate teachers have had to rely on their own intuitions or those of materials developers to make decisions on the emphasis a pronunciation course should take because although there is an increase in the interest in the last decade, improvement in students learning cannot be attributed to instruction only, but also to exposure regardless of instruction, which is a very uncontrollable variable in this setting.
On the other hand, English language teaching textbooks have been, up to a certain extent, discriminating against pronunciation since the communicative boom. Grammar used to hold the throne, a center stage and is coming back. It is regaining its integral role. However, pronunciation had its moments during the creation of the International Phonetic Alphabet and in the days of the Audio-Lingual Method, and today it is struggling to survive in the curriculum.

The Student and Pronunciation: What Students Are Expected to Do

Four documents have been analyzed to study what is expected of students in terms of pronunciation. These include: the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines for Speaking, the Speech Intelligibility Communicability Index for Describing Speech and Evaluating Its Impact on Communication, the Speaking Performance Scale for UCLA (University of California at Los Angeles) Oral Proficiency Test for Nonnative TAS (Teaching Assistants) and the Test of Spoken English (TSE) score level description.

ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines for Speaking, Generic Descriptions – Speaking considers the sound system in several references within the description. The levels range from Novice to Superior (Celce- Murcia, 1999)

In Novice-High, “Pronunciation may still be strongly influenced by first language. Errors are frequent and, in spite of repetition, some Novice-High speakers will have difficulty being understood even by sympathetic interlocutors.”
In the Intermediate-Mid, "Pronunciation may continue to be strongly influenced by first language and fluency may still be strained. Although misunderstandings still arise, the Intermediate-Mid speaker can generally be understood by sympathetic interlocutors."

In the Advanced-Plus, "Differentiated vocabulary and intonation are effectively used to communicate fine shades of meaning."

In the Superior level, "The Superior level speaker commands a wide variety of interactive strategies and shows good awareness of discourse strategies. The latter involves the ability to distinguish main ideas from supporting information through syntactic, lexical and suprasegmental features (pitch, stress and intonation).

There are underlying conceptions in the descriptions, that is, errors are due to interference of the mother tongue, comprehensibility is shaded by the interlocutor – sympathetic or not, and distinguishing the suprasegmental features is a task of the Superior level.

"A Multidimensional Curriculum Design" by Morley (1994) in Pronunciation Pedagogy and Theory: New Views, New Directions, ( pp76-77) presents a Speech Intelligibility Communicability Index for Describing Speech and Evaluating Its Impact on Communication. She presents six levels, a description for each, and the impact on
communication. Under “Impact on Communication” she acknowledges accent and determines six levels:

- **Level 1**  
  “Accent precludes functional oral communication”

- **Level 2**  
  “Accent causes severe interference with oral communication”

- **Level 3**  
  “Accent causes frequent interference with communication through the combined effect of the individual features of mispronunciation and the global impact of the variant speech pattern”

- **Level 4**  
  “Accent causes interference primarily via distraction; the listener’s attention is often diverted away from the content to focus instead on the novelty of the speech pattern”

- **Level 5**  
  “Accent causes little interference; speech is fully functional for effective communication” and

- **Level 6**  
  “Accent is virtually nonexistent.”

There are underlying conceptions in the descriptions, that is, one is accent as a cause of interference and the other that pronunciation or grammatical errors impede communication.

**Speaking Performance Scale for UCLA Oral Proficiency Test for Nonnative Teaching Assistants (TAS).** (Scale adapted from Interagency Language Roundtable Proficiency Test.) This table has a 0 to 4 rating and seven categories: Pronunciation, Speech flow, Grammar, Vocabulary, Organization, Listening comprehension, Question-handling. Under pronunciation:

- **4**  
  Rarely mispronounces.

- **3**  
  Accent may be foreign; never interferes; rarely disturbs NSs.
Often faulty but intelligible with effort.

Errors frequent; only intelligible to NS (native speaker) used to dealing with NNS (non-native speaker) and

Unintelligible

There are underlying conceptions in these descriptions, that is, intelligibility is the essence, the ability of NS who deal with NNS to understand them and rarely mispronounces as the ultimate goal, without considering intonation and rhythm.

A test which also determines needs and responsibilities of learners is the Test of Spoken English (TSE). This test is administered by Educational Testing Services (ETS) through the Test of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TOEFL) program, which is under the direction of the TOEFL Board established by and affiliated with the College Board and the Graduate Record Examination Board. The primary purpose of the TSE test is to measure the ability of nonnative speakers of English to communicate orally in English. It consists of 12 items, each of which requires examinees to perform a particular speech act. The test is delivered via audio-recording equipment and a test book. An interviewer on the test tape leads the examinee through the test; the examinee responds into a microphone, and the responses are recorded on a separate answer tape. The TSE score record consists of one score of communicative language ability, which is reported on a scale of 20-60. Raters evaluate each question and assign score levels using descriptors of communicative effectiveness related to language task/function, coherence and use of cohesive devises, appropriateness of response to audience/situation, and linguistic accuracy. This is the only subtle reference to pronunciation since pronunciation
and grammar are associated with accuracy. The scores are reported in increments of five (i.e., 20, 25, 30, 35, 40, 45, 50, 55, and 60). The score level performance is described as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Communication almost always effective: task performed very competently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Communication generally effective: task performed competently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Communication somewhat effective: task performed somewhat competently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Communication generally not effective: task performed poorly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>No effective communication: no evidence of ability to perform task.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The description above is fully communicative; thus, it disregards openly considering pronunciation or grammar. Linguistic accuracy is integrated into effective communicative and how competently the testee is able to perform.

Considerations about the Learner and Pronunciation in Experimental Studies

The role of the learner in acquiring L2 pronunciation is an interesting one.
Dalton and Seidlhofer (2000) considered sound in the body and sounds in the mind. They stated that our speech organs are not primarily organs for producing sounds. They are first and foremost involved in such lifetime supporting functions as breathing and eating. On the other hand, humans have a mental “filter” phasing out noise that is irrelevant and perceiving through another kind of filter, which is our knowledge of the sound system as a code. As long as our first language filter is “on,” we cannot perceive the differences that are crucial in the second language.

The learner seldom learns about the syllable level and other prosodic features. Studies acknowledge neglect of ambisyllabicity in English, under the influence of generative phonologists, who ignored the syllable level (Trammel, 1999) and also of the prosodic features of pronunciation.

In the teaching of foreign language pronunciation under the imperatives of the current ‘communicative’ and ‘acquisition’ approaches to language teaching (Brown, 1987), instruction in pronunciation has been de-emphasized or remains at a level of minimal phonemic contrasts (Beebe, 1984; Morley, 1987; Trammel, 1999). In the nineties, an Interest Section in Pronunciation was finally created in TESOL, the largest association of English teachers, but the question of pronunciation teaching in ESL/ESOL curriculum persists.

Concluding a study on VOT voice-onset-time, Gonzalez (1997) stated that there is a clear need to deal with pronunciation in the second language classroom; pronunciation should be examined through the use of commonly accepted methodological procedures involving instrumental analysis and second language teachers must be familiar with the phonetic and phonological components of the target language, as well as with techniques
designed to develop perception and articulation of this language. The real issue is whether, because they are familiar with phonetics, the students must be, too.

Morley (2000) identifies eight roles of the learner as speech performer. They have been labeled “Learner as ‘Performer’ Responsibilities”. They imply awareness, attitudes, and involved learning.

1. Develop speech awareness
2. Develop self-awareness of features of speech production and speech performance.
3. Develop self-observation skills and a positive attitude toward self-monitoring processes.
4. Develop speech-modification skills.
5. Observe the learner role as one of a ‘speech performer’—modifying, adjusting or altering a feature of speech/pronunciation—and the teacher role as one of assisting students in the manner of a speech coach, a singing coach, even a sports coach.
6. Take personal responsibility for your own learning, not only for immediate educational and personal needs, but also for future career needs.
7. Monitor and be aware of your own accomplishments.
8. Build a personal repertoire of speech monitoring and modification skills in order to continue to improve speaking effectiveness in English both during the course and beyond, when formal instructional program is completed.

If learners are eager to accept these responsibilities, they will be on the way to success.
Error Correction

Error correction has played its role in the "minimization" of pronunciation under the communicative approach. Advocates of fluency first proposed not to correct errors since they interfered the flow of communication. Ignoring errors completely (Stevick, 1982) has affected the learning of pronunciation. Others such as Lee (1999) consider phonological errors; e.g., segmental (sound systems such as consonants and vowels) and suprasegmental (word stress, pitch, rhythm and intonation), as global errors that should be corrected.

Gatbonton (1997) favors correction. In an article on teachers’ language management strategies, the author suggests that for teachers to be able to manage and improve quality output, teachers are to induce fluency and encourage accuracy, provoke full replies, and do error correction. She also recommends that to ensure input of high quality, it is necessary to repeat, expand, recast, correct and clarify (See Appendix G).

Intelligibility has become an umbrella term for appropriate pronunciation, grammar and use in descriptions of levels of EFL acquisition. "If intelligibility is to be achieved when speaking English, emphasis must be put upon pronunciation aspects such as word stress" (Benrabah, 1997). If stress is misplaced, language comprehension is hindered and lack of command is evidenced.

Vuletic (1968) identified four types of correction methods or procedures in line with the evolution of methods.

1. The articulatory procedure that pursued correcting by learning how to articulate sounds.
2. The phonological opposition procedure that pursued correcting by learning minimal pairs.

3. The use of the tape recorder in the classroom or the language laboratories as a device to hear and produce the sounds of the language.

4. The **verbo-tonal** system procedure that pursued correcting intonation and rhythm first, exaggerating certain intonation patterns, and shading sounds among others (beat, bit bet). This system was the complement of the audio-visual structuro-global method. Its point of departure was audition and its relation to articulation. For its followers correction begins and ends in a sentence.

**Age and Motivation**

Age has also played a significant role in the "minimization" of pronunciation. The critical period hypothesis has had serious pedagogical implications for the teaching of phonology after puberty, yet Nikolov (2000) challenged the strong version of the critical period hypothesis by identifying successful learners of a second language who started second language acquisition after puberty and have been able to achieve native proficiency. Finally, motivation is the key to all learning.

If students are integratively motivated, if they share an intrinsic motivation in the target language, they are likely to succeed. However, if they associate pronunciation with identity and consciously or unconsciously reject the internalization of the new sounds as a form of protecting their identity, no method, no teacher, no effort will be useful.
Comparative Textbook Reviews

Comparative reviews of textbooks describe and contrast types of activities, types of texts, types of sentences, types of communicative functions present in the textbook, types of accessories, or audio visual aids that may exist or may accompany a textbook. Five studies of this type were reviewed: Reppen (2001), Sole (2001), Herbert and Reppen (1999), Mera Rivas (1999) and Fortune (1998).

Reppen (2001) reviewed two computer software products for word concordancing. This review was a comparative analysis of two popular TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) textbooks based on five specific categories, namely platform, hardware systems requirements, support, language, and audience.

Sole (2001) analyzed 10 vocational ESL textbooks. Using a chart of activities included, the author analyzed the presence of the listening, speaking, vocabulary, reading, writing and grammar components in those textbooks. She used three ratings, i.e., with the terms: none, some and many, to indicate the presence or absence of the components in the books. Using a chart of accessories, the author noted the presence or absence of audiotapes, tape transcripts, teacher’s manual, workbook, illustrations B/W or color, charts and answer key. The answers were yes or no except for the category illustrations where the terms few, several and many were used. Using a chart of business issues addressed, the author recorded the presence or absence of communicative functions and other issues related to the business world. The analysis was made by replying yes, some, no, little, or indirectly.

Herbert and Reppen (1999) reviewed how to select and evaluate TOEFL preparation materials after TOEFL changed from the traditional paper and pencil format.
to a computer-based test. They offered hints and used a systematic method of analysis to assess the materials in the market.

Mera Rivas (1999) analyzed the reading component in a sample of English language teaching course books. The study was based on interactive models of reading and focused the analysis on lower-level processing skills and higher-level comprehension and reasoning skills. The author used five figures: types of text, pre-reading activities, while reading activities, post reading activities and some subjective criteria and judgments.

Fortune (1998) wrote a survey review of grammar practice books. He examined each grammar textbook to find out if the approach was inductive or deductive and it catered to the analytic or the holistic learner. He considered several aspects: the learners for whom the book is intended, the quality of the pedagogic grammar, the quality and variety of the grammar activities, the theoretical principles, underpinning those activities, the approach to learning employed, the use of tests (if any) and the designs. For the sake of consistency, the author looked at the same areas of grammar: conditional sentences, the passive voice, verb forms to express future meanings, present simple versus progressive and count and non count nouns. He did not use charts but rather descriptive paragraphs.

All studies of this type enable teachers and curriculum developers to gain a better image of the kind of textbook that best suits the needs of their students.

Though comparative textbook reviews exist for vocational ESL (Sole 2001), TOEFL (Herbert and Reppen 1999), reading (Mera Rivas 1999), and grammar (Fortune 1998), there have been no comparative textbooks studies to date that examine
pronunciation. Therefore, one of the major goals of this study is to fill the gap in L2 research by compiling an objective comparative textbook review of pronunciation materials.
CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY

This chapter deals with pronunciation from three perspectives: First, it looks at approaches and activities for teaching pronunciation to adult learners that teachers favor and feature in the curricula. A set of questions was designed to find out approaches and activities. Second, this chapter looks at the aspects of pronunciation that students favor; thus, another set of questions was devised for the learners to express what they felt about pronunciation. Finally, ten contemporary pronunciation textbooks were reviewed to analyze types of activities featured and the levels targeted.

Selection of the Teachers

Brief characterization of the teacher population of the survey

The researcher selected teachers of adult learners to participate in the survey. The survey was conducted to teachers in technological schools, community colleges and intensive English programs in Central Florida. Also out of state teachers of intensive English programs participated. The sample was surveyed through two media: paper and on-line. Teachers of some intensive English programs were surveyed on-line, and teachers of adults in Central Florida replied using the traditional paper-and-pencil technique.

The population of the sample comprised teachers from several academic
affiliations, yet they were chosen because they all teach English to speakers of other languages, teach oral skills, and teach a population of adult learners. Thus, most of them teach some pronunciation and do oral correction.

The first group surveyed was teachers who are currently subscribed to the Intensive English TESLIE-L server. For the most part, these teachers are TESOL members who teach in intensive English programs across the United States. These participants replied to this survey in response to a general request posted on TESLIE-L.

The second group of teachers surveyed was the instructors at an intensive English program in Central Florida. This survey was applied during a regular weekly staff meeting.

The third group of teachers was instructors of adult learners in community colleges. The survey was conducted during a meeting of the Central Florida TESOL Chapter. The meeting was attended mainly by community college teachers. The survey was also applied to two teachers of a community college not attending the meeting.

The fourth group of teachers was instructors of Adult Education and Workplace ESOL. The survey was conducted during staff meetings.

The fifth group of teachers was the five Enhanced ESOL instructors and one of the substitute teachers of a technological school. They are full-time instructors who teach Workplace ESOL, i.e., teachers who go to the workplaces to teach on-site. This survey was also applied during a weekly staff meeting. These teachers applied the student survey of this study during lesson 35. Also this group of adult ESOL instructors is following a pronunciation initiative, Sound tricks, that is a mini pronunciation lesson blended into the Adult ESOL lesson plan. The teachers demonstrate how to produce certain sounds, the
physicality of the sounds, illustrate the sounds with words that are relevant to the adult learner and make students listen and then repeat words, pairs of words, phrases, proverbs and idioms which contain the sound being studied.

**Instrument Applied to Survey Teachers’ Attitudes**

The instrument was a survey of questions based on information gathered in the review of literature and on practical experience. (See Appendix H for a copy of the exact instrument.) There were two aims in the questions that were asked. One was to identify the types of teaching materials in widespread use, not only in the Central Florida area, but also in other states in order to be able to compare the selection of textbooks different groups of teachers had made. The other aim was to explore the attitudes of teachers. The researcher was interested in finding out whether there was formal pronunciation teaching or incidental, whether textbooks or teacher made materials were being used and whether their programs dealt with pronunciation in some particular way.

**Description of the Survey Applied to ESOL Instructors**

Instructors were asked to answer *yes* or *no* to a group of questions about their programs and/or curriculum designs. The term program is used to refer to intensive English programs, ESOL in technological schools, or English, EAP, ESL, or ESOL in community colleges. It was in the interest of this study to know if there were separate classes being taught, just to teach pronunciation or rather if the pronunciation component was integrated at all in the speech, the oral expression, or speaking classes.
Information regarding the use of textbooks and software was also collected. The survey concluded with an open-ended question for teachers to express what they were doing in reference to pronunciation.

The survey had seven questions:

a. Does your program have a separate pronunciation class?

b. Does your program incorporate pronunciation into the curriculum in some other way?

c. Do you use a pronunciation book?

d. If so, what is it?

e. Do you use a pronunciation software program?

f. If so, what is it?

g. In other words, what/how does your program deal with pronunciation?

Selection of the Students

The researcher selected students of the Enhanced ESOL program as the subjects of the students’ questionnaire. They represent part of the workers of the hospitality industry in Central Florida and the linguistic backgrounds predominant in this area. Most of the students are native Spanish, Haitian-Creole, or Vietnamese speakers. Their cultural background ranges from the totally illiterate, who may be fluent in broken English, to the professional who has not been able to reinsert himself in the profession for lack of English accuracy and/or fluency.
Brief Characterization of the Student Population of the Sample Surveyed

The population of the sample comprised all the students enrolled in the Enhanced ESOL Program who attended classes during the week of October 14 through 18, 2001.

Job descriptions and communicative needs.

The students form six relevant workplace groups:

- kitchen personnel (cooks, assistants and dishwashers),
- seamstresses and laundry personnel,
- housekeepers,
- horticulture workers,
- custodians,
- merchandisers (shop assistants and servers), and
- engineering and workshop personnel (mechanics and support workers).

The communicative needs of the groups vary. Needs depend on their guest/customer or manager’s contact and also on their needs to initiate a dialogue or to respond to questions or requests.

Kitchen personnel like dishwashers and assistants may function with very little English while cooks do interact with their managers and with their fellow workers. They work “back of the house”, that is, without any contact with the public. Their communicative needs while performing their job are minimal, basically following instructions that become regular routines. Dishwashers simply listen to the noise of their equipment and very seldom listen to language while they work.

Seamstresses and laundry personnel also work “back of the house.” Like the kitchen personnel, they only interact with each other or their managers. While
seamstresses are required to understand instructions and may have more listening opportunities, that is, they listen to background music or other employees if they communicate in English, laundry personnel, on the other hand, interacts basically with their machines and simply listens to patterned noise. Their listening and speaking opportunities are very limited.

Housekeepers, horticulture workers, and custodians interact with guests. Housekeepers are a special group. They need to initiate a dialogue since their first step in performing their jobs may be knocking a door and saying simply “Good Morning, Housekeeping”. They must be able to understand then if the guests want service or not, if they need something, or if there is a privacy sign, not to knock. Some are very limited in the language but are often helped by other speakers of their own language in the job. Generally, they are very helpful to each other, or members of their linguistic community or their country of origin. Their abilities to smile, answer questions and satisfy guests’ needs range from nodding their heads to establishing a dialogue.

Horticulture workers and custodians do not need to initiate a dialogue, but they may have to give directions and answer questions that are not always predictable. Although their jobs are not directly related to the public, they have plenty of listening opportunities while they are working. They listen to park music or if they become focused listeners, they eavesdrop while they work.

Merchandisers respond to questions and also initiate dialogues. Their demands and needs are of a higher order. They are in direct contact with the guests, some even run registers or are expected to use the radio. This group of students already functions in the language with some limitations, some of them have developed fluency without accuracy.
in English, but their self-esteem has enabled them to pursue this kind of job. Even though there are a number of totally predictable communicative acts in their job needs, like formulaic for initiating a conversation, ("Good morning, Good afternoon, Good evening", "Welcome to...", "May I help you?", "What can I do for you today?") the responses may not always be predictable. If they become familiar with an area and its products, it becomes easier for them to handle, but if they float, it may be much more difficult. This group is much more knowledgeable in general terms and in company policies and standards.

Engineering and workshop personnel are a group that needs to follow instructions very accurately. They have to be able to understand, read, and sometimes write to perform their jobs. Their contact with speakers is limited to fellow workers or managers. They are the other end of the "back of the house" workers.

Depending on their assignments, these students may or may not listen to language or music in English or their own languages while they work. Some, like the dishwashers, just listen to patterned noise, that is, their listening opportunities are very limited. All these communicative needs, i.e., opportunities to listen, speak, read or write English in the job, determine, to a certain extent, language development outside the class.

To better describe the population some factors like age, group structure, selection of the students, motivation and background are briefly described.

- Age. The age of the students varies widely. They are all working adults. There are teen-agers as well as some in their sixties. (The term senior citizen does not apply as many of them are resident aliens.)
• Group structure. Groups are mixed and organized basically around a work location. The mixture is in level, linguistic background and gender. For example, there is a majority of male adults in horticulture jobs, while there is a majority of female adults in housekeeping.

• Selection. To enroll in the program, students had to apply and were chosen by their managers following the company criteria of selection, seniority. Students are paid two hours a week for attending Enhanced ESOL lessons. This project is unique and bold in Workplace ESOL. The fact that they are chosen by seniority and get paid for attending classes makes it difficult for the researcher to establish the motivation factor as a driving force.

• Motivation. All of the students joined the program on a voluntary basis, and the majority is highly motivated, yet a minority might have enrolled just for getting paid for not working for two hours, or by peer pressure as their performance in the language was poor. Most of the students are interested in improving their oral and written skills, that is, more interested in improving production rather than recognition.

• Background. (Linguistic, ethnic, and educational) The majority of the students surveyed speak Spanish, Haitian-Creole, or Vietnamese. Among the Spanish speakers, there are students from almost all the Latin American countries, i.e., Mexico, Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Panama, Cuba, Puerto Rico, The Dominican Republic, Colombia, Venezuela, Bolivia, Ecuador, Peru, Chile, Argentina, and Uruguay. In addition, there are students from Haiti and from Vietnam. In the program, there is a world representation,
which represents the spectrum of the company cast. There are students from Spain, Italy, France, the Czech Republic, Poland, Russia, Ukraine, Korea, Thailand, Taiwan, China, Hong-Kong, Morocco and India among others. This reality makes the groups very multilingual multicultural, although there are groups which by chance, or type of job may be monolingual monocultural. The educational background is also very diverse. There are almost illiterate students side by side with professionals, even doctors, whose command of the language has not enabled them to reinsert in their professions. There is an atmosphere of help and consideration. Some more able students have even adopted less able students and helped them.

Instrument Applied to Survey Students’ Attitudes

The instrument was a survey whose main objective was to determine the students’ attitudes towards pronunciation and what they favored. The items were based on information gathered in the review of literature and on practical experience. Statements instead of questions were used to make the survey “student-friendly”.

(See Appendix I for a copy of the exact instrument.)

Description of the Survey Applied to the Enhanced ESOL Students

Students had to describe how they felt in terms of four frequency adverbs: always, sometimes, seldom, never. The adverbs usually or frequently were purposefully omitted with the intention of making the students state if they always or sometimes did or felt something. Experience has taught the researcher there is a tendency to be less categorical
when *usually* is used, although it may be true the action was not performed 100 per cent of the time. There were ten statements which the students had to answer with one of the four frequency adverbs.

E.g. I (always-sometimes-seldom-never) speak English in class.

These were the ten statements in the survey:

1. I speak English in class.
2. I speak English at home.
3. I enjoy learning how to pronounce the sounds.
4. I improve my pronunciation in class.
5. The teacher helps me to pronounce in class.
6. I enjoy speaking English.
7. I consider the Soundtricks (pronunciation) lesson important for me.
8. I use the dictionary and its symbols to pronounce better.
9. I am nervous when my teacher corrects my mistakes.
10. I like my teacher to correct my mistakes.

Statements 1 and 2 gave the researcher information about how much English the learners use and if they use English in class and if it is used at home. Stating if they used English in their jobs was purposefully disregarded as they are supposed to be able to communicate and speak in English in their jobs. How much English they use was somehow discussed in the job description. Statement 6 was related to 1 because, if they like to speak, they should speak in class.
Statements 3, 4, 5, and 7, were directly related to pronunciation. In 3, they had to express a like or dislike; in 4, they had to assess themselves and in 5, if the teacher helped them. In the case of statement 7, a supplementary material on pronunciation, Soundtricks, was assessed.

Statements 9 and 10 were related to correction of errors. Statement 9 was about the way they feel and 10 if they liked their teacher to correct their mistakes.

The final statement was their native language. The selection of those three languages was based on the population that works for the company. In fact, the company translates surveys and some materials into these three languages and even the company newspaper into Spanish.

Selection of the Textbooks

The textbooks of the sample were chosen by analyzing the 2002 Alta, Longman, Cambridge, and Houghton Mifflin catalogs. Ease of availability in the long run determined the selection of the ten textbooks. All are listed under the heading *Pronunciation* in the catalogues. They cover the last decade, that is, from 1990 to 2001. A chart was designed to characterize the textbooks and to study the types of activities presented and the approaches followed.


Instrument Used to Compare the Textbooks

The instrument was a two-sheet chart with criteria based on previous comparative textbook reviews cited in the review of literature. (See Appendix J for a copy of the exact instrument.)

Description of Criteria to Carry out the Comparative Study of a Sample of Pronunciation Textbooks

The chart for the comparative study of the textbooks chosen comprises the following criteria presented in two separate sheets.

Sheet One

Year of publication of the textbooks
Title of the textbooks
Author(s) of the textbooks
Level
Approach
Types of Activities

Year, title, and author are self-explanatory.

Level refers to the relative position on a scale or the classical division of the contents of teaching into stages of complexity. Scales depend on educational institutions.

In general, there are three, i.e., beginner, intermediate or advanced, yet the literature records other categories such as: threshold level, raw beginner, false beginner, low
beginner, beginner, high beginner, beginner/intermediate, low intermediate, intermediate, high intermediate, intermediate/advanced, and advanced. Numbers have also been used to determine levels.

Approach refers to the methodological affiliation of the authors. Since the study covers the last decade, most of the textbooks fall into the Communicative Approach period.

Types of Activities were grouped into eight:

- **Listening for Ear Training**

This activity is listening to the teacher or the tape with or without visual clues or written language support. Listening may be focused on segmental or suprasegmental phonemes, that is, a given pronunciation target. It is passive listening, or receptive listening.

- **Listening and Repetition**

This activity implies listening and repetition of some pronunciation target. It may involve repetition of words or sentences after the teacher or the tape recorder without the support of written language or visual clues.

- **Listening, Repetition and Reading**

This activity involves listening and repetition of some pronunciation target while it is read by the student simultaneously. It activates the reading mechanism, as well as the production of correct sounds. It may be focused on the correspondences or lack of correspondences between spoken and written English.

- **Sound Discrimination Activity**
This activity is aimed at determining whether the learner can differentiate minimal pairs or types of intonation. It may be carried out with visual clues, written language support or by choosing A or B; or 1 or 2.

- **Contextual Activity**

  This activity presents the pronunciation target in a meaningful context. It may take the form of a dialogue or a monologue.

- **Minimal Pair Activity**

  This activity presents the pronunciation target in pairs of linguistic forms that differ by one element and contrast in meaning.

- **Pair Work Activity**

  This activity is aimed at making the students work in pairs. Traditionally, most of the ear training or pronunciation practice was done individually. This kind of activity which is popular across all areas of language teaching is also possible in the development of pronunciation.

- **Direct Explanation**

  This is a section of the lesson in which the author directly addresses the learners to enable them to produce the sounds or intonation patterns. It offers descriptions of the physicality of the sounds, its manners and points of articulation. It tells the learner about the position of the organs of speech in the production of the sound. Generally, it is accompanied by some visual support, such as a chart or an illustration of the organs of speech.
Sheet Two

This sheet collects the data gathered in relation to the audio-visual support offered by the authors of the textbooks.

- Audiotapes

Tapes that present the recordings by native speakers of the pronunciation activities determined by the textbook writer.

- Videotapes

Tapes with aural and visual support that present the videotaped material in context or illustrate how to produce sounds by watching organs of speech.

- Web Page.

On-line support for the learner. (World Wide Web. An information server on the Internet composed of sites and files that are connected to each other and are accessible with a browser.)

- Charts

Tables or graphs that present information, in an organized manner of certain pronunciation aspects.

- Illustrations of Speech Organs

Graphic representations of the organs of speech.

- Illustrations for Meaning

Graphic representation of certain words or situations whose aim is to favor comprehension or motivation.

- Notes on L1
By notes on L the researcher wanted to find out if any of the textbooks had taken into consideration the linguistic background of the students.

The study was carried out by a single rater, the researcher, minutely analyzing each of the textbooks chosen for this study and double-checking the results.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

The purpose of this study has been to examine the state of the teaching of pronunciation through two surveys and a comparative chart of pronunciation textbooks. One survey was applied to 61 teachers of adult learners and the other to 508 adult students in Central Florida. The comparative chart reviewed ten pronunciation textbooks in widespread use in the last decade.

Teacher Survey Facts and Figures

The total instructor population was 61. Five different groups of teachers were surveyed. All teach adult students.

Twenty-one of the respondents teach in an intensive English program, fourteen in technological school, twelve in intensive programs in other states and answered on-line, eight in community colleges, and six in Enhanced ESOL, at a technological school. The responses were analyzed by groups to later draw conclusions (See Figure 4.1.)
IEP: Intensive English program  
TS: Technological school  
IEP (On-line): Intensive English program teachers surveyed on-line  
CC: Community colleges  
EE TS: Enhanced ESOL in a technological school

Figure 4.1: Instructors’ Population by Affiliation

Figure 4.2: Responses to Survey Questions a, b, c, and e (Group IEP)
These responses were obtained from teachers who teach in an intensive English Program in Central Florida. Twenty-one instructors completed the survey (See Fig. 4.2)

a. Does your program have a separate pronunciation class?
   
   Yes - 19
   
   No - 2

b. Does your program incorporate pronunciation into the curriculum in some other way?

   Yes - 21
   
   No - 0

c. Do you use a pronunciation book?

   Yes - 13
   
   No - 8

d. If so, what is it?

   They use *Pronunciation Plus, Pronunciation Pairs, Well Said* and *Pronunciation Drills (PD’s).*

e. Do you use a pronunciation software program?

   Yes - 10
   
   No - 11

f. If so, what is it?

   *Well Said, Ellis, and Rosetta Stone.*

g. In other words, what/how does your program deal with pronunciation?

   The responses ranged from “at times of opportunity”, as needed on daily basis”, “in all classes”, “teachable moments in class”, to “minimal pairs”, “in
accent reduction classes”, “in reading textbook *Groundroads for College Reading* they use the phonetic alphabet” or “in grammar, the ‘ed’, ‘can-can’t’.

Figure 4.3: Responses to Survey Questions a, b, c, and e (Group TS)

These were the responses of the ESOL instructors of a technological school.

Fourteen teachers completed the survey (See Figure 4.3)

a. Does your program have a separate pronunciation class?

   Yes - 2
   No  - 12

b. Does your program incorporate pronunciation into the curriculum in some other way?

   Yes - 14
   No  - 0
c. Do you use a pronunciation book?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. If so, what is it?

*American English Pronunciation, Say the Word, PD’s*, the dictionary and *Laubach Ways to Reading*.

e. Do you use a pronunciation software program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f. If so, what is it?

None

g. In other words, what/how does your program deal with pronunciation?

The responses ranged from “I plan my own lessons”, “It is instructor lead and designed” to “oral practice”, “verbal repetition of instructor’s modeling”, “repetition”, “oral discussion”, “cassettes”, “video”, “supplementary activities”, “in a communicative approach”, “the ‘th’”, “the ‘-ed’ endings”, and “it’s easy”. Some stated they deal with pronunciation through direct instruction and others through indirect instruction or indirect attention.
These responses were obtained on-line from twelve instructors who teach in intensive English programs in continental and non-continental United States. Responses came from Alabama, California (2), Chicago, Hawaii, Iowa, Kansas, North Carolina, New York (3), Pennsylvania, and Philadelphia (See Figure 4.4)

a. Does your program have a separate pronunciation class?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2 as electives 1 optional)

b. Does your program incorporate pronunciation into the curriculum in some other way?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Do you use a pronunciation book?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d. If so, what is it?


e. Do you use a pronunciation software program?

Yes - 4

No - 8

f. If so, what is it?

*Well Said, Pronouncing American English,* and doesn’t recall name

g. In other words, what / how does your program deal with pronunciation?

The instructors stated they teach pronunciation integrated to the oral communication class, in both formal lessons and teaching moments, in listening and speaking classes, incidentally at the point of need, in beginning stages in the reading–writing pronunciation work, bits and pieces in the entry level in the listening and speaking classes and through speech dictations and taped journals, pronunciation tutorials. Some use “home grown” materials, and one said “each teacher does his/her own thing.”
Figure 4.5: Responses to Survey Questions a, b, c, and e (Group CC)

These were the responses of the English instructors in community colleges in Central Florida. Eight teachers completed the survey. (See Figure 4.5)

a. Does your program have a separate pronunciation class?
   - Yes: 6
   - No: 2

b. Does your program incorporate pronunciation into the curriculum in some other way?
   - Yes: 5
   - No: 3

c. Do you use a pronunciation book?
   - Yes: 7
   - No: 1
d. If so, what is it?

*Pronunciation Drills, Well Said, Sounds Great, Talk It Through, Talk It Up.*

*Exercises in American Pronunciation.*

e. Do you use a pronunciation software program?

Yes - 7
No - 1

f. If so, what is it?

*Ellis, Well Said,* and *Speech Works.*

g. In other words, what / how does your program deal with pronunciation?

The responses ranged from “emphasis is put on speech classes”, “in academic speaking and listening skills”, “dictation”, “repetition”, to “time is the biggest obstacle”.

![Bar chart]
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- Yes  - No
These were the responses of the Enhanced ESOL instructors at a technological school. Six instructors, the five instructors and a substitute teacher, completed the survey.

(See Figure 4.6)

a. Does your program have a separate pronunciation class?

Yes - 0
No - 6

b. Does your program incorporate pronunciation into the curriculum in some other way?

Yes - 6
No - 0

c. Do you use a pronunciation book?

Yes - 0
No - 6

d. If so, what is it?

None

e. Do you use a pronunciation software program?

Yes - 0
No - 6

f. If so, what is it?

None

g. In other words, what / how does your program deal with pronunciation?
These teachers follow a unified curriculum. A pronunciation component entitled "Soundtricks" is presented every other week. All the teachers reported they use a worksheet with minimal pairs and contextualized repetition practice.

![Diagram](image)

Figure 4.7: Responses to Survey Questions a, b, c, and e (Total Population)

Out of 61 teacher, 32 stated their programs offered a separate pronunciation class, 57 incorporate some form of pronunciation activity into the curriculum, 31 expressed they used pronunciation books, and 21 mentioned the existence of pronunciation software programs in their schools.
Student Survey. Facts and Figures

The results were grouped into four categories: use of English, on pronunciation, on independent work, and on error correction.

Under “use of English” the questions were:

1. I (always sometimes seldom never) speak English in class.
2. I (always sometimes seldom never) speak English at home.
6. I (always sometimes seldom never) enjoy speaking English.

Figure 4.8: On Use of English

The results reflected they use English in class and they use much less English at home but in general they enjoy speaking English.
Under “on pronunciation” the questions were:

3. I (always sometimes seldom never) enjoy learning how to pronounce the sounds.

4. I (always sometimes seldom never) improve my pronunciation in the English class.

5. My teacher (always sometimes seldom never) helps me to pronounce in class.

7. I (always sometimes seldom never) consider the Soundtricks lessons important for me.

Figure 4.9: On Pronunciation
The results “on pronunciation” indicate that a majority wants to improve, teachers help them improve pronunciation and they enjoy their mini pronunciation lessons.

Under “on independent work” the question was:

8. I (always sometimes seldom never) use the dictionary and its symbols to pronounce better.

The results demonstrated only one fifth of the population does not use the dictionary and its symbols to pronounce better.

Under “on error correction” the questions were:
9. I am (always sometimes seldom never) nervous when my teacher corrects my mistakes.

10. I (always sometimes seldom never) like my teacher to correct my mistakes.

The results "on error correction" demonstrated students want teachers to correct their mistakes but very few expressed they get nervous when the teacher corrects them.

The majority of the students are Spanish speakers, followed by Haitian Creole, Vietnamese and speakers of other languages.
A chart designed for this purpose contains all the information of the survey. Although the total population was 508 not all the students answered to all the questions.

See Table: Language Usage Survey Results.
Table 1: Language Usage Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #1</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>504</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>236</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #2</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>493</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>237</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #3</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>470</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>319</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #4</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>488</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #5</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>489</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>441</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #6</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>497</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>342</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #7</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>482</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>383</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #8</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #9</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>508</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #10</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>498</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>464</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native Language</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haitian-Creole</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: A Comparative Study of Ten Pronunciation Textbooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>APPROACH</th>
<th>LISTENING FOR EAR TRAINING</th>
<th>LISTENING AND REPEITION</th>
<th>LISTENING, REPEITION AND READING</th>
<th>SOUND DISCRIMINATION ACTIVITY</th>
<th>CONTEXTUAL ACTIVITY</th>
<th>MINIMAL PAIR ACTIVITY</th>
<th>PAIR WORK ACTIVITY</th>
<th>DIRECT EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Pronunciation Pairs</td>
<td>Baker &amp; Goldstein</td>
<td>intermediate</td>
<td>communicative</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Accurate English</td>
<td>Daver</td>
<td>intermediate</td>
<td>cognitive</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Well Said</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>intermediate</td>
<td>weak</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Focus on Pronunciation</td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td>intermediate</td>
<td>weak</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Pronunciation for International Students</td>
<td>Dale &amp; Roms</td>
<td>intermediate</td>
<td>revised audiolinguial</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Pronouncing American English</td>
<td>Orion</td>
<td>intermediate</td>
<td>communicative</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Pronunciation Plus</td>
<td>Hewings &amp; Goldstein</td>
<td>intermediate</td>
<td>communicative</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Pronunciation Matters</td>
<td>Henrichsen et al.</td>
<td>beginner intermediate</td>
<td>communicative</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Targeting Pronunciation</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>intermediate</td>
<td>communicative</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Talk It Up</td>
<td>Kozyrev</td>
<td>beginner</td>
<td>integrated</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: A Comparative Study of Ten Pronunciation Textbooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>AUDIO/TAPES</th>
<th>VIDEOTAPES</th>
<th>WEB PAGE</th>
<th>CHARTS</th>
<th>ILLUSTRATIONS OF SPEECH ORGANS</th>
<th>ILLUSTRATIONS FOR MEANING</th>
<th>NOTES ON L1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Pronunciation Pairs</td>
<td>Baker &amp; Goldstein</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Accurate English</td>
<td>Daver</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Well Said</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Focus on Pronunciation</td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>English Pronunciation for</td>
<td>Dale &amp; Poms</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Pronouncing American</td>
<td>Orion</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Pronunciation Plus</td>
<td>Hewings &amp; Goldstein</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Pronunciation Matters</td>
<td>Henrichsen et al.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Targeting Pronunciation</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Talk It Up</td>
<td>Kozyrev</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Description of the Chart Comparative Study of Ten Pronunciation Books.

Level: one textbook is for beginners and one for beginner intermediate. Five for intermediate and three for intermediate advanced.

Approach: one is a revised audiolingual, one cognitive, one integrated skills, the rest are communicative two weak communicative, three communicative and two communicative interactive.

Listening for ear training: none of the books offered listening for ear training type of exercises.

Listening and repetition: none of the books offered listening and repetition type of exercises.

Listening, repetition and reading: all of the textbooks offered the listening repetition and reading type of exercises.

Sound discrimination activities: all of the textbooks offered sound discrimination activities, which varied in type.

Contextual activities: all of the textbooks offered contextualized practice.

Minimal pair activities: all of the textbooks presented some type of minimal pair type of exercise.

Pair work: eight offered this kind of practice and two did not.

Direct explanation: all of the textbooks offered some kind of direct explanation on how to produce sounds.

Audiotapes: all of the textbooks are accompanied by audiotapes.

Videotapes: none of the books studied was accompanied by videotapes.
Web page: only one of the ten has a web page the students can visit.

Charts: all of the books presented charts, some more than others but all did.

Illustrations of speech organs: all of the books offered illustrations of the speech organs.

Illustrations for meaning: all but one presented illustrations for meaning.

Notes on L1: none but one presented notes on L1.

The sample studied was rather uniform in the selection of the main components of a pronunciation textbook. It is interesting to notice there is a gap in the teaching of the sound system. Most language textbooks do not approach pronunciation and there seems to be a vacuum since most of the books studied are directed to a language user in an intermediate or advanced level, to a student who is already fluent in English, but needs to break bad speech habits. For the adult false beginner, the researcher could not find any teaching material available that would contribute to minimize errors and to exercise the speech organs so as to improve pronunciation.
CHAPTER FIVE
DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

This study considered the following questions:

1. What approaches or activities for teaching pronunciation are currently
   featured in ESL/ESOL curricula for adult students?
2. What aspects of pronunciation practice do ESOL adult learners favor?
3. What kinds of activities are featured in current ESL textbooks to improve
   pronunciation?

The researcher hypothesized that pronunciation has become a neglected area
in adult ESOL contemporary teaching because a) communicative language teaching
underestimated form and accuracy, and pronunciation is both, and b) pronunciation
textbooks are incomprehensible to the layman and false beginners because of the
metalanguage of phonetics and because most of books are directed to the intermediate
and advanced learner.

Summary of the Role of Pronunciation in Current ESL/ESOL Curricula for Adult
Students (Based on Teacher Survey)

The approaches or activities for teaching pronunciation featured in ESL/ESOL
curricula for adult students are the following:
• Of the programs participating in this study, intensive English programs and community colleges approach pronunciation communicatively and directly through separate pronunciation classes, while technological education adult ESOL approaches it communicatively but indirectly.

• Almost all the teachers from all the educational institutions researched stated they incorporate pronunciation into the curriculum in some “other” way. By some other way, most of the teachers imply the teaching of pronunciation is incidental. Only one group of teachers of a technological school makes use of worksheets, “Soundtricks”, especially designed for addressing the sound system in the curriculum.

• The activities featured range from minimal pairs, modeling, repetition, oral practice, oral discussion to dictation, which denote teachers teach the pronunciation component in a non-systematic way. Other teachers even consider speaking activities, reading aloud or dictation as their pronunciation practice activity.

• Pronunciation textbooks are used in intensive English programs and community colleges at intermediate and advanced levels. Very few teachers of technological education indicated that they use pronunciation textbooks.

• Pronunciation software is not used in technological education, but it is used in intensive English programs and community colleges.

The survey carried out leads to the following conclusions:
In intensive English programs, as well as in community colleges, pronunciation is taught to the intermediate/advanced students who are mostly interested in making a professional or academic use of the English language. In those programs, there are subjects such as accent reduction, communication skills, or speech classes. Teachers stressed that they emphasize pronunciation during teachable moments in class. In addition, students have access to computer laboratories so they use computer software programs.

In technological education programs, there are no pronunciation courses per se, but most of the teachers believe they incorporate pronunciation into the curriculum in an indirect manner. Some believe it is through correction of errors as the students speak or read or when dealing with grammar, that pronunciation is taught. Most of the students are service workers who are interested in communicating in English for survival purposes and job related uses. In one program of a technological school there is a systematic pronunciation component that aims at a more professional use of the language by the hospitality workers.

The survey also showed:

a. the sound system is not presented in beginning stages or false beginning stages systematically,

b. awareness of the sound system is postponed until the student is in an intermediate or advanced level, and as a result,
c. the teaching of the physicality of the sounds is delayed until the students are ready for an intermediate level or is done spontaneously at times of opportunity.

Summary of the Aspects of Pronunciation Practice ESOL Adult Learners Favor (Based on Student Survey)

Out of 508 surveyed, 466 indicated their linguistic background. The researcher speculated many of the students who did not reply were a minority in a group who spoke that particular language and as the survey was anonymous, they opted not to circle their language for their own privacy.

Responses to #1, #2 and #6. On the use of English

The answers to item 1 and item 2 refer to their use of the language, in class and at home. The use of the English language in their job was deliberately disregarded as they are supposed to be able to function in English to be able to perform their jobs. It was a sensitive issue, also the kind of job they perform is an indicator of how often they have to use English, and this was not part of the research.

The fact that in #1 the students answered that they always (236) and they sometimes (233) speak English in class is a good indicator of their perception of their oral performance in class. That 233 students expressed that they sometimes speak English may be interpreted in three different ways: that they feel they do not have enough opportunities to participate in class, that there is not enough student – talking –
time, or that they are in a semi monolingual environment and thus they choose to speak their own language part of the time.

Question #2 “I speak English at home.” is evidence that the adult learner, who may have children who go to school and watch TV in English needs English at home, although he may prefer to switch to his native language. Surprisingly for the researcher only 76 said never. The fact that 237 replied sometimes show they attempt to communicate in English. Out of 493 only 22 said they always do.

Question number 6 reflects that 342 always and 130 sometimes enjoy speaking English, which means the students have a positive attitude towards speaking the language.

Responses to 3, 4, 5, and 7. On Pronunciation

Questions 3, 4, 5, and 7 deal with pronunciation. Again, the results widely met the researcher’s expectations. In # 3 “In enjoy learning how to pronounce the sounds”, 319 answered always and 117 answered sometimes. This evidences an appropriate disposition towards learning pronunciation. Question # 4 “I improve my pronunciation in the English class” showed a favorable balance. Out of 488, 289 answered always and 162 answered sometimes. This is a good response of the students in terms of their teachers’ performance and the nature of the program. Question # 5 “My teacher helps me to pronounce in class” was answered positively by 441 students who said always and 38 who said sometimes.
Question #7 that was about the pronunciation initiative of the program, that is, the mini pronunciation lesson called Soundtricks, was answered favorably by 383 students who replied always and 83 who said sometimes.

Response to #8. On independent work.

Question #8 was on the students’ independent work. To the question “I use the dictionary and its symbols to pronounce better” only 129 said always and 255 said sometimes. These figures indicate there is an inclination to use the dictionary, but more than 100 said they seldom or never use it.

Responses to #9 and #10. On error correction.

Questions #9 and #10 deal with the controversial topic on correction of errors. The researcher found out that in #9 “I am nervous when my teacher corrects my mistakes” was answered never by more than 50% of the students in the study. Only 66 stated always and 91 sometimes while 52 stated seldom and 299 never. These responses demonstrate that if there is adequate rapport between students and teachers as question #5 and 10 also prove, students are not nervous if they are corrected. The word nervous was purposefully chosen for the students to understand, as it is a cognate in Spanish and Haitian Creole. The fact that they marked never also indicated that in spite of the fact that the population is composed of false beginners, there was a good comprehension of the meanings of the frequency adverbs and the questions themselves.

The last question, #10, asked the students to say whether they like their teachers to correct their mistakes. The response was overwhelmingly positive. Out of 498
answers, 464 expressed they like to be corrected. This is core in the study as some
extremists in the communicative era have advocated for no correction whatsoever, there
is no doubt that the adult learner feels he needs to know how to improve his oral
expression. Most of them function in the language with little or some broken English,
but as some of them have expressed when asked about it, they say if the teacher does
not help us, or correct us, who is going to do it? What frustrates is the response of a
layman with a blunt: “I don’t understand what you are saying” or better, at times, I don’t
want to understand you because your English is broken and is hideous to my ears.
Punitive correction is out of the question, but encouraging correction can play a
significant role in the improvement of students’ performance. How and when to correct
may be the topic of researchers who follow me, but the need exists, and the desire of the
learners to find out how they can improve their spoken language cannot be left to the
spontaneous absorption of the language in the environment or in the classroom.
Listening and pronunciation may be focused and teachers may build up the sound
inventory of the students by making explicit how the sounds are articulated, by teaching
the physicality of the English sounds and by focusing on how to listen to them.

Summary of a Comparative Study of Ten Pronunciation Textbooks

The study reflects that all the textbooks of the decade have discarded activities
such as listening for ear training or listening and repetition as exercises in developing
pronunciation. Almost all the textbooks begin with listening, repetition and reading
practices. This kind of activity implies activating all the analyzers: visual, auditory
and kinesthetic. Students in the presence of a sound they cannot process are to listen,
repeat and read. The issue of the correspondences of the spoken and the written forms in English is in a way disregarded in an attempt to do just the opposite. Instead, the learner is to decode two different writing systems, regular (which is very irregular) and phonetic at the same time since the beginning of the lesson. Perhaps it is necessary to “warm up” the ear and the speech organs before using the visual analyzer.

All the textbooks included sound discrimination activities and minimal pair activities, some with, some without images for comprehension of meaning. These practices were popular in the days of the audiolingual approach and are still in widespread use. The nature of the English language makes it impossible not to use them. The communicative approach brought more contextual activities to the lesson and in all of the books, this kind of practice was identified to a higher or lesser degree. Another activity in most contemporary books is pair work. All but two have included pronunciation pair practice. Direct explanations are present in all. Considerations in reference to the L1 are absent, yet one author has included a box with the name of the language group that must target that sound or item. If a student speaks that language, he may focus on that particular practice item. Dale and Poms (1994) authored another pronunciation textbook for Spanish speakers that is not included in the study, but in the text for international students there is no reference to any particular language.

All textbooks have accompanying cassettes, and one even offers the possibility of visiting a web page. All the books surveyed have some illustrations, all include some illustrations of the speech organs and all but one have illustrations for meaning. Charts are used by all the authors to illustrate vowels and consonants.
Approaches followed by the authors varied. One textbook is integrative, that is, it combines listening, speaking and pronunciation. Another is cognitive, and its author states it is task-based and aims at discovering through comprehension. There is one that can be labeled revised audio-lingual since its structure resembles the audiolingual textbook, but with new types of activities. Two are weak communicative since they openly explain and yet practice communicatively. Two were classified as communicative interactive because there is plenty of innovative pair work in pronunciation practice. The last three are communicative by declaration of their authors and also because of the kind of activities they include.

Although the teaching of pronunciation implies dealing with discrete items, there is a tendency, in almost all the textbooks, at presenting the teaching material in context, after or before the practice with the discrete item.

Only one of the books is intended for beginners, or false beginners; the other nine target the intermediate or advanced learner.

It is unfortunate none of the textbooks suggests listening or listening and articulating before reading, as if the techniques for teaching listening did not apply to teaching pronunciation.

The study brings to light the lack of materials for lower level false beginning students.

One of the limitations of the study is the lack of a second rater. The fact that there was only one researcher is a limitation. Another limitation was the lack of previous studies on the topic.
Suggestions for Further Studies

Studies may be carried out on related questions regarding various aspects of ESOL pronunciation.

- Do the findings of this study hold constant for other pronunciation books?
- Is the pronunciation component present in ESOL textbooks for adult learners?
- Are the survey results the same as those in programs outside the geographic areas used in this study?
- Are there experimental studies on teaching sounds before correcting them?
- What is the role of phonetic correction in the language lesson?
- Is there a relationship between the critical period hypothesis and the teaching of pronunciation in adult education?
- How does a teacher’s training interact with the amount of pronunciation that is taught in that teacher’s class?
- What is most effective in ESOL, teaching from the letter to the sound, or from the sound to the letter?
- What is most effective in ESOL, teaching phonics, phonemic awareness, or the physicality of the sounds?
- Was pronunciation buried with the audiolingual method?
- Has communicative language teaching disregarded pronunciation?

Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to explore approaches and activities for teaching pronunciation currently featured in ESOL curricula for adult students by
The responses indicated that there is a lack of systematization of the pronunciation activity in the field, particularly, in adult education. The study also surveyed learners to document whether they favored the practice in pronunciation, and the results showed they do. Ten textbooks were reviewed aiming at delving into the types of activities and the structure of the pronunciation textbooks. Most of the textbooks target the intermediate-advanced learner, leaving the false beginner in a pronunciation limbo.

The researcher speculated that students favored correction and liked to learn pronunciation. Although the sample covered only technological school students, the researcher leaves the doors open for other researchers to confirm her speculations that students in intensive English programs and community colleges also favor correction and enjoy learning pronunciation. In fact, the socio economic status of technological students is often very different from the socio economic status of the IEP students, and in turn, most often their educational backgrounds, and thus, this factor may also be investigated.

The researcher would like to stimulate other researchers to examine whether there is a connection between the critical period hypothesis and the fate of the pronunciation component. The critical period hypothesis led the followers of the strong version of the communicative approach to displace the pronunciation component and to discard minimal pair practice and a great deal of pronunciation repetitive practice because these activities were associated to the audio-lingual drill and the behaviorist stimulus-response mechanism. It would be practical to study if the hypothesis that originated with the acquisition of the native language should be
language has a closer correspondence. Yet, there are regularities, there are rules, there is a sound system that has been described in many different ways, that is often not taught to the foreign language learner until he has advanced to a point when his habits my be very hard to break. By this, it is not meant that the raw beginner, who is a zero user would be able to internalize the pronunciation of each and every sound, but the average adult false beginner is well equipped and often willing to do so. This statement was confirmed in the survey applied to 508 adult learners.

The study demonstrates that learners appreciate a teacher who helps them improve pronunciation It also showed that most of the textbooks in the market are aimed at intermediate and advanced learners who have already established pronunciation habits, i.e., the learners who have already acquired the speech mechanisms or internalized their own interlanguage rules, or who perform in the foreign language with their broken or fossilized English.

Recommendations

The following list of recommendations is aimed not only at teachers, but also at ESL/ESOL, pronunciation, or teacher-training textbook writers.

- Let students know in language learning there are seven components: listening, speaking, reading, writing, pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary.
- Let them know that to pronounce well they must focus their listening and speak, act pronunciation.
- Let them know there are 26 vowel and consonant letters, however, there are many more vowel and consonant sounds. Inform gradually that the sounds of
the language are important to improve pronunciation. As fun facts let them know that there are 24 consonant sounds, but 11, 12 or even 17 vowel sounds according to different descriptions. Also that 60% of the words of English does not correspond with the spelling.

- Let them know there is intonation that is produced by the sequences of the tone of the voice. E.g., He’s working. He’s working in a restaurant. He’s working in a restaurant in the morning.

- Let them know there is rhythm, what is characterized by the regular recurrence of emphasized syllables. English tends to stress the first one in two-syllable nouns. E.g., Mary as opposed to Maria, Marie.

- Let them develop an awareness of their own fossils, or recurring mistakes. Let the student listen first, then make them articulate the sounds, then explain very plainly the physicality of the sound. After listening and articulation warming up has taken place, then connect with the written form.

- Let them know rules or regularities. Make them associate. E.g., same, came, name, frame and bake, cake, lake, flake. Let them discover rules.

- Let them know you will correct in an encouraging manner, maybe playing deaf, maybe echoing, maybe whispering, but that you care.

- Let them take responsibility for their progress and self-correction.

- Let them know there is hope, that they can improve.

- Let them feel you are an empathetic, warm, genuine and professionally dedicated speech therapist.
APPENDIX A

Map of Speech Areas
Figure A.1:

Map showing the major regional speech areas. A: Eastern New England; B: New York City; C: Middle Atlantic; D: Southern; E: Western Pennsylvania; F: Southern Mountain; G: Central Midland; H: Northwest; I: Southwest; J: North Central.

APPENDIX B

International Phonetic Alphabet
Figure B.2: The International Phonetic Alphabet

### CONSONANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Bilabial</th>
<th>Labiodental</th>
<th>Dental</th>
<th>Alveolar</th>
<th>Postalveolar</th>
<th>Retroflex</th>
<th>Palatal</th>
<th>Velar</th>
<th>Uvular</th>
<th>Pharyngeal</th>
<th>Glottal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plosive</td>
<td>p b</td>
<td>t d</td>
<td>t d</td>
<td>c j</td>
<td>k g q</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasal</td>
<td>m mj</td>
<td>n n</td>
<td>n n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trill</td>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tap or Flap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>r l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fricative</td>
<td>f v th s z z3 z z3 e j x y x h f h f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral Fricative</td>
<td>t l</td>
<td></td>
<td>i l 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximant</td>
<td>v j j j w</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral Approximant</td>
<td>l l</td>
<td></td>
<td>l l 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ejective Stop</td>
<td>p' t' t' c' k' q'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where symbols appear in pairs, the one to the right represents a voiced consonant. Shaded areas denote articulations judged impossible.

### VOWELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Front</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Back</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Close</td>
<td>i y</td>
<td>i u</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close-mid</td>
<td>e ø</td>
<td>ø y</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-mid</td>
<td>æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ</td>
<td>æ æ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>a a</td>
<td>d d</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where symbols appear in pairs, the one to the right represents a rounded vowel. The symbols for vowels used in this book sometimes differ from IPA usage.
APPENDIX C

Direct Method Lesson
LIBRO PRIMERO
DE
INGLES
POR
LEONARDO SORZANO JORRIN
CATEDRÁTICO DE INGLÉS
EN EL INSTITUTO DE SEGUNDA ENSEÑANZA DE LA HABANA

BASEADO EN CUADROS HECHOS EXPRESAMENTE
:: PARA LA ENSEÑANZA DEL INGLÉS ::

APROBADA COMO OBRA DE TEXTO POR LA
JUNTA DE SUPERINTENDENTES DE ESCUELAS
DE CUBA

OCTAVA EDICIÓN

CULTURAL, S. A.
HABANA

Muestra de escritura fonética.

dis bai iz dzim–hiz neim
iz dzim–hu iz dis go:l?
iz greis–fi iz a piti go:l–
wzt iz hs neim?
hi neim iz
greis– di yu si: on’do bai?
yes, ai du– wzt iz hiz neim?
ai dount nou– wel, hir
neim iz go:l–

Letras 'nuevas.

2 - nat = not.  b - bin = thin.
3 - bai = a boy.  p - de = they.
1 - hir = cut.  f - fi: = she.
=x- max = man.  x - sin = sing.
NAMES FOR THE PUPILS


Agnes, Alice, Annie, Beatrice; Bertie, Caroline, Carrie, Catherine, Katie, Charlotte, Lottie, Dorothy, Edith, Elizabeth, Lizzie, Bessie, Elsie, Emily, Ethel, Florence, Flossie, Gertrude, Gladys, Grace, Helen, Hilda, Jane, Jennie, Jessie, Lily, Louise, Lucy, Mabel, Margaret, Maggie, Mary, Mamie, May, Maud, Mildred, Phyllis, Rose, Sarah, Sally, Sophie.

PRELIMINARY WORK—FIRST LESSON.

For the teacher.—Rule: All words contained in lesson should be known before book is opened. Give English names to pupils; there is a list to select from on the page opposite. It starts you on the road to speaking English at the time and gives an English atmosphere to class.

Process: Let one’s choose his name, preferably his or her own, if it is short. Point to a boy and say You are Tom. Ask: What is your name? and teach answer. My name is Tom. Point to Tom and say to another: This is Tom. Ask: Who is this? When all can ask and answer the teacher and each other, write the sentences used on blackboard, have them read and copied. Time taken up by all this isn’t wasted, because it proves that you want real knowledge, not parrot work, and that it isn’t so difficult to master at least a few words.

Exercise suggested: Who can write his name on the blackboard? Who can write: This is Tom? Sentences getting harder.

Pronunciation: Devote a part of each lesson to pronunciation.

LESSON I.

THE CLASSROOM

1. Tom is a boy. Mary is a girl. Tom is in the classroom. He is in the class-
room. Mary is in the classroom. She is in the classroom. Tom and Mary are in the classroom. The boy and the girl are in the classroom.

2. Are you a boy? Yes, I am. Is Tom a boy? Yes, he is. Is Mary a boy? No, she is not, she is a girl. Tom is not a girl, he is a boy.

SPELLING AND PRONUNCIATION

boy (boi) the (ðә)
girl (gail) classroom (klәsrәm)
Tom (tom) she (ði:)
Mary (mәrә) he (ði:)
one (әnә) and (әnd)
first (fәst) are (ә:)
lesson (leseәn) you (yu:)

QUESTIONS


MEMORIZE

SINGULAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am a boy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. You are a boy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. He is a boy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXERCISES

1/1.—Make a list of five words in this lesson that have two syllables, and one word that has three syllables.

2/1.—Write three sentences about Tom, and three about the classroom.

3/1.—Fill the blanks in the following sentences: (a) I— in the classroom. (b) Tom and Mary—in the classroom. (c) —you a boy? (d) —Tom a boy? Yes, —is. (e) Mary—not a boy,—is a girl.

4/1.—Fill the blanks in the following sentences: (a) He is a—. (b) She is a—. (c) Tom is not a—. (d) Mary is not a—she is a—. (e) Is—a girl? Yes,—is.

5/1.—(a) Write three questions with their answers about Tom. (b) Write three questions with their answers about the classroom. (c) Write three questions with their answers about Mary.
APPENDIX D

Pattern Drills Method
LESSON III

PRONUNCIATION

The following diagrams indicate some of the positions of the tongue.

Notice the pronunciation of the vowels in the following words. They are usually pronounced very long.

leave [i]  man [m]  coat [o]
sit [t]  not [n]  foot [u]
make [k]  but [b]  soon [o]
bed [d]  wall [w]

4. Pronunciation of [i] and [u]

In the vowel [i] the position of the tongue is high front; the lips are unrounded and the muscles are tense.

In the vowel [u] the position of the tongue is not as high as in [i]; the lips are unrounded and the muscles are more relaxed than in [i].
APPENDIX E

Table of Competencies
Table 4: Competencies and Skills, Percentages, and Review Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency/Skill</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Review Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge of language principles</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Categorize basic concepts of phonology (e.g., stress, intonation, juncture, and pitch) as they apply to language development.</td>
<td></td>
<td>19, 26, 36, 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Determine phonemic characteristics (e.g., consonants, blends, vowels, diphthongs) in a given word.</td>
<td></td>
<td>19, 26, 36, 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Recognize methods of phonemic transcription (e.g., International Phonetic Alphabet and Traeger-Smith).</td>
<td></td>
<td>19, 26, 36, 42, 44, 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Recognize phonographemic differences (e.g., homophones and homographs).</td>
<td></td>
<td>19, 36, 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Identify structural patterns in a given word (e.g., root words, affixes, compound words, and syllables).</td>
<td></td>
<td>7, 19, 26, 36, 44, 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Apply principles of English morphology as they relate to language acquisition.</td>
<td></td>
<td>19, 26, 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Compare characteristics of idiomatic expressions, slang, and Standard American English.</td>
<td></td>
<td>19, 44, 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Determine principles of morphological interference between English and other languages.</td>
<td></td>
<td>19, 26, 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Categorize and analyze the structure of English sentences.</td>
<td></td>
<td>7, 19, 26, 36, 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Recognize methods of grammatical analysis (e.g., traditional, structural, or contemporary).</td>
<td></td>
<td>7, 19, 26, 36, 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Determine principles of syntactic interference between English and other languages.</td>
<td></td>
<td>19, 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge of language acquisition</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Identify the principles, characteristics, and terminology of current first and second language acquisition theories.</td>
<td></td>
<td>19, 26, 30, 32, 36, 43, 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Match instructional approaches with language learning theories.</td>
<td></td>
<td>5, 19, 26, 30, 31, 32, 36, 38, 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Compare language acquisition of different age groups (e.g., elementary, secondary, and adult).</td>
<td></td>
<td>12, 30, 32, 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Differentiate between language proficiencies relating to basic interpersonal communicative skills and cognitive academic language skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td>6, 9, 10, 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Identify principles of contrastive and error analyses.</td>
<td></td>
<td>5, 19, 26, 32, 36, 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Identify language acquisition characteristics of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students such as gifted, SLD, EMH and hearing impaired.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10, 11, 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Apply ESOL strategies to specific learning styles.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2, 5, 36, 39, 41, 47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

Florida Performance Standards
FLORIDA PERFORMANCE STANDARDS
for
TEACHERS OF ENGLISH FOR SPEAKERS OF OTHER LANGUAGES

The following is a list of the 25 ESOL standards with indicators which define or "flesh out" each standard. The indicators are drawn from the 75 ESOL Competencies/Skills, as reflected by the numbers in parentheses.

The ESOL teacher is able to:

Standard 1: Conduct ESOL programs within the parameters, goals, and stipulations of the Florida Consent Decree.
Indicator 1: Understand the history of the Florida ESOL Consent Decree, including federal and state laws.
Indicator 2: Know the specific requirements of the six sections of the Florida ESOL Consent Decree with regards to meeting the needs of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students.

Standard 2: Recognize the major differences and similarities among the different cultural groups in the United States.
Indicator 1: Identify specific characteristics of U.S. culture.
Indicator 2: Compare and contrast features of U.S. culture with features of other cultures.

Standard 3: Identify, expose, and reexamine cultural stereotypes relating to LEP and non-LEP students.
Indicator 1: Apply ethnolinguistic and cross-cultural knowledge to classroom management techniques.
Indicator 2: Identify teacher behaviors that indicate sensitivity to cultural and linguistic differences.
Indicator 3: Identify different sociolinguistic language functions (e.g., formal, informal, conversational, and slang).
Indicator 4: Identify culture-specific, nonverbal communications (e.g., gesture, facial expressions, and eye contact).

Standard 4: Use knowledge of cultural characteristics of Florida's LEP population to enhance instruction.
Indicator 1: Identify teacher behaviors that indicate sensitivity to cultural and linguistic differences.
Indicator 2: Adapt items from school curricula to cultural and linguistic differences.
Indicator 3: Identify culture-specific features of content curricula.
Indicator 4: Identify cultural biases in commercialized tests.
Indicator 5: Identify strategies for facilitating articulation with administrators, content area teachers, parents, and the community.

Standard 5: Determine and use appropriate instructional methods and strategies for individuals and groups, using knowledge of first and second language acquisition processes.
Indicator 1: Identify the principles, characteristics, and terminology of current first and second language acquisition theories. [12]
Indicator 2: Compare language acquisition of different age groups (e.g., elementary, secondary, and adult). [14]
Indicator 3: Identify principles of contrastive and error analyses. [16]
Indicator 4: Apply ESOL strategies to specific learning styles. [18]

Standard 6: Apply current and effective ESOL teaching methodologies in planning and delivering instruction to LEP students.
Indicator 1: Identify major methodologies and current trends in ESOL teaching. [48]
Indicator 2: Identify characteristics and applications of ESOL approaches. [49]
Indicator 3: Develop applications of Total Physical Response for beginning stages. [50]
Indicator 4: Plan a Language Experience Approach lesson appropriate for LEP students. [51]
Indicator 5: Identify features of communicative approaches for teaching ESOL. [52]
Indicator 6: Recognize features of content-based ESOL approaches. [53]
Indicator 7: Identify cognitive approaches to second language learning. [54]
Indicator 8: Identify features of content-based ESOL for the elementary, middle, and high school level. [55]
Indicator 9: Identify features of content-area reading for LEP students. [56]
Indicator 10: Identify various instructional strategies used in an ESOL classroom. [57]

Standard 7: Locate and acquire relevant resources in ESOL methodologies.
Indicator 1: Demonstrate knowledge of the historical development of TESOL. [33]
Indicator 2: Recognize contributions of major leaders in the field of ESOL methodology. [43]
Indicator 3: Recognize major language education professional organizations. [66]
Indicator 4: Demonstrate knowledge of major professional publications related to ESOL. [67]

Standard 8: Select and develop appropriate ESOL content according to student levels of proficiency in listen, speaking, reading, and writing, taking into account: (1) basic interpersonal communicative skills (BICS), and (2) cognitive academic language proficiency skills (CALP) as they apply to the ESOL curriculum.
Indicator 1: Differentiate between language proficiencies relating to basic interpersonal communicative skills and cognitive academic language skills. [15]
Indicator 2: Select appropriate ESOL content according to students' levels of proficiency in listening. [23]
Indicator 3: Select appropriate ESOL content according to students' levels of proficiency in speaking. [24]
Indicator 4: Select appropriate ESOL content according to students' levels of proficiency in reading. [25]
Indicator 5: Select appropriate ESOL content according to students' levels of proficiency in writing. [26]

Standard 9: Develop experiential and interactive literacy activities for LEP students, using current information on linguistic and cognitive processes.
Indicator 1: Match instructional approaches with language learning theories. [13]
Indicator 2: Compare language acquisition of different age groups (e.g., elementary,
Indicator 2: Differentiate between language proficiencies related to basic interpersonal communicative skills and cognitive academic language skills. {14}
Indicator 3: Select appropriate ESOL content according to students' levels of proficiency in reading. {25}
Indicator 4: Select appropriate ESOL content according to students' levels of proficiency in writing. {26}
Indicator 5: Identify cognitive approaches to second language learning. {54}
Indicator 6: Identify features of content-area reading for LEP students. {56}

Standard 10: Analyze student language and determine appropriate instructional strategies, using knowledge of phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, and discourse.

Indicator 1: Categorize basic concepts of phonology (e.g., stress, intonation, juncture, and pitch) as they apply to language development. {1}
Indicator 2: Determine phonemic characteristics (e.g., consonants, blends, vowels, diphthongs) in a given word. {2}
Indicator 3: Recognize methods of phonemic transcription (e.g., International Phonetic Alphabet and Traeger-Smith). {3}
Indicator 4: Recognize phonographemic differences (e.g., homophones and homographs). {4}
Indicator 5: Identify structural patterns in a given word (e.g., root words, affixes, compound words, and syllables). {5}
Indicator 6: Apply principles of English morphology as they relate to language acquisition. {6}
Indicator 7: Compare characteristics of idiomatic expressions, slang, and Standard American English. {7}
Indicator 8: Determine principles of morphological interference between English and other languages. {8}
Indicator 9: Categorize and analyze the structure of English sentences. {9}
Indicator 10: Recognize methods of grammatical analysis (e.g., traditional, structural, or contemporary). {10}
Indicator 11: Determine principles of syntactic interference between English and other languages. {11}
Indicator 12: Apply principles of linguistic semantics and discourse as they relate to second language acquisition.

Standard 11: Apply essential strategies for developing and integrating the four language skills of listening comprehension, oral communication, reading and writing.

Indicator 1: Identify essential skills for teaching listening. {19}
Indicator 2: Identify essential skills for teaching speaking. {20}
Indicator 3: Identify essential skills for teaching reading. {21}
Indicator 4: Identify essential skills for teaching writing. {22}
Indicator 5: Apply multi-sensory ESOL strategies for instructional purposes. {58}

Standard 12: Apply content-based ESOL approaches to instruction.

Indicator 1: Identify content-specific vocabulary. {37}
Indicator 2: Distinguish between ESOL and English language arts curricula. {39}
Indicator 3: Recognize the features of content-based ESOL approaches. {53}
Indicator 4: Identify features of content-based ESOL for the elementary [middle, and high school] level. {55}

Indicator 5: Identify features of content-area reading instruction for LEP students. {56}

Indicator 6: Adapt content area tests to ESOL levels appropriate to LEP students. {64}

Standard 13: Evaluate, design and employ instructional methods and techniques appropriate to learners' socialization and communication needs, based on knowledge of language as a social phenomenon.

Indicator 1: Compare language acquisition of different age groups (e.g., elementary, secondary, and adult). {14}

Indicator 2: Differentiate between language proficiencies related to basic interpersonal communicative skills and cognitive academic language skills. {15}

Indicator 3: Apply ESOL strategies to specific learning styles. {18}

Indicator 4: Identify different sociolinguistic language functions (e.g., formal, informal, conversational, and slang). {29}

Indicator 5: Identify culture-specific, nonverbal communications (e.g., gesture, facial expressions, and eye contact). {30}

Indicator 6: Identify culture-specific features of content curricula. {38}

Indicator 7: Apply multi-sensory ESOL strategies for instructional purposes. {58}

Standard 14: Plan and evaluate instructional outcomes, recognizing the effects of race, gender, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and religion on the results.

Indicator 1: Apply ethnolinguistic and cross-cultural knowledge to classroom management techniques. {27}

Indicator 2: Identify teacher behaviors that indicate sensitivity to cultural and linguistic differences. {28}

Indicator 3: Adapt items from school curricula to cultural and linguistic differences. {35}

Indicator 4: Identify cultural biases in commercial tests. {59}

Indicator 5: Design appropriate tests for determining placement and assessing progress and achievement of LEP students. {63}

Standard 15: Evaluate, select, and employ appropriate instructional materials, media, and technology for ESOL at elementary, middle and high school levels.

Indicator 1: Identify state-adopted ESOL curricular materials. {40}

Indicator 2: Demonstrate the ability to evaluate and select appropriate instructional materials for specific ESOL proficiency levels. {41}

Indicator 3: Identify characteristics unique to the evaluation of an ESOL text. {42}

Indicator 4: Identify appropriate instructional equipment for ESOL lessons (e.g., language masters, filmstrips, video cassettes, audio cassettes, and computers). {44}

Indicator 5: Identify characteristics to be considered when selecting printed media for ESOL classes. {45}

Indicator 6: Identify characteristics to be considered when selecting computer-assisted instructional materials for ESOL classes. {47}

Standard 16: Design and implement effective unit plans and daily lesson plans which meet the needs of ESOL students within the context of the regular classroom.

Indicator 1: Identify various ESOL programmatic models, such as pull-out and immersion. {34}
Indicator 2: Adapt items from school curricula to cultural and linguistic differences. [35]
Indicator 3: Develop appropriate curricula for ESOL levels. [36]

Standard 17: Evaluate, adapt, and employ appropriate instructional materials, media, and technology for ESOL in the content areas at elementary, middle, and high school levels.
Indicator 1: Identify content-specific vocabulary. [37]
Indicator 2: Identify culture-specific features of content curricula. [38]
Indicator 3: Distinguish between ESOL and English language arts curricula. [39]
Indicator 4: List examples of realia that are designed to teach LEP students. [46]
Indicator 5: Determine strategies for content area teachers to use with LEP students. [73]

Standard 18: Create a positive classroom environment to accommodate the various learning styles and cultural backgrounds of students.
Indicator 1: Apply ESOL strategies to specific learning styles. [18]
Indicator 2: Apply ethnolingluistic and cross-cultural knowledge to classroom management techniques. [27]
Indicator 3: Identify teacher behaviors that indicate sensitivity to cultural and linguistic differences. [28]
Indicator 4: Apply mult-sensory ESOL strategies for instructional purposes. [58]

Standard 19: Consider current trends and issues related to the testing of linguistic and culturally diverse students when using testing instruments and techniques.
Indicator 1: Identify cultural biases in commercial tests. [59]
Indicator 2: Recognize available ESOL entry/exit tests. [60]
Indicator 3: Identify suitable assessment instruments that assist in complying with legal obligations of districts serving LEP students. [61]

Standard 20: Administer tests and interpret test results, applying basic measurement concepts.
Indicator 1: Construct ESOL listening, speaking, reading, and writing test items. [62]
Indicator 2: Design appropriate tests for determining placement and assessing progress and achievement of LEP students. [63]
Indicator 3: Adapt content area tests to ESOL levels appropriate to LEP students. [64]

Standard 21: Use formal and alternative methods of assessment/evaluation of LEP students, including measurement of language, literacy and academic content metacognition.
Indicator 1: Identify levels of English proficiency to place students appropriately for ESOL instruction. [68]
Indicator 2: Interpret LEP student assessment data related to placement, progress, and exiting from programs. [69]

Standard 22: Develop and implement strategies for using school, neighborhood, and home resources in the ESOL curriculum.
Indicator 1: Identify strategies for facilitating articulation with administrators, content area teachers, parents, and the community. [72]

Standard 23: Identify major attitudes of local target groups toward school, teachers, discipline, and education in general that may lead to misinterpretation by school personnel; reduce cross-cultural barriers between students, parents, and the school setting.
Indicator 1: Identify specific characteristics of U.S. culture. {31}
Indicator 2: Compare and contrast features of U.S. culture with features of other cultures. {32}
Indicator 3: Identify strategies for facilitating articulation with administrators, content area teachers, parents, and the community. {72}

Standard 24: Develop, implement, and evaluate instructional programs in ESOL, based on current trends in research and practice.
Indicator 1: Demonstrate effective lesson planning by providing multi-level ESOL activities for individual, small group, and whole group instruction (e.g., utilizing peer tutors and volunteers or aides, flexible scheduling, appropriate room arrangement, and assessing external resources). {70}
Indicator 2: Identify ESOL-specific classroom management techniques for a multi-level class. {71}

Standard 25: Recognize indicators of learning disabilities, especially hearing and language impairment, and limited English proficiency.
Indicator 1: Identify language acquisition characteristics of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students such as gifted, SLD, EMH, and hearing impaired. {17}
APPENDIX G

Language Management Chart
LANGUAGE MANAGEMENT

INPUT MANAGEMENT

PROVIDE ADEQUATE INPUT

MAKE INPUT SALIENT

ENHANCE INPUT (WRITE, UNDERLINE, HIGHLIGHT, ETC.)

PERSONALIZE CONTEXTUALIZE

ENSURE INPUT IS OF HIGH QUALITY (APPROPRIATE, ACCURATE)

RECYCLE

PROVIDE ADEQUATE COMMUNICATION OPPORTUNITIES

SUSTAIN CONVERSATIONS

REPEAT EXPAND RECAST CORRECT CLARIFY

OUTPUT MANAGEMENT

ELICIT/PROVOKE OUTPUT

ASK QUESTIONS ASK OPINIONS PROMPT SCAFFOLD

ENCOURAGE Ss TO SPEAK LOUDLY, CLEARLY

HAVE Ss TAKE TURNS SPEAKING

IMPROVE QUALITY OF OUTPUT

INDUCE FLUENCY ENCOURAGE ACCURACY

PROVOKE FULL REPLIES

CONDUCT DRILLS CONDUCT GRAMMATICAL EXERCISES

DO ERROR CORRECTION
APPENDIX H

Teacher Survey
Dear colleague,
Finally, before becoming a senior citizen, I am writing my thesis on pronunciation materials and textbooks that are being used in intensive English program courses and in Adult –Ed. courses. I appreciate your time and cooperation. Please circle and / or answer the following questions briefly. Your information is important for my project. Thank You.

a. Does your program have a separate pronunciation class?
   Yes  No

b. Does your program incorporate pronunciation into the curriculum in some other way?
   Yes  No

c. Do you use a pronunciation book?
   Yes  No

d. If so, what is it?

e. Do you use a pronunciation software program?
   Yes  No

f. If so, what is it?

g. In other words, what / how does your program deal with pronunciation?
APPENDIX I

Student Survey
Survey of English Language Usage

Circle ONE of the frequency adverbs in parentheses.
Do not write your name.

1. I (ALWAYS SOMETIMES SELDOM NEVER) speak English in class.
2. I (ALWAYS SOMETIMES SELDOM NEVER) speak English at home.
3. I (ALWAYS SOMETIMES SELDOM NEVER) enjoy learning how to pronounce the sounds.
4. I (ALWAYS SOMETIMES SELDOM NEVER) improve my pronunciation in the English class.
5. My teacher (ALWAYS SOMETIMES SELDOM NEVER) helps me to pronounce in class.
6. I (ALWAYS SOMETIMES SELDOM NEVER) enjoy speaking English.
7. I (ALWAYS SOMETIMES SELDOM NEVER) consider the SoundTricks lessons important for me.
8. I (ALWAYS SOMETIMES SELDOM NEVER) use the dictionary and its symbols to pronounce better.
9. I am (ALWAYS SOMETIMES SELDOM NEVER) nervous when my teacher corrects my mistakes.
10. I (ALWAYS SOMETIMES SELDOM NEVER) like my teacher to correct my mistakes.

My native language is (HAITIAN-CREOLE SPANISH VIETNAMESE OTHER).
APPENDIX J

Chart for the Comparison of Textbooks
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>APPROACH</th>
<th>LISTENING FOR EAR TRAINING</th>
<th>LISTENING AND READING</th>
<th>LISTENING AND READING AND READING</th>
<th>SOUN D DISTINCTION</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>CONTEXTUAL ACTIVITY</th>
<th>MINIMAL PAIR ACTIVITY</th>
<th>PAIR WORK ACTIVITY</th>
<th>DIRECT EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Pronunciation Pairs</td>
<td>Baker &amp; Goldstein</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Accurate English</td>
<td>Daver</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>advanced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Well Said</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>advanced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Focus on Pronunciation</td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>English Pronunciation for International Students</td>
<td>Dale &amp; Poms</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Pronouncing American English</td>
<td>Orion</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Pronunciation Plus</td>
<td>Hewings &amp; Goldstein</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Pronunciation Matters</td>
<td>Henriksen et al.</td>
<td>Beginner</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Targeting Pronunciation</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>advanced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Talk It Up</td>
<td>Kozyrev</td>
<td>Beginner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Pronunciation Pairs</td>
<td>Baker &amp; Goldstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Accurate English</td>
<td>Daver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Well Said</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Focus on Pronunciation</td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>English Pronunciation for International Students</td>
<td>Dale &amp; Poms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Pronouncing American English</td>
<td>Orion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Pronunciation Plus</td>
<td>Hewings &amp; Goldstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Pronunciation Matters</td>
<td>Henrichsen et al.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Targeting Pronunciation</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Talk It Up</td>
<td>Kozyrev</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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