THE ROLE OF PRONUNCIATION IN FINNISH EFL TEXT-BOOKS AND EFL TEACHING

Leni Mäkinen
Master's Thesis
English
Department of Language and
Communication Studies
University of Jyväskylä
May 2021

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Tiedekunta - Faculty Humanistis-yhteiskuntatieteellinen	Laitos - Department Kieli- ja viestintätieteiden laitos
Tekijä – Author Leni Mäkinen	
Työn nimi – Title The role of pronunciation in Finnish EFL textbooks and teaching	
Oppiaine – Subject Englannin kieli	Työn laji – Level Maisterin tutkielma
Aika - Month and year Toukokuu 2021	Sivumäärä - Number of pages 115 + liitteet

Tiivistelmä – Abstract

1970-luvun loppupuolella valtaan noussut kommunikatiivisen kielenopetuksen ideologia on vähentänyt ääntämisen painoarvoa kieltenopetuksessa merkittävästi. Vaikka tilanne on viime vuosina muuttunut, tutkimukset osoittavat, että ääntämistä opetetaan yhä liian vähän, ja etenkin prosodia jää vähälle huomiolle. Myös ääntämisen aseman oppikirjoissa on todettu olevan melko vähäinen.

Tämä tutkimus pyrki selvittämään ääntämisen roolia suomalaisissa alakoulun, yläkoulun ja lukion englannin oppikirjoissa ja opetuksessa sekä opettajien näkemyksiä ääntämismateriaalien riittävyydestä oppikirjoissa. Tutkimukselle oli tarvetta muun muassa siksi, että aiheesta ei ole kovin montaa kattavaa tutkimusta Suomessa, eikä sitä ole tutkittu suuresti tuoreimpien opetussuunnitelmien voimaantulon jälkeen. Aihetta tutkittiin oppikirja-analyysilla ja englannin opettajille suunnatulla kyselyllä. Oppikirjoista tutkittiin sisällönanalyysin keinoin ääntämistehtävien osuus kaikista tehtävistä, tehtävien sisältö ja fokus sekä tehtävätyyppi. Kyselyssä selvitettiin opettajien ääntämisopetuksen määrää, sen sisältöä ja siinä käytettäviä metodeja ja työkaluja sekä opettajien mielipiteitä ääntämisen roolista oppikirjoissa. Kyselyn tulokset analysoitiin pääosin määrällisesti IBM SPSS -ohjelmalla, verraten kouluasteiden eroja tilastollisilla testeillä.

Tulokset osoittivat, että vaikka ääntämisen ja etenkin prosodian rooli suomalaisissa englannin oppikirjoissa on yhä vähäinen, niitä opetetaan silti säännöllisesti. Kirjojen tulisi kuitenkin tarjota enemmän ääntämistehtäviä etenkin prosodiaa koskien - myös opettajien mielestä. Ääntämiseen pitäisi kenties myös kiinnittää enemmän huomiota alakoulun jälkeen, sillä sitä opetettiin huomattavasti enemmän alakoulussa, ja ääntämisellä oli suurin rooli juuri alakoulun kirjoissa. Tuloksissa näkyikin vahvasti oppikirjojen vaikutus opetukseen. Ääntämistehtävien (prosodian vähyyttä lukuun ottamatta) ja -opetuksen sisältö olivat kuitenkin melko hyvin linjassa suositusten kanssa. Vaikka tehtävissä ja opetuksissa käytettiin vaihteleviakin metodeja, niissä dominoivat kuitenkin melko perinteisenä pidetyt keinot, kuten ääneen luku ja kuuntele ja toista -harjoitteet. Täten luovemmille metodeille voisi olla tarvetta sekä kirjoissa että opetuksessa.

Asiasanat – Keywords EFL teaching, L2 learning, pronunciation, pronunciation teaching, pronunciation in textbooks, prosody, teacher survey, textbook analysis

Säilytyspaikka- Depository JYX

Muita tietoja - Additional information

TABLES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1   INTRODUCTION

The status and role of pronunciation in language teaching have varied greatly over time, from great importance to almost total negligence (Celce-Murcia, Brinton & Goodwin, 2010: 2-8). According to Tergujeff and Kautonen (2017: 17-18), pronunciation used to have a significant role in language teaching before the rise of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), and the goal was to gain an almost native-like pronunciation that was trained with very traditional methods, such as reading aloud or repeating after a model. However, in the late 1970s, CLT started to dominate language teaching, and the above-mentioned methods were considered outdated. However, new alternative methods were not invented, and thus explicit pronunciation teaching had to give way to discussion tasks. This is somewhat controversial since pronunciation is an important part of communication, and errors in it can cause misunderstandings and even communication breakdowns (Szpyra-Kozłovska, 2015: 2). Tergujeff and Kautonen (2017: 18) point out that even though native-like pronunciation is an unnecessary and often unattainable goal, explicit pronunciation teaching is needed to guarantee everyone an understandable way of speaking. In addition, according to them, it is important to remember that we do not learn a foreign language in the same manner as we learn our mother tongue, and some learners are less prone to absorb a sufficiently good pronunciation by solely being exposed to the target language without explicit teaching. Furthermore, raising phonological awareness in students can enhance learning, and especially learners from different linguistic backgrounds might need a more varied toolkit for pronunciation teaching. Nonetheless, the important role of pronunciation in communication has gained more support in the 21st century (Tergujeff & Kautonen, 2017: 17-19). However, several studies (Derwing & Munro, 2015: 78) have shown that still too little time is devoted to explicit pronunciation teaching and when pronunciation is taught, sounds are favored over prosody. This is slightly worrisome since some studies indicate that errors in suprasegmental features can in

fact hinder understanding more than errors in individual sounds (e.g., Derwing, Munro & Wiebe, 1998, as cited in Derwing & Munro, 2015: 87; Kuronen 2017: 71).

The present study combines a textbook analysis and a teacher survey and aims to find out how pronunciation is treated in Finnish EFL textbooks and classrooms. More specifically, the goal is to respond to the following research questions:

1. **How many and what type of exercises do Finnish EFL textbooks have concerning pronunciation?**
   a. How many of all exercises deal with pronunciation?
   b. What are the topics treated in the pronunciation exercises? Are either segmental or suprasegmental features favored?
   c. What are the most common pronunciation exercise types?
2. **How much and how do Finnish EFL teachers teach pronunciation? What are the reasons behind this?**
   a. How much do the teachers spend time on pronunciation teaching? Do they think it is enough? What are the reasons behind this?
   b. What are the topics treated in pronunciation teaching? Are either segmental or suprasegmental features favored?
   c. What are the most common methods of teaching pronunciation?
3. **According to the teachers, do Finnish EFL textbooks provide enough material for the teaching of pronunciation?**

Especially in Finland, teachers tend to rely heavily on textbooks although phenomenon-based learning has slightly reduced this tendency (Tergujeff, 2017b: 85-86). Thus, both types of data were needed to ensure a comprehensive picture of the topic: A mere textbook analysis would not have revealed how pronunciation is taught in practice as teachers are likely to search for materials outside the books as well, while focusing only on teacher's views would not have brought forth possible shortcomings in textbooks. The results are compared with previous studies, especially Tergujeff's research (2010, 2012a, 2012b), to see if the role of pronunciation in textbooks and teaching has changed. In addition, the different school levels will be compared. The study also shows whether the role of pronunciation is similar in textbooks and in the classroom and may provide important insight into the possible shortcomings in both textbooks and teaching in terms of pronunciation.

Although there have been quite a lot of studies on pronunciation teaching and materials, the topic is not very widely studied in the Finnish context. Secondly, this study combines a textbook analysis with a teacher survey, both of which are popular methods in studies regarding language teaching but are rarely used together. Thus, it aims to give a more comprehensive picture of the issue by studying it from two different angles and answering multiple questions at once. Thirdly, the present study

pays special attention to prosody, which tends to be a rather neglected area in pronunciation teaching and does not get much recognition in studies, either. In addition, the findings regarding the status of prosody in textbooks vary a great deal. For instance, in Tergujeff's study (2010), the books had barely any material concerning intonation, sentence stress, or connected speech, while in several studies conducted abroad prosody has, in fact, been dominating in the books studied (e.g., Henderson and Jarosz, 2014: 271; Derwing, Diepenbroek & Foote, 2012: 28; Szpyra-Kosłoswka, 2015: 111-112). Thirdly, even though pronunciation and oral skills in general are not very rare topics among master theses, most of the theses tend to focus on upper secondary school, whereas this study considers both basic education and upper secondary school. All in all, this study provides important information that complements and updates the findings from previous studies. For example, there have not been that many master's theses or higher-level studies on pronunciation teaching materials in Finnish EFL textbooks in recent years and, for example, Tergujeff's comprehensive study *Pronunciation teaching materials in Finnish EFL textbooks* (2010) was carried out over ten years ago. As the Finnish National Core Curricula for both Basic Education and General Upper Secondary Schools and textbooks themselves have changed since then, it is reasonable to study whether the way pronunciation is treated in textbooks and teaching has changed. Finally, although teachers' views on textbooks have been researched, there are no Finnish studies focusing on their opinions on the sufficiency of pronunciation teaching materials in EFL textbooks.

Now that the aims and research questions of the present study have been introduced and the need for this study has been explained, it is time to briefly discuss the outline of the thesis. The three following chapters provide a background for the study. First pronunciation is discussed from the point of view of teaching. After defining some central concepts related to pronunciation, its role as a part of communicative competence and oral skills and the importance of its teaching are discussed. The rest of the chapter deals with the history of pronunciation teaching and its current state as well as the goals and topics of pronunciation teaching defined or suggested in the CEFR, the NCC, and a few other sources. The third chapter discusses pronunciation from the point of view of learning. The process of learning pronunciation and factors affecting it are treated, after which English phonology is introduced and the difficulties it causes for Finnish students are explained. Finally, the fourth chapter deals with the findings from previous studies related to the research questions. After this, the data and the methods of analysis of the present study are explained, while the sixth chapter presents the results. Finally, the last chapter combines discussion and conclusion, which summarizes the aims and methods, brings together the findings and compares them to previous studies. In addition, implications and a critical evaluation of the study as well as suggestions for future research are provided.

2 THE ROLE OF PRONUNCIATION IN LANGUAGE TEACHING

In this chapter, I will discuss the current role of pronunciation in language teaching and how it has changed over time. I will start by briefly defining the term *pronunciation* and its relation to *phonology* and *phonetics*, after which I will continue by discussing its role as a part of communicative competence and oral skills. The third part focuses on the importance of teaching pronunciation, whereas the fourth one covers pronunciation teaching and different approaches to it in a historical perspective. The fifth part will discuss the teaching of pronunciation in today's context from the perspective of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), while the final part deals with the goals of pronunciation teaching based on the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR), the Finnish National Core Curricula, and a few other sources.

2.1 Defining phonology, phonetics, and pronunciation

In order to better understand what pronunciation consists of and what it is related to, it is important to first briefly define what *phonology* and *phonetics* mean. Pennington and Rogerson-Revell (2019: 3) define *phonology* as the sound system of a language, referring to the meaningful distinctions in sounds in that language. As all spoken units of a language are based on speech sounds, phonology can thus, according to them, be considered as the building blocks of a language. Even though the term is sometimes used to refer to all of the phenomena concerning linguistic sounds (Pennington & Rogerson-Revell, 2019: 3-4), it is often limited to mean the study of sound patterns in a particular language or in a variety of language, whereas the branch of *phonetics* focuses on the scientific description of speech sounds across all languages (Rogerson-Revell, 2011: 2). These speech sounds are presented, for instance, in the *International*

Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) of the *International Phonetic Association* (Odisho, 2003: 33). Both phonetics and phonology provide important information for language teaching: the former enables a detailed description of the attributes of individual speech sounds, whereas the latter aims to explain how these sounds work within a certain language (Rogerson-Revell, 2011: 2). However, the term *pronunciation*, as Pennington and Rogerson-Revell (2019: 4) point out, has a more practical or applied base. Thus, linguists and researchers in the field of second language acquisition (SLA) prefer to use the term *phonology* (or occasionally *phonetics*). However, language teachers normally use the term *pronunciation* instead of *phonology* to refer to "an area of proficiency in language learning or a type of skill in spoken language performance" (Pennington & Rogerson-Revell, 2019: 4). Therefore, due to the pragmatic nature of the topic of this study, the term *pronunciation* will be used throughout the text when discussing phonology in the context of teaching.

Derwing and Munro (2015: 5) define pronunciation as follows: "All aspects of the oral production of language, including segments, prosody, voice quality, and rate". However, according to Pennington and Rogerson-Revell (2019: 4-5), pronunciation is traditionally divided into two main categories: *segmental features* (individual sounds) and *suprasegmental features* (prosody). The former consists of vowels and consonants, whereas the latter refers to features that affect more than one sound or segment, including "*tone* and *intonation* (defined by pitch), *rhythm* (defined by duration) and *stress* or *accentuation* (defined by acoustic intensity, force of articulation, or perceptual prominence)" (Pennington & Rogerson-Revell, 2019: 4-5). Odisho (2003: 59) defines *tone* and *intonation* as the continuous change in pitch that can also be called the melody of speech. If this change causes semantic differences between words, the language is a *tone language*, such as Chinese. However, in *intonation languages,* like English, the pitch pattern does not affect the semantic meaning of words but is used to signal syntactic, semantic, and attitudinal features of an utterance (Odisho, 2003: 59). *Rhythm* is the distribution of stressed and unstressed syllables and pauses that consists of word and sentence stress (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010: 209). *Word stress* refers to the stressed syllables within a word: the vowels of stressed syllables are often longer, louder, and have a higher pitch, but all these features may not be present in all stressed syllables (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010: 184). *Sentence stress*, on the other hand, refers to the several stressed elements within a sentence (Celce-Murcia et al, 2010: 208). As Celce-Murcia et al. (2010: 164) point out, prosody also entails features of *connected speech*, which means the changes in pronunciation within and between words caused by their neighboring sounds and with the purpose of saving time and energy. These features include *contractions, blends,* and *reductions* (the written and/or oral changes in word boundaries), *linking* (tying sounds smoothly together), *assimilation* (the change resulting in a greater resemblance between adjacent sounds), *dissimilation* (the change causing neighboring

sounds to resemble each other less), *deletion* (the omission of a sound), and *epenthesis* (the inclusion of an additional sound). Thus, the dichotomy is not as clear because prosody can affect the realization of individual sounds. However, it helps in classifying the desired learning outcomes of pronunciation teaching (Kuronen, 2017: 59).

In this section, I have defined the concepts of *phonology*, *phonetics*, and *pronunciation*. I have also briefly introduced the main elements of pronunciation: segmentals and suprasegmentals. In the next section, I will discuss the role of pronunciation in the context of communicative competence and oral skills.

2.2 Pronunciation as a part of communicative competence and oral skills

According to Lee (2008: 16), the main goal of foreign language (FL) teaching is to "create a communicative environment in which learners express themselves in the target language." Most of the goals of the present-day FL teaching are closely linked to improving students' communication skills (Rivers, 1981: 8-11). Communicative language competence is also emphasized in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, a document that lays a foundation for the creation of language syllabi, curriculum guidelines, examinations, textbooks and so on across Europe, and include descriptions of six levels of language proficiency (Council of Europe, 2001: 1).

Communicative competence is often discussed from the point of view of Canale and Swain's model (1980: 29-31), in which it is divided into three groups: grammatical, sociolinguistic, and strategic competence. *Grammatical competence* involves knowledge of vocabulary and rules of morphology, syntax, sentence-grammar semantics, and phonology. Therefore, pronunciation is a part of the grammatical competence. *Sociolinguistic competence* refers to the skill of using appropriate language in different situations (e.g., mastering conversational norms and registers). Finally, *strategic competence* entails verbal and non-verbal strategies that are used to overcome problems in communication (e.g., gestures or paraphrasing the meaning of a word that has been forgotten). *Communicative performance*, on the other hand, is the "realization of these competencies and their interaction in the actual production and comprehension of utterances", influenced by general psychological constraints (Canale & Swain, 1980: 6).

However, communicative competence is rather a broad concept as it entails verbal and non-verbal communication, oral and written forms as well as production and comprehension skills (Canale & Swain, 1980: 29). Thus, oral skills can be seen as a subskill to communicative competence. In addition, oral skills can be further distinguished from speech communication skills: oral skills are language-specific skills to orally communicate via the target language, whereas speech communication skills

refer to the skills that are needed in all communicative language use in which one produces, receives, or transmits speech (Hildén, 2000: 172-173).

A very straightforward way of defining oral skills is to regard them as including all the abilities that are needed to understand, produce, and use language appropriately and naturally in speech communication in different kinds of situations (Salo-Lee, 1991: 2). Bygate (1987: 5-6) divides speaking into *motor-perceptive skills* and *interaction skills*. The former and more superficial level concerns the correct perception, recall, and articulation of sounds and structures of a language, while the latter means using motor-perceptive skills and linguistic knowledge to communicate. It involves decisions about the content of an utterance, the manner of expressing it, and choosing whether one needs to develop what they are saying, while not forgetting one's intentions and desired relations with the interlocutors. Motor-perceptive skills thus enable speaking, but one is not able to really communicate and convey messages without making intentional decisions about their language use. This seems to be in line with Canale and Swain's communicative competence model: One needs to have sufficient knowledge of vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation to speak and understand a foreign language. However, it is necessary to also make decisions about how to speak appropriately in a given situation and what type of verbal or non-verbal strategies to use to convey the message successfully.

Although oral skills involve quite a lot of elements, pronunciation naturally plays an important role in it since pronunciation skills strongly influence whether one's message is understood (Tergujeff & Kautonen, 2017: 19). As Pennington and Rogerson-Revell (2019: 1) put it: "It is the crucial starting point for all spoken language, since thoughts must be articulated in sound in order to be heard and so to become a message that can be communicated to another person".

To sum up this section, the hierarchy from communication skills to pronunciation skills could be presented as follows: communication skills → speech communication skills → oral skills → pronunciation skills. In this section, the role of pronunciation within communicative competence and oral skills has been dealt with. Before discussing how pronunciation teaching has changed over time and what the current trend is, it is first important to see why it is important to teach pronunciation overall.

2.3   The importance of teaching pronunciation

To understand why it is important to teach pronunciation, it is crucial to distinguish between the processes of *acquisition* and *learning*, which Odisho (2003: 10-11) defines as follows: *Acquisition* is usually a subconscious, automatic and effortless process of internalizing a sound system, while *learning* refers to a more mechanical process that

happens consciously and requires effort on the learner's part. The former is often associated with how children adopt the pronunciation of their first language (L1) or a given language, while the latter is normally linked to the process that adults go through in order to master the pronunciation of a target language. Nonetheless, these two processes often complement each other and are influenced by factors such as the age of the learners, amount of exposure to the target language, the conditions of exposure to the linguistic material and the level of motivation (Odisho, 2003: 11).

However, this does not mean that children would not need pronunciation teaching. Tergujeff and Kautonen (2017: 17-19) mention several factors supporting explicit pronunciation teaching. Firstly, learners do not usually acquire a foreign language in the same manner as they learned their L1, especially when the target language is not fully dominant in the environment. Thus, although learners are likely to gain benefits from the pronunciation input and output outside the school context, they cannot be expected to automatically master the pronunciation of a foreign language just by being exposed to it in their free time. Secondly, it is also important to remember that learners are different, and some are less prone to absorb influences from their surroundings. In addition, not all know how to properly exploit the opportunities to hear and speak the target language in their environment. Thirdly, new languages often entail elements that differ or do not exist in the learner's L1 and that require a lot of practicing. Explicit teaching, in which the learning goals are made clear to the student, enhance, and expedite the learning process. Thus, increasing students' awareness leads to more efficient learning. Finally, classes tend to be quite heterogenous nowadays, and students come from varying linguistic backgrounds and can thus have very different types of challenges with pronunciation. Therefore, teachers should have a more diverse toolbox of teaching techniques to answer to the needs of all students. In addition, according to Celce-Murcia et al. (2010: 34), meta-phonological awareness, which is likely to be facilitated through explicit pronunciation teaching, correlates positively with language performance and improves one's spoken comprehensibility.

Odisho (2003: 7-14) also gives examples why differences between one's L1 and the target language can cause problems that cannot be solved by mere exposure but require explicit teaching. Firstly, to be able to produce a certain sound, a learner must first be able to perceive that sound. However, especially adult learners may suffer from *psycholinguistic deafness*, which means that they fail in recognizing sounds or in differentiating between them. This is due to too little exposure to L2, which has caused a bias for L1 sound system. Fortunately, this problem can often be solved by combining multisensory and multicognitive approaches and using a variety of teaching styles. Multisensory approach means using as many sensory channels as possible. For instance, the teaching of pronunciation can include hearing the sound (auditory), seeing (visual) how producing the sound changes, for example, jaw or lip position, and

feeling (tactile/kinesthetic) how the sound is formed in mouth. Secondly, children might easily perceive a sound but lack neuromuscular maturation to produce it themselves. In this case, the learner needs plenty of exposure but also proper practice.

Furthermore, having a sufficiently good pronunciation is crucial for communication as no efficient oral communication can be achieved without it, and phonetic errors can lead to misunderstandings and communication breakdowns (Szpyra-Kozłovska, 2015: 2). According to Jenkins (2000: 1), pronunciation is the area that challenges intelligibility between non-native speakers the most and creates probably the most significant barrier to successful communication. Native speakers (NS) are also often more sensitive to errors in pronunciation compared to those in lexical or syntactic items (Rogerson-Revell, 2011: 5). Although phonetic misunderstandings can often be easily solved, and the listener might be able to deduce the meaning from the linguistic and/or extralinguistic context (Szpyra-Kozłovska, 2015: 2), incorrect pronunciation might lead to embarrassing and uncomfortable situations. For example, intonation has several functions in English, including conveying emotions and attitudes towards the topic and the interlocutor (Tergujeff & Kautonen, 2017: 18). Thus, errors in intonation can cause one to leave a bad impression.

On the other hand, the problem is not always occasional errors but rather a systematic repetition of wrong patterns. For instance, Kelly (2000, as cited in Szpyra-Kozłovska, 2015: 3) claims that German learners who use their native intonation patterns when speaking English appear abrupt or impolite, while the Spanish who employ their native prosody are often regarded as bored and disinterested. Szpyra-Kozłovska (2015: 3-4) provides other reasons as well. Firstly, just barely understandable pronunciation puts too much strain on the listener and is likely to cause annoyance and irritation. Secondly, pronunciation does not, unfortunately, only affect others' perception of one's linguistic proficiency, but it can also lead to judgments on the speaker's personality, intelligence, and social background. In the worst case, negative attitudes towards poor pronunciation and accented speech can result in stigmatization and discrimination. Thirdly, pronunciation skills can also influence language learning in general as well since those with poor pronunciation tend to be less confident to use the target language, whereas learners with better pronunciation are often more eager to communicate in a foreign language and thus get more experience of achievement.

However, not all agree on the importance of explicit pronunciation teaching. For example, Krashen's (1985, as cited in Derwing & Munro, 2015: 46-47) *input hypothesis* had a major effect on pronunciation teaching. According to this model, the most efficient way of learning languages for adults is through plenty of comprehensible input with very little explicit instruction. In addition, Purcell and Suter (1980, as cited in Derwing & Munro, 2015: 26) did not find significant correlation between pronunciation instruction and pronunciation scores although Derwing and Munro (2015: 47-49)

point out several shortcomings of the study. For instance, they measured changes only in the strength of foreign accent, not considering features like intelligibility, fluency, or any finer details of their subjects' oral performance. On the other hand, in Sisson's study (1970, as cited in Derwing & Munro, 2015: 26), two different instructional methods led to improvement in pronunciation. However, Krashen's hypothesis together with Purcell and Suter's findings and Canale and Swain's Communicative competence model caused a mainstream tendency of abandoning the formal teaching of pronunciation as well as grammar in the late 20th century (Derwing & Munro, 2015: 47). However, the important role of pronunciation in communication has been noted again in the 21st century (Tergujeff & Kautonen, 2017: 18).

I have now discussed the reasons why sufficiently good pronunciation and thus the explicit teaching of it are important. On the other hand, I have also provided examples of models and studies that do not support this view. The different approaches to pronunciation teaching over time will be discussed in more detail in the next section.

2.4   The teaching of pronunciation over time: different approaches

Before discussing the current state of pronunciation teaching, it is important to briefly deal with the trends that have dominated the field over a longer period of time. According to Celce-Murcia et al. (2010: 2), modern language teaching has generated two main approaches to pronunciation teaching: *Intuitive-Imitative Approaches* and *Analytic-Linguistic Approaches*. The former one, which was the only approach until the late nineteenth century, relies on the learner's listening skills and ability to imitate the rhythms and sounds of the target language without any explicit information. The latter one, developed to complement rather than substitute the first one, utilizes explicit information and tools, such as phonetic symbols and articulatory descriptions.

Celce-Murcia et al. (2010: 3-8) provide a concise overview of the history of the methods used in the teaching of pronunciation. In the late 1800s and early 1900s, *Direct Method*, grounded on the observations of how children acquire their L1 and of children and adults learning foreign languages outside the instructional context, was popular. In this method, students are taught through intuition and imitation as they repeat after the model provided by the teacher or a recording. The more recent naturalistic methods, such as Krashen and Terrell's Natural Approach (1983, as cited in Celce-Murcia et al, 2010: 3), are successors of this method. These methods support the idea that learners should first internalize the target sound system before starting to produce speech themselves.

However, the *Reform Movement* emerged in the 1890s, introducing the International Phonetic Alphabet (henceforth IPA), which enabled to represent the sounds of

any language visually (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010: 3). According to Celce-Murcia et al. (2010: 3-4), this was the result of the establishment of phonetics as a science that aimed at describing and analyzing the sound systems of languages. This movement argued that speech is primary in languages, and thus the spoken form should be taught first. In addition, the following practices were supported: research in the field of phonetics should influence language teaching, teachers must receive training in phonetics, and learners should practice phonetics to obtain good speaking skills. The reform was likely to influence the development of *Audiolingualism* in the United States and of the *Oral Approach* in Britain in the 1940s and 1950s. In both methods, pronunciation is valued highly and taught explicitly right from the start. Imitation is complemented with varying tools, such as different visual aids. In addition, *minimal-pair drills*, which means practicing sounds with words that differ only by one sound that is in the same position in both words, became a frequently used technique during this time.

Nonetheless, during the 1960s, the status of pronunciation in teaching worsened due to the *Cognitive Approach*, influenced by Chomsky's transformational-generative grammar and Neisser's cognitive psychology (Celce-Murcia et al, 2010: 5). The supporters of this approach considered language to be behavior governed by rules instead of habit formation and favored grammar and vocabulary over pronunciation because they argued that achieving native-like pronunciation was impossible and thus time should be spent on teaching more learnable elements (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010: 5).

In the 1970s, two interesting methods emerged: *Silent Way* and *Community Language Learning* (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010: 5-8). In the former method, learners are taught from the beginning not only the correct pronunciation of individual sounds but also how words form phrases and how blending, stress, and intonation affect the pronunciation of an utterance. However, students do not have to know phonetic alphabets or explicit linguistic information. Instead, the teacher uses different gestures and rhythmic and visual tools to guide the students, speaking as little as possible from which the method has gotten its name. In the latter method, a typical lesson starts with the teacher standing behind one of the students, hands on the student's shoulders. He or she then asks each student to say something in their L1 that they would like to be able to express in the target language, and the teacher provides a translation of this sentence. This phrase is repeated so many times that the student can say it fluently, after which it is recorded. The teacher then writes transcriptions of the utterances, provides translations, and asks whether students want to practice the pronunciation of the sentences. If they do, the teacher stands behind one student and uses a technique called *human computer*. In this technique, the student can turn on or off the "computer" by asking for a model of pronunciation while practicing the correct pronunciation.

I have now discussed the different approaches and methods in pronunciation teaching over time. However, this was not an exhaustive list of all the methods but

gives a good overview of the topic. As can be seen, the role of pronunciation has varied a great deal from total negligence to great importance and even quite distinctive methods. Now that we understand the history of pronunciation teaching, it is time to discuss its current role in language teaching.

2.5 The teaching of pronunciation today: Communicative Language Teaching

As we discussed in section 2.2, *communicative competence* is emphasized in the present-day teaching, and the goal is to establish a communicative setting where students can freely express themselves in the target language. This is in line with the currently dominant method in language teaching, *Communicative Language Teaching* (CLT), also known as *Communicative Approach*, that began to take over in the late 1970s (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010: 8-11). The advocates of the method argue that communication in the target language should be the priority in all classroom instruction since the main purpose of language is communication (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010: 8). Communication plays a big role in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) and the Finnish National Core Curricula (NCC). For instance, the self-assessment grid of the CEFR language proficiency levels divides speaking skills into spoken production and spoken interaction (Council of Europe, 2001: 26-27), which emphasizes the communicative nature of speaking as a separate skill. In addition, it provides descriptive scales of the levels for several different types of oral and written communication situations. Furthermore, the updated version added online communication to the list (Council of Europe, 2018). In the Finnish National Core Curriculum for Basic Education, three of the eleven main objectives of foreign language teaching in classes 3–6 and 7–9 are about interaction (Finnish National Board of Education, 2016a: 237, 376). In upper secondary school, one of the goals of EFL teaching is to understand the significance of the English language and its role in international communication (Finnish National Board of Education, 2016b: 117). Thus, here communication is closely linked to the global status of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) and English as an International Language (EIL). In addition, the two first compulsory courses of English pay special attention to acting in different communicative situations (Finnish National Board of Education, 2016b: 117).

At first one might think that the emphasis on communication in the classroom would increase the teaching of pronunciation as it is an integral part of communication. However, as Tergujeff and Kautonen (2017: 17-18) point out, this approach has, in fact, weakened the status of pronunciation in language teaching as explicit pronunciation training was substituted by more general communicative tasks for two reasons.

Firstly, as the objective of native-like pronunciation was deemed unrealistic by this approach, explicit pronunciation was not seen as so important anymore. Secondly, the previous methods were seen outdated by the supporters of CLT. However, they did not develop alternative techniques, which led to the negligence of explicit pronunciation training. However, the role of pronunciation is slowly improving as it has been understood that pronunciation is a central feature in communication, and in the worst case, errors in it can hinder successful interaction. However, native-like pronunciation is rarely the goal anymore as the emphasis is on intelligibility.

I have now addressed the way in which CLT has affected the status of pronunciation in language teaching. I will now move on to discuss how the CEFR and the Finnish National Curricula treat pronunciation and what type of objectives they list for it.

2.6   The goals and content of pronunciation teaching

The goals of pronunciation teaching will be discussed based on the CEFR and the National Core Curricula (henceforth NCC) for Basic Education and General Upper Secondary School. Although the NCC are prepared in accordance with different laws (Finnish National Board of Education 2016a, 2016b), the CEFR is likely to influence them, and at least the descriptions of language proficiency levels in the NCC are based on it (Finnish National Board of Education, 2016a, 2016b). As the local curricula must be formed in compliance with the NCC (Finnish National Board of Education, 2016a), the NCC could be considered the most important document when it comes to the content and goals of teaching in Finland. At the end of this section, I will show what has been written about the topic in other sources.

2.6.1   Pronunciation in the CEFR

The first version of the CEFR (Council of Europe, 2001) did not give a very detailed description of what learners at each proficiency level should know and be able to do as to pronunciation. It stated that phonological competence consists of knowledge and skills in the perception and production of phonemes and allophones (the realization of phonemes in particular contexts), in the phonetic features that divide phonemes (e.g. nasality and plosion), in the phonetic composition of words (syllable structure, the sequence of phonemes, word stress, and word tones), in sentence phonetics (sentence stress, rhythm, intonation), and in phonetic reduction (e.g. elision and assimilation) (Council of Europe, 2001: 116-117). This list may sound quite exhaustive, but the descriptions of pronunciation skills at the language proficiency levels were somewhat vague (Table 1).

TABLE 1 Phonological control in the CEFR (Council of Europe, 2001: 117)

	Phonological control
C2	As C1
C1	Can vary intonation and place sentence stress correctly in order to express finer shades of meaning.
B2	Has acquired a clear, natural, pronunciation and intonation.
B1	Pronunciation is clearly intelligible even if a foreign accent is sometimes evident and occasional mispronunciations occur
A2	Pronunciation is generally clear enough to be understood despite a noticeable foreign accent, but conversational partners will need to ask for repetition from time to time
A1	Pronunciation of a very limited repertoire of learnt words and phrases can be understood with some effort by native speakers used to dealing with speakers of his/her language group

The document left it to the reader to decide on the new phonological skills that are required of the learner between the levels, the relative importance of segmental and suprasegmental features, and whether phonetic accuracy and fluency should be a goal at an early stage of language learning or a longer-term objective (Council of Europe, 2001: 117). According to Lintunen and Dufva (2017: 53), the vagueness of the descriptions has been a challenge in language teaching.

However, the updates to the CEFR (2018) provide more information on the role of pronunciation and offer a thorough and exhaustive description of the proficiency levels. The new version claims that the original phonology scale was the only CEFR illustrative descriptor that was developed based on a native speaker norm, and that the updated version concentrates on intelligibility rather than native-like skills (Council of Europe, 2018: 47). The new version takes too much space to be included here, but it is visible at the end of this paper (Appendix 1). The core areas that were considered when planning the scale were *articulation* (the pronunciation of sounds/phonemes); *prosody* (intonation, rhythm, word and sentence stress, and speech rate/chunking); *accentedness* (accent and deviations from the norm); and *intelligibility* (how accessible the meaning is for listeners and the level of ease in understanding) (Council of Europe, 2018: 134). However, due to overlaps in the sub-categories, the scale is divided into three categories: overall phonological control that replaces the old scale, sound articulation, and prosodic features. In the first one, intelligibility works as the key factor for discriminating between levels, and other features considered are the amount of influence from other languages, and the mastery of sounds and prosodic features. The second category emphasizes familiarity and confidence with the sounds of the target language as well as clarity and precision in their articulation, while the last category highlights the ability to use prosody to convey meanings more

precisely. Key concepts involve the mastery of stress, intonation, and/or rhythm, and the skills to utilize and/or vary stress and intonation in order to emphasize one's message (Council of Europe, 2018: 134-135).

We have now learned that the original version of the CEFR did not specify the goals of pronunciation at different proficiency levels very clearly, while the update published in 2018, replacing the original scale, provided an exhaustive descriptor scale that emphasized intelligibility instead of native-like pronunciation and valued both segmental features and prosody. Now we will see how the NCC treat pronunciation.

2.6.2 Pronunciation in the National Core Curricula

The NCC for Basic Education discusses pronunciation only shortly and rather vaguely. One of the objectives of EFL instruction in classes 3–6 is to "offer the pupil opportunities for producing speech and writing on a wider range of topics, also paying attention to essential structures and the basic rules of pronunciation" (Finnish National Board of Education, 2016a: 237). The content of teaching related to this objective is observation of pronunciation and a great deal of practice, including topics such as word and sentence stress, rhythm, and intonation. In addition, the students practice recognizing the phonetic transcriptions in English (Finnish National Board of Education, 2016a: 238). Thus, the NCC seems to highlight the importance of both individual sounds and prosody. In classes 7–9, the content of pronunciation teaching is not described in any way. However, one of the goals of EFL teaching in secondary school is good pronunciation, and to get the numerical grade 8 at the end of the syllabus, the student should be able to apply several fundamental or simple pronunciation rules also in new expressions (Finnish National Board of Education, 2016: 376-379). Nonetheless, the document leaves a lot of room for different interpretations and does not specify, for example, which sounds or stress patterns are the most crucial for smooth communication and should thus be emphasized in teaching. However, the role of pronunciation in NCC for Basic Education has become stronger since the previous curriculum, which did not mention pronunciation at all besides the descriptor scales of language proficiency at the end of the document (Finnish National Board of Education, 2004).

The NCC for General Upper Secondary Schools, on the other hand, does not even mention pronunciation directly when dealing with EFL teaching. However, it does not discuss grammar or vocabulary, either. Instead, the document focuses more on broader themes, such as lifelong language-learning skills and competences of global citizenship (Finnish National Board of Education, 2016b). However, the descriptor scales of language proficiency provided at the end of the document, based on the CEFR scales, do involve pronunciation in their text production skills (Finnish National Board of Education, 2016b: 252-261). Quite interestingly, at level A1 (A1.1–A1.3), the focus is on understandable pronunciation, whereas levels A2 (A2.1 and A2.2) and B1

(B1.1 and B1.2) entail the basic rules of pronunciation, and prosodic features are not mentioned until level B2 (B2.1 and B2.2). This implies that both segmental and supra-segmental features are regarded as important, although prosody seems to be considered belonging to a greater proficiency and thus more difficult. At level B2, the clarity of pronunciation as well as word stress and intonation are emphasized. The level C1.1 requires natural and pleasant pronunciation in which speech rhythm and intonation are typical of the target language. Although the new curriculum, which will be implemented in Finnish upper secondary schools starting in August 2021, is quite in line with the current one as to pronunciation, it does specify that one of the main contents of the second mandatory course is the formation of sounds and speech production, including different variants of English and comparisons to other languages (Opetushallitus, 2019: 181).

This section has demonstrated that the NCC do not give very detailed descriptions of the content or goals of pronunciation teaching. However, the change seems to be for the better, as the current NCC for basic education and the future NCC for general upper secondary schools indicate. In addition, both sounds and prosody appear to be equally valued although the latter seems to be considered more challenging since skills related to it are not directly mentioned at the first levels of proficiency.

2.6.3 Other sources

Now that we have seen how the CEFR and the NCC treat pronunciation, it is useful to discuss what other sources claim should be the goal and content of pronunciation instruction. In section 2.3, I offered reasons why pronunciation teaching is important. However, this raises a question of how good one's pronunciation should be. According to Levis (2005: 370), pronunciation teaching and research have been influenced by two contrastive approaches: the *nativeness principle* and the *intelligibility principle*. In the former one, which was the dominant approach before the 1960s, the goal is to achieve native-like pronunciation, and this goal is seen as realistic. In the latter principle, the goal is to reach understandable pronunciation, no matter how strong the foreign accent is. However, as Szpyra-Kozłowska (2015: 7) points out, achieving native-like or near-native pronunciation is an unattainable goal for many, and learners with native-like English pronunciation are scarce. Moreover, as Lintunen and Dufva (2017: 51) point out, if the aim is perfect and errorless speech, it can prevent students from practicing their overall oral skills and discourage them from speaking. According to them, there are also some benefits to being recognized as a learner. For instance, shortcomings in politeness or cultural knowledge are more easily forgiven. Despite the evidence not supporting the nativeness principle, it still influences the teaching of pronunciation, for instance, in the aim to reduce foreign accent (Levis, 2005: 370).

In regard to the intelligibility principle, Szpyra-Kozłowska (2015: 7) distinguishes between *basic* or *minimal intelligibility* and *comfortable intelligibility*. The first one enables rudimentary communication but demands a lot of effort on the listener's part to understand the message, while the second one puts only little if any strain on the listener. As she points out, although minimal intelligibility might be enough for some, such as tourists travelling abroad who need English just to survive (e.g., to ask for directions or order a meal in a restaurant), comfortable intelligibility allows learners to use the target language in different types of situations and for various purposes.

These different goals obviously influence what should be taught. If the goal is a native-like pronunciation, all phonetic details of the target language should be practiced, but if the goal is to be understood, some elements should be emphasized, while others can be neglected (Szpyra-Kozłowska, 2015: 7). Despite the claims that prosody is more crucial to intelligibility than sounds because listeners can quite easily compensate errors in phonemes (e.g., Celce-Murcia et al., 2010: 33; Kuronen, 2017: 71), Levis (2005: 369-370) argues that there is not enough evidence to prove this. He also claims that some prosodic features are unlearnable. However, the priorities of pronunciation teaching should not be restricted to either one. As Derwing and Munro (2015: 9) note, both sounds and prosody should be considered in pronunciation teaching.

There have been models invented to help teachers choose the priorities for their pronunciation instruction. Rogerson-Revell (2011: 247-248) provides five criteria to guide this choice: intelligibility, functional load, degree of tolerance, return on investment, and end-purpose. These criteria are presented below (Table 2).

TABLE 2 Pronunciation teaching priorities (Rogerson-Revell, 2011: 247-248)

Criteria	Reason	Priority	Example
Intelligibility	The error causes communication breakdown	High	voicing and syllable length ('pea<u>ce</u>' vs 'pea<u>s</u>')
	The error does not affect intelligibility	Low	• /d/ vs /ð/ in 'dis' and 'this' • 'wrong' tone choice
Functional load	The error is a frequently occurring contrast or feature: it would make understanding 'uncomfortable'	High	Confusion between /e/ in 'bet' and /æ/ in 'bat'
	This feature occurs rarely or not is some varieties of English	Low	Use of retroflex [ɽ] or uvular [ʀ] instead of English post-alveolar approximant /r/ as in 'tree'
Degree of tolerance	The error is a source of 'irritation' for the listener and requires a high degree of tolerance	High	• Overuse of final rising tone on statements etc. • Incorrect word stress (e.g., 'develop instead of de'velop')

	Listeners are used to, or accept this feature of foreign or regional accent	Low	Lack of discrimination between use of light /l/ (e.g., 'lip') and dark [ɫ] (e.g., 'eel')
Return on investment	The effort involved merits the result achieved	High	• Nuclear stress placement • Thought group divisions
	The effort included is greater than the "return"	Low	Attitudinal functions of tone choice
End-Purpose	The error would prevent reaching the level of competence required	High	Lack of lengthening of vowels in stressed syllables (for language teachers)
	The feature will not interfere with achieving the target	Low	Lack of use of schwa for speakers in EIL contexts

Pennington and Rogerson-Revell (2019: 154-155) add fluency and impact to the list. A feature should earn a high priority in pronunciation teaching if it interrupts the flow of speech too much (e.g., frequent pauses that do not occur at phrasal or information-unit boundaries) or reduces the impact of the message greatly (e.g., insufficient distinction between stressed and unstressed words in sentences).

Jenkins (2000: 136-163) came up with the *Lingua Franca Core* (LFC), which combines the features of English phonology that are crucial to intelligibility among nonnative speakers (NNS) and should be taught internationally to ensure successful communication. The division between crucial and noncrucial features is based on her research on interactions between NNS. She concluded that all consonant sounds except /θ, ð/, and [ɫ]; aspiration of word-initial voiceless stops /p, t, k/ (e.g., to distinguish 'pat' and 'bat'); and vowel length (e.g., to distinguish 'bet' and 'bed') are crucial to intelligibility. In addition, certain consonant clusters, such as no omission of sounds in word-initial clusters; the distinction between tense (long) and lax (short) vowels (e.g., 'leave' vs 'live'); and nuclear stress particularly when highlighting a contrast (e.g., 'HE is not coming today' vs 'He is not coming TODAY') were found out to be crucial elements to intelligibility. On the other hand, vowel quality (e.g., the difference between /bʊg/ and /bʌg/) does not matter if it is used consistently, and weak forms (unstressed syllables) of function words, features of connected speech, word stress, rhythm, and pitch movement were deemed unnecessary to comprehension. As we can see, these findings are not fully in line with Rogerson-Revell (2011), the CEFR (2018) or the NCC. For instance, word stress was considered important in the other sources, while Jenkins found it noncrucial. On the other hand, Jenkins (2000) and Rogerson-Revell (2011) agree that the consonant sounds /θ/, /ð/ and [ɫ] are not as important, whereas vowel length and placement of nuclear stress should be paid attention to. However, it is important to remember that the research was based on interaction between NNS, and some features considered noncrucial in the LFC might cause

problems when communicating with native speakers or at least put plenty of strain on them.

Tergujeff (2017a: 170-171) provides some suggestions on what should be emphasized in EFL pronunciation teaching. She, unlike Jenkins (2000), argues that stress and rhythm deserve special attention as well as intonation. With respect to segmentals, Tergujeff would emphasize the distinction between the sounds /v/ and /w/ and between /b, d, g/ and their voiceless and aspirated counterparts /p, t, k/. In addition, sounds /s, z, ʃ, ʒ, tʃ, dʒ/ can be challenging for those who do not have these sounds in their native language. Like Jenkins (2000) and Rogerson-Revell (2011), she does not consider /θ, ð/ crucial to intelligibility but argues that they should still be taught and practiced due to their high frequency in English. Regarding vowels, Tergujeff suggests that more attention should be paid to vowel quality rather than focusing solely on vowel length.

This section has demonstrated that there have been several attempts to define the priorities of pronunciation instruction. Although these suggestions can benefit language teachers at a more practical and detailed level compared to the CEFR and the NCC, there still does not seem to be a full consensus on the most crucial phonetic features that should be emphasized in teaching. In this chapter, I have discussed pronunciation in the context of teaching. It is now time to treat the topic from the point of view of the learner.

3 LEARNING ENGLISH PRONUNCIATION

In this chapter, I will discuss the learning of English pronunciation. I will first briefly introduce how pronunciation is learned and discuss the factors that can affect the process. Then English phonology is covered, including segmental and suprasegmental features. Finally, the chapter will conclude with a discussion of the elements of English phonology that can cause special challenges to Finnish learners.

3.1 The process of learning pronunciation

In section 2.3, I introduced the difference between acquisition, which is an unconscious, automatic and effortless process of internalizing a sound system usually associated with children learning their L1, and learning, which is a conscious and mechanical process that requires effort on the part of the learner and is often linked to the way adults learn a new language (Odisho, 2003: 10). However, these two processes normally complement each other (Odisho, 2003: 11). I also discussed how there is not a full consensus on how pronunciation is learned or acquired: Some argue that explicit pronunciation instruction is needed (Derwing & Munro, 2015: 30; Tergujeff & Kautonen, 2017: 17-19), while others claim that the most efficient way is to expose adult learners to plenty of input with only very little explicit teaching (Krashen's input hypothesis, 1985, as cited in Derwing & Munro, 2015: 46-47). Therefore, there does not seem to be definite knowledge of how one learns or acquires the sound system of a foreign language.

However, according to Odisho (2003: 12-13), acquiring a sound system follows the three following steps: *perception*, *recognition*, and *production*. The previous stage is a prerequisite for achieving the next one, and the final stage cannot be reached without continuous rehearsal. *Perception* means that the learner feels and senses the presence of the sound, while in the *recognition* phase, he/she is able to differentiate the sound

from others and also perhaps identify the differences in relation to other sounds. In the final stage called *production*, the learner can retrieve the sound from his/her memory and reproduce it. These stages correspond to the three-stage procedure of learning: *registration*, *retention*, and *retrieval*. *Registration* means the perception, encoding and neural representation of information at the same time they are experienced; *retention* signifies the neurological representation of an experience that can be stored for later use; and *retrieval* is the ability to access the previously registered and retained information. During these stages, the three types of memories play a big role. In the phase of *perception/registration*, *sensory memory* is at work. It is the initial level of information storing, in which the amount of information is very limited and lasts for only a couple of seconds. From sensory memory, some of the information continues to *short-term memory*, which can store around seven items at a time for about half a minute. This type of memory is needed in the *recognition/retention* phase. In *long-term memory*, the information can be stored for a longer time or even permanently. In other words, learning means transferring information from sensory memory towards long-term memory, via short-term memory. Long-term memory is of course needed when one needs to *retrieve* the information concerning the target sound from it and then *produce* the sound correctly. Thus, the process of sound system acquisition is closely linked to the processes of general learning and memory (Odisho, 2003: 13).

This indicates that one first needs to be able to perceive the target sound and differentiate it from other sounds before learning to produce the sound him/herself and that continuous practice is needed during this process. However, knowledge of factors affecting this process might provide more practical information about how learners acquire or learn the sound system of a foreign language. These factors will be discussed next.

3.2   Factors affecting the learning of pronunciation

There are several factors that can affect the process of learning pronunciation: age (younger learners are usually more prone to achieve better pronunciation); amount and type of input and output; motivation; and language aptitude (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010: 16-20; Derwing & Munro, 2015: 31-49; Pennington & Rogerson-Revell, 2019: 77-93; Trofimovich, Kennedy & Foote, 2015: 354-364), among others. The last one entails aspects of, for example, short-term memory, phonetic coding (ability to discriminate, code, and retain auditory sequences), rote learning (ability to associate sounds with meanings), inductive learning (ability to infer rules or patterns based on linguistic information), and musical skills (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010: 20; Trofimovich et al., 2015: 357). However, this section concentrates on the factors caused by either the learner's

L1 or the elements of the target language since I will later, in section 3.3.3, discuss the aspects in English phonology that can be especially challenging for Finnish learners of English due to the influence of their L1 or because these aspects are otherwise considered more difficult than others. I will discuss three central concepts, but there are also other theories that attempt to explain how different linguistic factors affect the acquisition or learning of a phonetic system.

One central theory in phonological acquisition is the *Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis* (CA), originally created by Lado in 1957 (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010: 22). According to this theory, the acquisition of L2 is influenced by the learner's L1 so that similarities between the languages facilitate the process (*positive transfer*), while differences tend to result in errors (*negative transfer* or *interference*) (Pennington & Rogerson-Revell, 2019: 75). Thus, sounds of English that do not exist in Finnish or different prosodic patterns between the two languages are assumed to cause difficulties for Finnish learners of English. According to Trofimovich et al. (2015: 356), there is evidence that the degree of similarity or difference between the sounds of L1 and L2 influences how L2 sounds are perceived and then produced. Nevertheless, several studies do not support CA as L1-L2 similarities or differences did not correlate with learners' performance, and phonetic features that differed the most were not found to be the ones causing the most usual or severe errors (Pennington & Rogerson-Revell, 2019: 75-76). As Ullakonoja and Dufva (2017: 26) point out, sometimes the most problematic features are those that are almost the same between the languages but are still produced slightly differently. For instance, Finnish learners of English can easily detect the difference in length of the vowels in words *sheep* and *ship* since in Finnish vowel length is also a distinctive feature that differentiates between meanings. However, they may have difficulties in perceiving that the quality of the vowel in each word is also different, i.e., they are produced in a slightly different manner. Despite the criticism towards the theory, Celce-Murcia et al. (2010: 23) argue that most researchers in the field hold CA valid in L2 pronunciation acquisition as negative transfer accounts for foreign accents but doubt its validity in other areas of language acquisition.

Another often-cited concept is *language universals*, which means that all languages share common features, and their surface differences are actually somewhat unimportant (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010: 26). The hypothesis starts from the idea that despite the vast amount of sounds that the human vocal apparatus could produce, all languages consist of relatively finite inventory of sounds and share very similar patterns of combining and hierarchizing sounds. For instance, all languages have vowel and consonant sounds that include sounds that contrast with each other in predictable manners (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010: 26). Based on Jakobson's (1941, as cited in Celce-Murcia et al., 2010: 26) *implicational hierarchy* "Stops → Nasals → Fricatives", it can be deduced that a language with nasals will have stops, and a language with fricatives

will have both nasals and stops. However, this does not mean that languages with stops would necessarily have nasals or that languages with stops and nasals would automatically have fricatives as well. The universality of different features will affect how difficult or easy these elements are for learners. For instance, the universal tendency to simplify consonant clusters by deleting consonant sounds is claimed to account for the errors of consonant deletion even in L1 English acquisition, sometimes extending to adult speech (e.g., 'las̶t thing'). Similarly, the universal preference for ending syllables in a vowel sound might cause trouble for learners because English syllable structure favors syllables ending in consonant sounds (Rogerson-Revell, 2011: 21).

The third theory discussed here is *markedness theory*, which divides linguistic elements into *unmarked* and *marked features*. Unmarked features are more basic or neutral, more universal, more frequent, and they are learned first, while marked features are more specific, less frequent, more limited, and acquired later (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010: 25). Marked features are considered more complex and difficult to produce, whereas unmarked features are easier to learn (Pennington & Rogerson-Revell, 2019: 76). For instance, Eckman's Markedness Differential Hypothesis (1977, as cited in Rogerson-Revell, 2011: 21) suggests that differences between the L1 and L2 are only likely to cause challenges if the feature in L2 is more marked than in L1. For instance, the final voiced consonants, such as /z/ in 'rise' that are common in English but marked in many other languages can be regarded as difficult by learners of English (Rogerson-Revell, 2011: 21).

In this section, I have discussed some of the factors that affect the learning or acquisition of pronunciation, paying special attention to three often-cited theories that aim to explain how one's L1 may either facilitate or challenge the process of acquiring a phonetic system of a foreign language and why some phonetic features tend to generally cause more problems and errors than others. In the next section, I will present the sound system of English and, based on the theories introduced here, discuss the possible difficulties that Finnish learners of English may face regarding pronunciation.

3.3 English phonology

In this section, the sound system of English will be introduced. I will first cover the segmental features, starting with the vowel sounds and then presenting the consonant sounds. I will use the IPA to do this. After this, the suprasegmental features of English will be discussed. Since prosody is a rather broad area, all its aspects cannot be covered, and the focus will be on intonation, stress, and rhythm. Finally, I will point out some features of English phonology that can cause difficulties for Finnish learners.

3.3.1 The vowel sounds of English

According to Rogerson-Revell (2011: 61), the vowel sounds of English can be problematic for learners for several reasons. Firstly, the vowels are more challenging to describe than the consonant sounds because they are produced differently depending on the variant of English used. Secondly, the speakers' age, gender, and social or educational background also affect the pronunciation of these sounds. Thirdly, the English vowel system can cause difficulties to learners as most languages have twice as many consonants as vowels, while English has 24 consonants and up to 20 vowels.

When producing vowel sounds, the air passes relatively freely between the articulators, and vowels are typically voiced, so there is not a contrast between voiced and voiceless sounds, unlike with consonants (Rogerson-Revell, 2011: 61). According to Rogerson-Revell (2011: 61-69), English vowels can be classified based on the position of the articulators and the duration of the sounds. The first one refers to the position of tongue, lips, and jaw. Vowels are produced by changing the position of the tongue without touching the roof of the mouth. They can be classified as front, back, or central depending on which part of the tongue is raised highest in the mouth. The lips, on the other hand, can be either in a spread, neutral, or rounded position. Finally, the jaw can be closed, open, or somewhere between the two (closed-mid and open-mid). The second feature, duration of the sound, plays an important role in English phonology as some vowels are significantly longer than others. Odisho (2003: 48) adds the contrast between tense and lax vowels to the list as producing some vowels require more muscular tension than others.

In BBC English (the standard pronunciation of British English), there are 20 vowels: five long vowels, seven short vowels, and eight diphthongs, during which the tongue changes its position: /eɪ/, /aɪ/, /əʊ/, /aʊ/, /ɔɪ/, /ɪə /, /eə/, and /ʊə/ (Rogerson-Revell, 2011: 86). The twelve 'pure' vowels are presented below (Table 3).

TABLE 3 BBC English vowels (based on Rogerson-Revell, 2011: 67-78)

Vowel	Jaw position	Tongue position	Lip position	Length	Example
/iː/	close	front	slightly spread/unround	long	'heed'
/ɪ/	close-mid	front but less than /iː/	slightly spread/unround	short	'hid'
/e/	close-mid/open-mid	front	spread/unround	short	'head'
/æ/	open	front	slightly spread/unround	short, often longer than other short vowels	'had'

/ə/	open-mid/close-mid	central	neutral	short	'ago'
/ɜ:/	open-mid	central	neutral	long	'bird'
/ʌ/	open-mid	central	neutral	short	'cut'
/u:/	close	back	fully round	long	'shoe'
/ʊ/	close, close to close-mid	back, close to central	rounded	short	'put'
/ɔ:/	close-mid/open-mid	back	very rounded	long	'saw'
/ɒ/	open	back	slightly rounded	short	'dot'
/ɑ:/	open	back	neutral	long	'hard'

It is crucial to understand that this table does not describe the sounds and their fine differences in a detailed manner. In addition, Deterding (2015: 76-77) brings forth several important notions regarding the categorization of English vowels. Firstly, length diacritic is not always used with long vowels, and some omit it because the vowels are tense rather than long. In fact, in some situations they can appear shorter than the lax vowels. Secondly, some charts include the sound /ɛ/ or substitute the phoneme /e/ with it. Thirdly and most importantly, one categorization is not enough to describe the vowel sounds of all English varieties. There are several differences between British and American English, not to mention other varieties or local dialects.

Now that the vowel sounds of English have been introduced, it is time to see what type of consonant sounds English has.

3.3.2   The consonant sounds of English

There are 24 consonant sounds in English that can be categorized based on the *place* of articulation, the *manner* of articulation, and the presence or absence of *voicing* (Rogerson-Revell, 2011: 42). The first one refers to the place where the sound is produced in the vocal tract. In English, the consonant sounds can be produced between the upper and lower lips (bilabial), between the lower lip and upper teeth (labio-dental), the tip of the tongue behind or between teeth (dental), between the tongue tip and alveolar ridge (alveolar), between the tongue blade/front and the back of the alveolar ridge/front of hard palate (post [palatal]-alveolar), between the front of the tongue and hard palate (palatal), the back of the tongue touching the soft palate (velar), or by using the glottis (glottal). The manner of articulation, on the other hand, means the different types of stricture or contact between the articulators: complete closure (a complete 'stop' of the air flow somewhere in the vocal tract), partial closure (narrowing or partial closure of air stream), and approximation (proximity of articulators without touching). Finally, the presence of voicing means that there is a vibration of the air flowing through the vocal cords. In voiceless sounds, the air passes through

the open glottis without vibration, while in voiced sounds the vocal cords are tightened and near each other, and there is vibration. The following categorization of consonant sound is Rogerson-Revell's (2011: 49-54), and some researchers have classified the sounds slightly differently as we will see.

Plosives or stops are consonant sounds involving a full closure of the airflow and consisting of four phases: closure phase (articulators touching each other), hold phase (air pressure increases), release phase (articulators separate), and post-release part (an air flow after the movement of the articulators, plosion). There are six plosives in English: two bilabials (/p/ and /b/), two alveolars (/t/ and /d/), and two velars (/k/ and /g/), and the first one of each pair is voiceless and the second one voiced. In addition, the voiceless plosives are often aspirated (the air can be heard passing through the glottis after the release phase), especially when they start a syllable, and require more breath force and muscular tension. Thus, /p/, /t/, and /k/ are sometimes called fortis (Latin for 'strong') and the rest lenis (Latin for 'weak').

Fricatives are the largest consonant sound group in English with nine phonemes. Fricatives have a partial closure, when the air flows through a narrow passage, creating a hissing sound. Due to the strongness of the sound in some fricatives, they are called sibilants (/s, z, ʃ, ʒ/). There are two labiodentals (/f/ and /v/), dentals (/θ/ as in 'thought' and /ð/ as in 'this'), alveolars (/s/ and /z/), palate-alveolars (/ʃ/ as in 'sheep' and /ʒ/ as in 'leisure') and one glottal (/h/) fricative. The latter one of each pair is voiced and lenis, while the first one is voiceless and fortis. The phoneme /h/ is usually voiceless but occurs as voiced between two vowel sounds (e.g., 'ahead' or 'behalf'). However, in initial positions, the voiced fricatives are barely voiced, and the greater energy used to produce the voiceless counterparts is, in fact, a better distinguisher in those situations.

The remaining four groups of consonant sounds are much smaller. There are only two **affricates** in English: /tʃ/ as in 'chin' and /dʒ/ as in 'gin', which are both palato-alveolars and of which the former is voiceless and fortis, and the latter voiced and lenis. Affricates are combinations of two sounds: they start as plosives and end as fricatives. In addition, there are three **nasals** sounds: /m/, /n/ (voiced alveolar), and the unusual /ŋ/ (voiced velar, e.g., in *sing*). In nasals, the air flows through the nose as the velum is lowered, and the air passes freely through the nasal cavity. **Laterals** are consonant sounds in which the air does not flow through the usual way across the center of the tongue but round the sides of the tongue as it touches the alveolar ridge. There is only one lateral phoneme in English: the voiced alveolar /l/. The last group, **approximants**, involves three phonemes: bilabial /w/, post-alveolar /r/ (as in 'car' in American English), and palatal /j/ (as in 'year'), which are all voiced.

However, some phoneticians regard /j/ and /w/ as semi-vowels since they are phonetically similar to vowels but function like consonants (Rogerson-Revell, 2011:

54). There are also some other differences between categorizations: Odisho (2003: 39) groups nasals and laterals under approximants, while in Celce-Murcia et al.'s (2010: 60) categorization, /l/ and /r/ belong to **liquids** and /w/ and /y/ (instead of /j/) form the group of **glides**, and all four phonemes are classified as approximants. Deterding (2015: 74), however, categorizes the consonant sounds identically to Rogerson-Revell (2011). Nonetheless, as he points out (2015: 73), the /r/ phoneme in the IPA is not an approximant but a trill, and the correct representation for the postalveolar approximant would be /ɹ/. On the other hand, he admits that the /r/ is more familiar and thus often used in place of the correct symbol.

Now we have seen both the vowels and consonants of English phonology. However, it is important to remember that phonemes have different *allophones*, i.e., different realizations of the phoneme (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010: 50-51). While phonemes are marked with slashes, allophones are represented between square brackets. For instance, the phoneme /p/ has three allophones: the heavily aspirated [pʰ] in initial position (e.g., 'pat'), [p] that follows an initial /s/ and is not aspirated (e.g., 'spin'), and the unreleased [p̊] in final position (e.g., 'cup') (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010: 51). Nonetheless, as allophones, unlike phonemes, do not affect the meaning of a word and are not thus as crucial to intelligibility, they are not treated here in detail. Now we have discussed the segmentals of English phonology, and in the next part, the most central suprasegmental features of English will be covered.

3.3.3 Suprasegmental features of English

As mentioned above, prosody is rather a broad topic as it entails elements such as tone and intonation, word and sentence stress, rhythm, and features of connected speech. Thus, its whole content cannot be dealt with here. Instead, I will focus on the most important aspects of intonation, stress, and rhythm.

English **intonation**, i.e., the rising and falling of a pitch, has four levels: 1= low, 2= middle, 3= high, and 4= extra high, and it has several functions. Firstly, as Celce-Murcia et al. (2010: 220-241) point out, it reflects the grammatical function of an utterance and signals uncertainty or certainty. For example, if one says "Now", a rising intonation signifies a question ("Now?"), while a falling intonation would mean that the speaker's intention is to command ("Now!). Furthermore, if an utterance is pronounced with a rise on the prominent syllable followed by a fall in intonation, it implies certainty and is usually a declarative sentence, while a drop on the prominent syllable followed by a rise in intonation would indicate a question (e.g., "She is here." vs. "She is here?"). Questions that can be answered with either 'yes' or 'no' or repetition questions (e.g., "You're doing what?") have a rising intonation, while open choice questions and tag questions are pronounced with a falling pitch. When listing information, the final item is pronounced with a falling intonation, while the rest have a

rising intonation. Secondly, intonation conveys information about the speaker's attitudes and emotions (Celce-Murcia et al, 2010: 245-247). A low tone on the final or only prominent syllable of an utterance can indicate boredom or disinterest, whereas an exaggerated high tone on the prominent syllable and a drop on the final syllable signify excitement. A low tone on the prominent syllable followed by a rising intonation signify surprise or disbelief. These two latter cases reach the highest pitch level, which is not used normally when asking questions or making statements. Finally, intonation divides the stream of speech into logical parts, called intonation units or thought groups (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010: 221-223). These units are preceded and followed by a pause, entail one prominent element, have an intonation contour of their own, and typically have a grammatically coherent structure. The prominent element is marked with stress and a higher intonation. Elements can be given prominence if it is new information, if the speaker wants to emphasize something, or if there are two elements that need to be contrasted. The length of intonation units is usually longer in rapid speech, while in slow speech there are more pauses. However, too short units can retard speech and result in too many unintentional prominent elements. This can cause difficulties to the listener and even lead to misunderstandings.

Stress means that some syllables in words and some elements in sentences are pronounced louder, longer and with a higher pitch (Tergujeff, 2017a: 170). Celce-Murcia et al. (2010: 184-185) point out that although word stress in English is far from random, it can first seem quite unsystematic as it is affected by the word's origin, the additions of prefixes or suffixes, and the word's grammatical function in the utterance. According to them, the stress in words can be either strong, medial, or weak, i.e., strongly stressed, lightly stressed, or unstressed. They also note that there are several studies that indicate that the correct placement of lexical stress has a great impact on comprehensibility. Wrong word stress affects intelligibility and the rhythm of speech. Thus, it seems rather odd that Jenkins (2000) did not find word stress important enough to be included in the LFC. For instance, some verbs and nouns are distinguished by word stress, so that in the noun, the word stress is on the first syllable, and in the verb, it is on the last (e.g., 'TRANSport' vs. 'transPORT') (Tergujeff, 2017a: 170). Regarding sentence stress, Tergujeff (2017a: 170) provides simplified rules for its placement. Firstly, content words are often stressed, while function words, such as conjunctions, articles, prepositions, or pronouns, are unstressed. However, function words can be stressed if the speaker wishes to correct something that has already been said (e.g., "Oh, the cat is IN the car? I thought you said he is ON the car), and negative auxiliary verbs can be stressed as well (e.g., "No, I CAN'T come tomorrow"). Secondly, as mentioned when discussing intonation, different elements in sentences can be given prominence through intonation and stress if the information in them is new, the speaker wants to emphasize the element for some other reason, or if two parallel items

are contrasted (e.g., "Is this AEROBIC or ANAEROBIC exercise?"). Like word stress, sentence stress also affects intelligibility to a great extent (e.g., Celce-Murcia et al., 2010: 212; Tergujeff, 2017a: 170).

Celce-Murcia et al. (2010: 209) define rhythm as the "patterned beat of stressed and unstressed syllables and pauses", formed by word stress and sentence stress. As they point out (2010: 208), languages are often divided into stress-timed and syllable-timed languages. In the former, to which English belongs, syllables are grouped into metrical feet, each of which entail one strong-stressed syllable with lightly stressed and unstressed ones. Strongly stressed syllables occur regularly forming a pattern, a regular rhythmic beat. In the latter, there is not as clear alternation of strong and weak syllables, but all syllables are roughly the same length regardless of stress. However, as Celce-Murcia et al. (2010: 208) and Rogerson-Revell (2011: 159-160) point out, this dichotomy has been questioned by several researchers as it has been hard to prove empirically, and the distinction is often considered too rigid.

After having introduced the main features of English phonology, it is time to see what difficulties these elements pose for Finnish learners.

3.3.4 Challenges for Finnish learners

In this section, I will introduce some of the difficulties that Finnish learners might encounter when learning to pronounce English, based on the theories presented in section 3.2 and some other sources. One of the aspects that can cause difficulties is the differences between the orthographies of the languages. Finnish has a very regular orthography (Ullakonoja & Dufva, 2017: 28), meaning that spelling and pronunciation have a great correspondence. In English, on the other hand, one letter can be pronounced in different ways depending on the context, like the letter 'g' in words like *go* (/g/), *page* (/dʒ/), *rouge* (/ʒ/), and *rough* (/f/), and one sound can correspond to several different spellings, such as /ɛ/ in words like *b<u>e</u>d*, *br<u>ea</u>d*, *fri<u>e</u>nd*, *<u>a</u>ny*, and *f<u>oe</u>tid* (Derwing & Munro, 2015: 15). Learning to spell and read English orthography is often challenging for native speakers but is likely to be particularly difficult for those learners whose L1 has a rather phonetic orthography (Derwing & Munro, 2015: 15).

According to the markedness and language universal theories discussed in section 3.2, elements that are "marked" (harder to produce) or less universal across languages should be more difficult to learn and are acquired later. Thus, as fricatives are less universal than plosives or nasals, they should be harder to learn (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010: 26). English is more marked as to plosives in final position than Finnish as it allows words and syllables to end in both voiceless and voiced plosives, while in Finnish, other syllables can end in all voiceless plosives, but the only allowed plosive for the final sound of the last syllable is /t/ (Suomi, Toivanen & Ylitalo, 2006: 198). Thus, plosives in final position might cause difficulties for Finnish learners of English.

However, differences between the two languages might be a more convenient starting point, despite the criticism that the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis has received. As explained in section 3.2, according to CA, differences between the languages are likely to cause difficulties, while similarities facilitate learning (Pennington & Rogerson-Revell, 2019: 75). Thus, sounds and features of prosody that do not exist in Finnish or are different from its patterns, should be more difficult to learn and more likely to result in errors. Suomi et al. (2006: 152-161) provide a great overview of Finnish phonology and the status of different phonemes, which works as a basis for the following analysis. In regards to vowels, Finnish lacks the English vowels /ɪ, ə, ɜ:, ʌ, ʊ, ɔ:, ɒ/, and thus producing these sounds can be found challenging. Furthermore, the quality of the Finnish vowels differs from the reference vowels in the IPA (especially /e, ø, o/), which might lead to slight differences in pronunciation. Regarding consonant sounds, plosives /b/ and /g/ occur only in loan words and some speakers substitute them with /p/ and /k/. Similarly, the phoneme /ʃ/ can be encountered only in loan words and is not used by many Finnish speakers. Thus, these sounds cannot be unquestionably considered phonemes of Finnish, which might indicate problems in their production. In addition, Finnish lacks the dental fricatives /θ/ and /ð/, the fricative /ʒ/ (while [z] occurs as an allophone of /s/), both affricates, and the approximants /w/ or /ɹ/, and the voiceless plosives are not aspirated, either. This indicates that Finnish learners might have problems with these sounds, too. In regard to prosody, word stress in Finnish, like in English, has three levels, but the strong stress is always on the first syllable (Suomi et al., 2006: 220). Additionally, Finnish is traditionally considered a syllable-timed language, which makes also the rhythm of English difficult for Finnish learners (Tergujeff, 2013: 22). In terms of intonation, Finnish does have a rising pitch at the beginning of commands and questions but is typically considered to have a falling intonation and a relatively narrow range of pitch (Suomi et al., 2006: 240), which is likely to complicate the correct pronunciation of English intonation.

Tergujeff (2013: 22-23) lists numerous features of the English phonology that have been proven to be difficult for Finnish learners in several different studies, some of which support the ideas discussed above. The most difficult sounds for Finnish-speaking learners of English seem to be sibilants, affricates, dental fricatives, and the tense-lax opposition of vowels (e.g., /i/ vs. /ɪ/) (Morris-Wilson, 1992; Lehtonen et al., 1977 & Wiik, 1965, as cited in Tergujeff, 2013: 22). This resonates with CA, as Finnish has only one sibilant (/s/) as a phoneme (while [z] is an allophone, and /ʃ/ occurs only in loan words) and does not have affricates, dental fricatives, or some of the English vowels. However, some studies suggest that the problems are greater as to prosody. Stress and rhythm as well as linking sounds together and coarticulation are regarded as particularly challenging (Morris-Wilson, 1992: 189-190). Finnish word stress

is said to be weaker and less melodic compared to English (Niemi, 1984, as cited in Tergujeff, 2013: 22), and it has been found that Finnish learners of English do not distinguish enough between stressed and unstressed syllables, use too few weak forms compared to native speakers of English, and have too many pauses and in inappropriate places in their speech (Paananen-Porkka, 2007). The findings are less straightforward as to intonation. According to Hirvonen (1970: 79), the production of rising contours causes trouble for Finnish learners, while Toivanen (1999, as cited in Tergujeff, 2013: 23) found that although their intonation was flatter than that of native English speakers and they did not know how to employ rising intonation to signal uncertainty (e.g., reserved statements), it did not cause any great difficulty for the participants. However, as Tergujeff (2013: 23) points out, without comprehensive studies on the intelligibility of the L1 Finnish speakers' English, it cannot be concluded whether these challenges are harmful to intelligibility in interaction with NS or other NNS.

I have now treated the process of learning the sound system of a language and factors affecting it, presented the main aspects of English phonology and discussed elements that Finnish-speaking learners of English can find particularly difficult in it. In the next chapter, the attention is turned more specifically to the research questions of the present study by providing information related to them from previous studies.

4   PREVIOUS STUDIES

In this chapter, previous studies and other sources will be explored to see how the role of pronunciation in textbooks and teaching has been researched before and what type of previous findings there are regarding the research questions of the present study. In addition, this chapter aims to better manifest why the current study is needed and how it links to previous research on the topic. The material concerning the role of pronunciation in textbooks will be covered first, after which the discussion is turned to the actual teaching of pronunciation. Although teachers' opinions on EFL textbooks have been studied, there are no studies dealing with their views on the sufficiency and quality of the pronunciation-related materials in them. Thus, the third research question cannot be provided a background, which itself indicates a need for more research. However, for example Hietala (2015) studied teachers' satisfaction with EFL textbooks used in upper secondary school, and despite the generally positive views, one of the areas causing dissatisfaction was in fact pronunciation.

4.1   Pronunciation teaching materials in textbooks

In this section, previous studies and other sources will be consulted to find out how pronunciation is represented in textbooks. The amount and focus of the material related to pronunciation will be dealt with first. 'Focus' refers to the possible domination of either segmental or prosodic features in the materials. After this, a classification of pronunciation exercise types will be provided, and their prevalence will be discussed.

4.1.1   Amount and focus of pronunciation-related material

Textbooks play a huge role in teaching, and especially in language teaching (Tergujeff, 2013: 38). Sobkowiak (2012: 112) claims that textbooks are the center of nearly all EFL

teaching around the world, and they seem to be clearly the most popular teaching material used in foreign language classrooms in Finland (Luukka et al., 2008: 97). Despite the importance of textbooks, there are not very many up-to-date studies on the amount and focus of pronunciation teaching material in textbooks.

Regarding the amount, Derwing et al. (2012: 28) studied 48 ESL textbooks and found out that only 5% of the total content was about pronunciation. Moreover, Tergujeff (2010: 194) found among the 16 textbooks (including also exercise books and teacher's guides) 1803 cases of pronunciation-related material, 829 of which were specifically aimed at pronunciation training and 974 of which could possibly be used to teach it (e.g., exercises entailing oral production of English). However, she does not comment on the sufficiency of the material or provide the total number of all materials or a percentage for the pronunciation-related material in the books. In addition, there are some theses written on the role of pronunciation and oral skills in textbooks. For example, Hietala (2013) studied the role of oral skills in two series of Finnish EFL textbooks used in upper secondary schools (Open Road and ProFiles). Only 2.6% of the oral skills activities in Open Road were about pronunciation (p. 71), while ProFiles did not include pronunciation-related material at all in the actual chapters of the book (p. 100). However, both series had a separate section devoted to pronunciation at the end of the books that was not included in the data. Pasanen (2007) studied the role of pronunciation in German textbooks used in elementary, secondary, and upper secondary schools and concluded that pronunciation exercises were not very numerous especially in the textbooks aimed at secondary and upper secondary schools.

In regard to the focus of the materials, according to Derwing & Munro (2015: 22-23), segmental features used to be favored over prosody: the progress was seen to develop from smaller units (sounds) to larger ones (words, phrases, sentences), and thus prosody was reserved for a late time, which did not necessarily ever come. However, they argue that newer textbooks take prosody more into account. Henderson and Jarosz's (2014: 271) findings support this as 76% of the pronunciation exercises in French and 75% in Polish EFL textbooks were about prosody. Similarly, in Derwing et al.'s study (2012: 28), prosodic features, especially intonation and sentence stress, were more frequent than individual sounds. In Szpyra-Kosłoswka's study (2015: 111-112), 14 of the 20 most treated phonetic issues in 20 EFL textbooks were about prosody. Among segmentals, vowels were the most common topic in all these studies.

On the other hand, Tergujeff's study (2010: 201) indicates that this is not always the case, as the books in her study almost entirely neglected the explicit teaching of intonation, rhythm, and connected speech. The IPA, on the other hand, was extensively used. However, Salenius (2011) studied prosody in two EFL textbook series (Open Road and English United) and in two Swedish textbook series used in upper secondary school, and the results were not as alarming concerning EFL textbooks.

Stress had a considerable role in most of the books, while intonation deserved much less attention. The EFL books included all three parts of prosody to a certain extent: intonation, stress, and connected speech (including rhythm in this study), while one of the Swedish books did not entail prosody at all and the other neglected intonation entirely (pp. 114-115). On the other hand, in Henderson and Jarosz's study (2014: 273-274), activities regarding intonation dominated in both countries. Exercises of word stress were popular in both Polish and French EFL textbooks, while sentence stress received much more attention in France. In regard to individual sounds, there was much more variation between the countries. However, the tense/lax vowel distinction, diphthongs, and the schwa sound were among the most common elements (pp. 272).

This section has demonstrated that there might be a need for more pronunciation teaching materials not only in English textbooks but also in other languages. However, the findings differ as to the focus of the materials as some studies indicate that prosody has a significant role, while others have revealed a tendency of ignoring at least some aspects of it. In the next section, I will discuss different ways to classify pronunciation material and exercises.

4.1.2 Classification of pronunciation teaching materials and their frequency in textbooks

Pronunciation teaching materials and exercises can be classified in several different ways. I will now present three categorizations that differ greatly as to the number of categories as well as regarding the broadness of the concept of pronunciation.

Firstly, Tergujeff's (2010: 195-200) data-driven classification considers only the material that is specifically aimed at practicing pronunciation. In this classification, the pronunciation teaching materials are divided into eight categories:

1. **Phonetic training:** Materials in which the IPA is utilized, such as vocabulary lists. Examples of exercises involve either writing words with the phonetic symbols or deciphering phonetic transcription by either reading it aloud or writing it in normal letters. This category also entails information about the differences between the sound systems of L1 and the target language and the placement of articulators when producing certain sounds, which can be enhanced through, for example, multisensory methods and different visual aids.
2. **Read aloud**: This category consists of reading aloud exercises that do not serve an obvious communicative function but are conducted with a partner. These can be individual words, sentences, stories, or dialogues, depending on the level of the learners. This category also entails dramatized dialogues, comic strips, reading aloud single words in board games, and reading text in different moods.

3. **Listen and repeat:** In these exercises, learners need to imitate words or sentences. Vocabulary lists, glossaries, and dialogues can be used for this, and segmental features can be trained by listening and repeating minimal pairs and tongue twisters.

4. **Rhyme and verse:** This category entails, for instance, reading aloud children's rhymes, or exercises in which learners must fill in the gaps in a rhyme, continue lists with rhyming words, or connect words that rhyme.

5. **Rules & instructions:** Learners are given explicit rules and instructions on when to use certain segmental or prosodic features, such as information about the pronunciation of *-ed* endings in verbs or the rising intonation in yes/no questions.

6. **Awareness-raising activities:** Students' awareness of different learning styles and habits is increased, and they are encouraged to find methods of learning that work for them. In addition, their awareness of different varieties of English can be raised. One example is self-evaluation forms regarding pronunciation.

7. **Spelling and dictation:** These activities involve spelling words, minimal pairs, or mathematical problems in pairs to practice words with difficult letter-to-phoneme correspondence. This can also be done silently by spelling the word based on the movements of the mouth.

8. **Ear training:** These activities focus mainly on discriminating individual sounds and are closely linked to the IPA. For example, learners are played minimal pair words, and they must mark which of the contrasting sounds they hear. To train prosody, students must, for example, mark the correct place of word stress.

However, as this classification is data-driven, it does not encompass material or exercise types that were not present in the data. As Tergujeff (2010: 201) points out, her data did not include, for example, communication activities or pronunciation games, visual aids (e.g., pictures of how a given sound is produced in mouth), recordings of learners' production, or exercises utilizing multiple senses. Additionally, some categories seem somewhat overlapping. For instance, activities involving reading aloud children's rhymes could technically be classified as a 'read aloud' activity as well. Nonetheless, Tergujeff (2010) does not specify how she made the choice in these situations or whether certain materials were included in more than one category.

Celce-Murcia et al. (2010: 45-48) see pronunciation in a broader light and classify pronunciation activities into five categories:

1. **Description and analysis** include verbal and written instructions on how to produce a certain phonetic feature and when to use it. This category includes activities in which students examine, for example, the vibrance of vocal cords or the position of the speech organs in mouth when producing a certain sound. Different diagrams, charts, and tools, such as rubber bands or kazoos, can be utilized.

2. **Listening discrimination**: Students are asked to identify a sound or to discriminate it from other sounds.
3. **Controlled practice**: These activities focus on form and accuracy and are usually limited to a few features. Typical examples are repetition and oral reading, among which minimal-pair words or sentences and short dialogues are popular. In addition, tongue twisters, short poems, and children's rhymes are often used.
4. **Guided practice:** This category involves semi-structured or semi-controlled activities, such as information-gap activities or cued dialogues, in which context and meaning are given more prominence. The focus is on both fluency and accuracy.
5. **Communicative practice:** Learners practice the newly acquired phonological feature with open-ended tasks that require negotiation of meaning and genuine exchanges of information. The focus is on both the correct form and the content of the message. Some examples are storytelling, role play, interviews, debates, value clarification, and problem solving.

According to Celce-Murcia et al. (2010: 45), these practices should be conducted in this order, from consciousness-raising towards production. However, this classification, unlike Tergujeff's (2010), does not include awareness-raising activities that would inform students of their progress or of different learning styles concerning pronunciation. More importantly, it includes activities that focus on other skills besides pronunciation, whereas Tergujeff focused on material that was explicitly about pronunciation. However, Celce-Murcia et al. (2010: 8-10) also provide a classification of teaching methods and practices that share many similarities with Tergujeff's categories (2010). Nonetheless, as this classification lacks the groups 4–8 of Tergujeff's classification and categorizes minimal pair drills and tongue twisters as their own groups, it is not discussed here in more detail to avoid confusion.

There are also more concise classifications. For example, according to Rogerson-Revell (2011: 217), the typical pronunciation teaching sequence involves three phases: listening, imitation, and production. *Listening* involves practicing hearing sounds correctly and distinguishing between them. Minimal pairs are often used to practice differences between phonemes. In the *imitation* phase, the teacher provides accurate models for the students to repeat and then gives feedback on their performance. However, as Rogerson-Revell (2011: 217) points out, this might work better with younger learners as imitation may not be enough to correct fossilized pronunciation errors. Finally, in the *production* phase, the students use the phonetic feature in free speaking, aiming to internalize it so that they will be able to consistently pronounce it right.

There are not many studies or master's theses written about the frequency of pronunciation material or exercise types in textbooks. However, the most common types in Tergujeff's (2010) data were quite traditional methods: phonetic training

(33%), read aloud (29%), and listen and repeat (18%). The rest came far behind: 8% were rhyme & verse, 4% rules & instructions, 4% awareness-raising activities, 3% spelling & dictation, and only 2% ear training. Tergujeff (2010: 201) does not differentiate between imitation and production, but production was overall favored in the material over receptive and theoretical skills. Järvinen (2017: 77) studied two French textbook series in which the most common exercise types were free production (not included in the categorizations presented here) and read aloud. Henderson and Jarosz (2014: 270) used the classification provided by Celce-Murcia et al. (2010), and the most common activities belonged to the groups of controlled practice (France: 32%, Poland 42%), listening discrimination (France 38%, Poland 35%), and description and analysis (France: 20,5%, Poland: 18%), while guided practice (France: 8,5%, Poland: 0%) and communicative practice (France: 1%, Poland: 0%) were scarce. Thus, in their data, listening and imitation had a much more prominent role compared to production.

I have now introduced some ways of categorizing pronunciation teaching materials and exercises. Although Tergujeff's and Henderson and Jarosz's studies indicate that traditional methods are popular, the findings of the two studies also have differences. For instance, listening discrimination was the second most common exercise type in the latter study, and listening and imitation were favored over production, while in Tergujeff's data, ear training was the least frequent exercise type, and production was more common than receptive or theoretical skills. All in all, this section focusing on the findings regarding the role of pronunciation in textbooks has demonstrated that more research on the topic is needed. Firstly, there seems to be a need for more exhaustive studies. Tergujeff's (2010) textbook analysis is probably the most comprehensive study on the topic in Finland, but it did not include the online materials of the books. Thus, there were no studies that would deal with both basic education and upper secondary school, while also taking into account the online materials. Secondly, the findings concerning the focus of the material seem to be rather inconsistent. Therefore, more research is needed to draw conclusions on the role of sounds and prosody in textbooks. Finally, studies treating the frequency of different exercise types are very scarce, and they utilize different types of categorizations and methods, which makes comparisons and broader conclusions difficult. In the next section, the focus will be turned to teachers' practices in pronunciation teaching.

4.2   Pronunciation in the classroom

In this section, I will provide a background for how pronunciation is taught in practice according to previous studies and demonstrate why more research is needed. First, the amount of time devoted to pronunciation in teaching will be discussed, after which

attention is turned to the focus of pronunciation instruction, meaning the statuses of segmental and suprasegmental features. The third and final part of this section concentrates on the different methods of teaching pronunciation and their frequency.

4.2.1 Amount of time devoted to pronunciation in language teaching

As stated above, the role of explicit pronunciation teaching has decreased since the CLT approach gained prominence. Pronunciation tends to have a low priority in language teaching (e.g., Pennington & Rogerson-Revell, 2019: 173, Szpyra-Kozłowska, 2015: 5). Based on several different studies in which teachers have been asked about their way of teaching pronunciation, Derwing and Munro (2015: 78) conclude that language teachers tend to correct students' production in class, but many of them do not provide systematic pronunciation instruction although some do incorporate elements of pronunciation in their lessons. However, the studies suggest that students would like to have more instruction on pronunciation. As part of the English Pronunciation Teaching in Europe Survey, Tergujeff (2012a) studied the practices of English teachers as to pronunciation. Most of the 92 participants (84.8%) spent up to 25% of their teaching time on pronunciation, while 7.6% spent up to 50% of their teaching time on pronunciation, and 3.3% did not include pronunciation in their teaching at all. Nevertheless, this does not give a very detailed picture of the situation as the categories are so broad (0%, up to 25%, up to 50%, up to 75%, and more than 75%).

In relation to the explicit teaching of pronunciation, the use of phonetic symbols in teaching seems to divide opinions. Although phonetic script is usually recommended in pronunciation teaching literature, seen as an important part of explicit pronunciation teaching, often used in foreign language textbooks, and considered particularly beneficial when learning a language with weak spelling-to-sound correspondence, like English (Tergujeff, Ullakonoja & Dufva, 2010: 63), some studies suggest that phonetic symbols are not very systematically used in Finland. For example, half of the students in Tergujeff et al.'s study (2010: 65) reported that phonetic script is never dealt with in their language class. In English particularly, 25% answered that phonetic symbols were never taught in their class and 55% reported that they were rarely taught. Only 1% reported that they were often used in teaching, while 19% responded 'sometimes'. Nonetheless, 72.8% of the teachers in Tergujeff's study (2012a: 37-39) reported teaching their students to recognize phonetic symbols, while only 5.4% answered that they teach their students to learn how to write them. In addition, 22.8% required that students learn to recognize some of them and 17.4% that they learn to write some of them. Those who reported using phonetic symbols argued that they help learners in their pronunciation and considered them to be essential in language teaching. In addition, they pointed out that the presence of phonetic symbols in textbooks had facilitated the choice to include them in their teaching. Those who reported

not using phonetic symbols often mentioned that they would be too difficult for young learners. Another common reason was lack of time. Writing phonetic symbols was often deemed unnecessary, and not teaching learners the writing of phonetic symbols was more common among the primary-level teachers as it was considered too challenging for young learners. Despite the relatively frequent teaching of phonetic symbol recognition in Tergujeff's study (2012a), four of the five teachers interviewed by Kauppinen (2015: 41) thought that although it is important that teachers are familiar with phonetic script, pronunciation teaching should focus on more practical issues than phonetic symbols. However, one of the participants regarded them as essential in learning to pronounce a foreign language, especially in placing stress correctly.

There are several reasons behind the negligence of pronunciation instruction. In addition to the curriculum and the teacher, other factors that affect the time spent on pronunciation teaching include the quality and content of teaching materials, mainly textbooks, and how teacher training has prepared instructors for the teaching of pronunciation (Derwing & Munro, 2015: 78-81). Furthermore, six of the eight Australian teachers that MacDonald (2002: 5) interviewed revealed that they did not like teaching pronunciation, and five of them claimed to be bad at it. Five of the interviewees reported teaching pronunciation less than once in two weeks, and only one participant answered that the amount of pronunciation teaching is enough for his students. Some of the participants did not know how to assess pronunciation or assist students with their production, and some were afraid of embarrassing their students by correcting their pronunciation or of interrupting their communication (p. 7-9). Therefore, they abstained from monitoring their pronunciation. The participants also blamed the lack of appropriate teaching materials (p. 11). In Henderson et al.'s (2015: 13) English Pronunciation Teaching in Europe Survey, 485 European teachers evaluated the quality of the training that they had received in the teaching of English pronunciation on a scale from 1 (extremely poor) to 5 (excellent). The mean, 2.91, indicates that there is a need for improvement as to pronunciation in teacher training. The Finnish teachers of the study considered their own pronunciation training sufficient but reported that they had not received training in how to teach it (Tergujeff, 2013: 41). Besides the lack of suitable materials and shortages in teacher training, Szpyra-Kozłowska (2015: 5-6) mentions the little or no attention that pronunciation receives in international language examinations and teachers' own poor pronunciation and thus their insecurity about their skills as one of the reasons behind the marginal status of pronunciation in teaching.

There have also been some master's theses written about the topic. Kaski-Akhawan (2013) compared students' and teachers' views on the teaching of English oral skills in Finnish upper secondary school. The findings revealed that while teachers paid little attention to pronunciation, students would have liked to have more

phonetic training. On the other hand, the five teachers of English and French who Kauppinen (2015) interviewed all considered pronunciation very important, most of them emphasizing intelligibility and successful communication over flawless production. However, four of the interviewees admitted spending too little time on pronunciation in class, often due to lack of time (p. 34).

This section has demonstrated that pronunciation tends to be universally a somewhat neglected part of language teaching. Several factors influence the amount of time spent on pronunciation instruction, including the dominance of CLT, curricula, teachers' own preferences and skills, international examinations, lack of time, and teaching materials. Nonetheless, some studies seem to suggest that one of the biggest reasons is shortcomings in teacher training.

4.2.2 The focus of pronunciation teaching

As discussed in section 2.6.3, there is no consensus on what aspects of pronunciation should be prioritized in language teaching. Similarly, findings differ as to whether segmental or suprasegmental features dominate in textbooks, as seen in section 4.1.1. However, in general, segmental features tend to nowadays receive more attention in teaching compared to prosody, partly influenced by Jenkins' Lingua Franca Core (Szpyra-Kozłowska, 2015: 111). Many language teachers seem to be uncomfortable teaching suprasegmental features as they feel that they do not have enough training (Derwing & Munro, 2015: 80), and some researchers regard certain elements of prosody as unlearnable (e.g., Levis, 2005: 369-370).

This seems to be the case in Finland as well. For example, in Tergujeff's (2012b) classroom observations, there was no explicit teaching on suprasegmental features. In addition, in Tergujeff et al.'s study (2010: 66), 48% of the 207 Finnish students reported that they never practice intonation or rhythm in their English lessons, while 44% responded 'rarely'. No one reported that these elements would have been practiced often in their classes. This indicates that at least some parts of prosody tend to be neglected in EFL teaching in Finland. On the other hand, in Kauppinen's (2015: 40) study, all five interviewees agreed on the importance of both segmental and suprasegmental features, and among the latter intonation, stress, and rhythm were particularly emphasized. However, this does not necessarily mean that the participants teach both individual sounds and prosody equally.

This section has shed light on the statuses of individual sounds and prosody in language teaching. As discussed above, findings from previous studies do not give a coherent picture of this focus in textbooks because some studies indicate that prosody is well considered in EFL and other language textbooks, while others suggest that at least some parts of it are completely neglected. However, the findings in this section are more straightforward and suggest that suprasegmental features do not receive

enough attention in language classrooms. The next section concentrates on the different methods of teaching pronunciation and their frequency based on different studies.

4.2.3   Pronunciation teaching methods and their frequency

The techniques used in pronunciation teaching are grouped slightly differently in different sources and they overlap to a certain extent. The following classification is derived and adapted from Tergujeff (2013 & 2012b), Celce-Murcia et al. (2010) and Rogerson-Revell (2011), and some of the methods are equivalent to the exercise types listed above.

1. **Listen and repeat**. Students repeat sounds, words, or sentences after the teacher or a record. This method may be considered old-fashioned, but pronunciation is about motor skills and automaticity, for which drilling is essential (Rogerson-Revell, 2011: 23). It can be enriched with audio or video recordings, computer labs, and other technological devices (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010: 9). Although Tergujeff (2013: 31) lists both minimal pairs and tongue twisters in this category, minimal pairs do not necessarily involve imitation but can be used for discriminating between different sounds without repeating the words (Rogerson-Revell, 2011: 220). Thus, in this categorization, like in Celce-Murcia et al. (2010), minimal pair drills and tongue twisters are their own groups.
2. **Reading aloud**. See section 4.1.2.
3. **Phonetic training** involves the use of the IPA, articulatory descriptors, and articulatory diagrams (e.g., vowel charts) and entails activities in which learners write phonetic transcriptions or read/decode phonetically transcribed text (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010: 9).
4. **Minimal pair drills** mean either distinguishing between or producing words that differ in one sound. These drills typically start with word-level practices and then advances to the sentence-level (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010: 9)
5. **Tongue twisters** are phrases which practice pronouncing two (or more) phonemes that are likely to cause difficulties (e.g., "She sells seashells by the seashore"). However, Derwing and Munro (2015: 106) advise against tongue twisters as they are challenging to even native speakers and can cause frustration in learners.
6. **Corrective feedback** means that the teacher corrects students' pronunciation mistakes. However, several sources (see Tergujeff, 2013: 34) argue that the teacher should only give cues in order to give students an opportunity to self-correct. A more sensitive way of doing CF is to reformulate the learner's utterance with correct pronunciation so that it does not appear as explicit correction.

7. **Discrimination/ear training** activities can vary from distinguishing between individual sounds or listening for stress or intonation to familiarizing students with different accents and language varieties (Tergujeff, 2013: 33).

8. **Dictation/spelling.** See section 4.1.2

9. **Rules and instructions** mean that the teacher gives explicit instructions on when to use certain segmental or suprasegmental features. See section 4.1.2.

10. **Rhyming and poems** are used to draw attention to pronunciation. For examples of rhyming activities, see section 4.1.2. Poetry can be used to practice the rhythm and stress of a language (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010: 350).

11. **Awareness-raising** activities increase learners' knowledge of themselves as learners. According to Tergujeff (2013: 32-33), students' awareness of different variants of English and its status as an international language is relevant to pronunciation learning, and connected speech can be used to provoke discussion on the stereotypical ideas about 'correct' and 'sloppy' speech. Students can also be encouraged to recognize their learner types, for instance, with learning diaries and awareness-raising questionnaires, and their understanding of their development can be raised through self-evaluations.

12. **Multisensory methods.** According to Celce-Murcia et al. (2010: 337), students' awareness can be raised by visual, auditory, tactile, and kinesthetic reinforcement. Thus, Tergujeff (2013: 32-33) lists these methods under awareness-raising methods. Celce-Murcia et al. (2010: 337-338) provide some examples of multisensory methods. **Visual reinforcement** can mean providing students with large cards containing one symbol, a word in which the sound occurs, and a picture of how the sound is produced. The cards can then be grouped according to different aspects (e.g., bilabials or voiceless sounds). Associating sounds with colors, a sound-color chart, is also a visual aid. **Auditory reinforcement** can involve associating sounds with objects that produce a somewhat similar sounds, for example, the sound /tʃ/ with a moving train. **Tactile reinforcement**, reinforcement through the sense of touch, can mean drawing students' attention to what parts of their mouth their tongue is touching when pronouncing a certain sound, feeling the vibration on their vocal cords with voiced sounds, or placing their fingers in front of their mouths to feel the puff of air resulted from aspiration. Finally, **kinesthetic reinforcement**, learning through movement, can involve making some sort of movement according to the intonation or stress patterns of what is heard/read.

13. **Games.** Although there are communicative board games (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010: 346), games designed directly to teach pronunciation may be scarce. However, the teacher can create other types of games. For instance, he or she can hang pictures of two sounds on the wall while students form two lines and thus teams, and after

the teacher says a word containing one of the sounds, the heads of the lines compete who can get to the correct picture first (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010: 346).

14. **Recordings of learners' production.** "Audio and video recordings of rehearsed and spontaneous speeches, free conversations, and role plays. Subsequent playback offers opportunities for feedback from teachers and peers as well as for teacher-, peer- and self-evaluation" (Celce-Murcia et al. 2010: 10).

15. **Creative techniques.** According to Tergujeff (2013: 33), creative techniques vary from whole brain activities, such as relaxation techniques, guided imaginary activities, and the use of classical music to activate the right hemisphere of the brain, to using drama and nonmainstream pedagogies. The voice modulation techniques often used by drama coaches can give students better control over their articulation, especially pitch, volume, and rate of speech (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010: 340). Tergujeff (2013: 33) also adds developmental approximation drills, which were a group of their own in Celce-Murcia et al. (2010: 10), to this group. This method follows the steps that native English speakers usually go through as they acquire their L1. For instance, they normally learn /w/ before /r/, and thus learners who have problems with /r/ can start by practicing words that begin with /w/ and then continue to words starting with /r/ (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010: 10).

16. **Materials, tools, and technology.** Pronunciation teaching can be enriched with different tools and technologies. Tools can vary from cartoons, jokes and riddles, jazz chants and songs to different gadgets and props, such as mirrors, feathers, rubber bands, and kazoos (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010: 344). Mirrors can be used to observe lip position and mouth movement, feathers can be placed in front of the mouth to demonstrate the puff of air in aspirated sounds, rubber bands can be stretched when a stressed syllable occurs, and kazoos are a great tool for highlighting intonation. Technology, such as audio, video, different pronunciation software, and mobile applications, can be utilized, although the speech recognition or automatic feedback received from software and applications may not always be reliable (Celce-Murcia et al. 2010: 359). In addition, the Internet provides a lot of material for the teaching of pronunciation, for instance, web pages that combine sound, video, and graphics to demonstrate pronunciation (Celce-Murcia et al. 2010: 360).

It is important to keep in mind that these categories overlap to a certain extent since it is impossible to form groups that would not share any similarities. For example, rhyming and poems and games could be part of the last category, and multisensory methods can be combined practically with any of these methods. Thus, different techniques cannot be regarded as definite or unlinked.

There are not many comprehensive studies on the frequency of different pronunciation teaching methods. In addition, different classifications of these techniques

make the comparisons difficult. However, in Tergujeff's (2012b: 603) classroom observations, 'listen and repeat' was by far the most common method (39 occurrences), followed by 'teacher corrects' (23) and 'teacher points out' (21). If these two latter groups can be combined as 'corrective feedback', it would be by far the most common method. 'Read aloud' (10) and 'phonemic script' (9) were also relatively common, while 'rhyme' (3), 'rules' (2), 'dictation/spelling' (2), 'discrimination' (1), and 'tactile reinforcement' (1) were scarce. This seems to indicate a preference for traditional methods. Although discrimination was used only once in these lessons, in the study conducted for the English Pronunciation Teaching in Europe Survey, 40.2% of the respondents reported using ear training and 27.2% reported using it to some extent (Tergujeff, 2012a: 40). However, 26.1% responded 'I don't know', which might indicate that some teachers are not very familiar with different techniques and their content. In Hismanoglu and Hismanoglu's study (2010: 988) of the pronunciation teaching techniques of English teachers of North Cyprus, the teachers preferred traditional techniques (dictionaries, reading aloud, and dialogues), but most of them were reluctant to utilize technology. In Kauppinen's study (2015), traditional methods were also common, but more creative techniques were brought up as well. All the participants mentioned using texts, such as textbook chapters, songs, poems, rhymes, or dialogues, for reading aloud, repetition, and using the words in new contexts. Both teacher correction and peer correction were mentioned, and peer and group work involved, for instance, games and reading tasks. One of the interviewees reported utilizing mirrors, phones, cameras, and recordings of leaners' production in pronunciation teaching, while another emphasized paying attention to the position of articulatory organs. These same participants also told that they use associations and visualizations in their teaching.

In this section, I have introduced one possible categorization of different techniques of pronunciation teaching. Although there are not many studies on the popularity of these methods, traditional techniques seem to have maintained their important role in pronunciation teaching. This part of the chapter dealing with the previous studies related to the role of pronunciation in teaching has again revealed a need for further research, especially in the Finnish context and from the teachers' perspective. For instance, in Kaski-Akhawan's study (2013: 25), only four of the respondents were teachers, while Kauppinen (2015) interviewed five teachers. Thus, there seems to be a need for larger-scale studies so that the results would be more generalizable. In addition, the popularity of different teaching methods concerning pronunciation has not been researched much, and the differences in categorizations also complicate the comparison between the studies.

Now that the background for the whole study has been provided, it is time to see how the present study was conducted in practice.

5 THE PRESENT STUDY

In the chapters above, I have discussed the role of pronunciation in language teaching, factors affecting pronunciation learning, English phonology as well as some challenges that Finnish learners are likely to face with it, and findings from previous studies. After having presented the background, it is now time to focus on the present study. I will first introduce the aim and research questions of the study, after which the data and chosen methods for analysis will be discussed.

5.1 Aim and research questions

The overall goal of this study is to examine the role and content of pronunciation teaching in basic education and in upper secondary schools. Pronunciation started to lose its status in language teaching in the late 1970s due to the rising dominance of Communicative Language Teaching, and it did not start gaining it back until the 21st century (Tergujeff & Kautonen, 2017: 17-18). However, several studies have shown that still too little time is devoted to explicit pronunciation teaching and when pronunciation is taught, segmental features are favored over prosody (Derwing & Munro, 2015: 78). Tergujeff's (2013) findings support this claim as she found out that most of the teaching of pronunciation concentrates on individual sounds. In addition, the EFL textbooks that she studied had barely any material concerning intonation, rhythm, and connected speech (Tergujeff, 2010). However, this study was conducted 10 years ago, and the Finnish National Core Curricula for Basic Education and General Upper Secondary Schools have also changed since then. Thus, I aim to find out whether there has been a change in the way Finnish EFL textbooks deal with pronunciation and how much and how it is taught in practice, paying special attention to the role of prosody. In addition, the school levels will be compared and the relationship between the

findings of the textbook analysis and the teacher survey will be looked into. In more detail, the goal of the study is to answer the following questions:

1. **How many and what type of exercises do Finnish EFL textbooks have concerning pronunciation?**
   a. How many of all exercises deal with pronunciation?
   b. What are the topics treated in the pronunciation exercises? Are either segmental or suprasegmental features favored?
   c. What are the most common exercise types?
2. **How much and how do Finnish EFL teachers teach pronunciation? What are the reasons behind this?**
   d. How much do the teachers spend time on pronunciation teaching? Do they think it is enough? What are the reasons behind this?
   e. What are the topics treated in pronunciation teaching? Are either segmental or suprasegmental features favored?
   f. What are the most common methods of teaching pronunciation?
3. **According to the teachers, do Finnish EFL textbooks provide enough material for the teaching of pronunciation?**

In order to answer the first research question, a textbook analysis was conducted, while answers to the other two questions were obtained from a teacher questionnaire. In section 2.3, I discussed the reasons why explicit pronunciation teaching is important. By answering these questions, the study can provide important insight into the possible shortcomings in relation to the status of pronunciation in Finnish EFL textbooks and teaching and thus provide suggestions for changes to improve the quality and diversity of language teaching in Finland.

5.2 Data

The data of the study consist of Finnish EFL textbooks and a teacher questionnaire. Both were needed to fully understand the role of pronunciation in teaching. Teachers, especially in Finland, tend to rely quite heavily on textbooks (Tergujeff, 2017b: 85-86), which means that any shortcomings in them are likely to affect teaching as well. However, teachers' views are needed to get a broader understanding of the topic, especially as nowadays there seems to be a shift toward other materials besides textbooks. In other words, a mere textbook analysis would not shed light on how pronunciation is taught in practice, while the survey alone would not reveal the possible shortages or changes in textbooks. To sum up, these two data collection methods complement each

other and provide information about what type of material textbooks offer for pronunciation teaching and how pronunciation is taught in practice.

5.2.1 Textbooks and their online materials

The data of the textbook analysis consist of eight Finnish EFL textbooks aimed at elementary, secondary, and upper secondary school students, involving both textbooks and their separate exercise books. Teacher's guides and other online materials are also included in the study. There are two books from both levels of basic education and four books from upper secondary school. The books were chosen from the classes three and seven and the two first courses of upper secondary school. These choices were made for two reasons. Firstly, the scope of the study and having two different sets of data limit the number of the books that can be analyzed. Secondly, these choices make the results more comparable with Tergujeff's (2010) findings as she also studied two Finnish EFL textbooks per each level, including exercise books and teacher's guides, and the books were from the classes three and seven and from the first course of upper secondary school. However, I chose to include the second course as well because each course emphasizes different elements and thus one course would not necessarily give a very truthful picture of the status of pronunciation.

As the study focuses on activities, textbooks that did not have activities were excluded from the data. Similarly, the sections in the online materials that did not have activities were left out, and only actual exercises were counted in those sections that included both activities and other type of material. Thus, for example the digital versions of the books, exercise keys, Finnish translations of the texts, or audio transcriptions were not obviously analyzed as they would not bring anything new to the data or contain exercises. In addition, vocabulary tests were excluded from the data because they normally do not contain elements related to pronunciation. Moreover, recordings of the exercise materials were conducted only if needed to determine the content of the exercise. The activities in the teacher's guides were counted only if they were different from the ones in the exercise book. Thus, only completely new activities and largely modified versions of the exercises in the books were counted. Similarly, identical activities were not counted twice. For example, some reoccurring self-evaluations or peer evaluations were the same and were therefore counted only once.

The aim of this part of the study was to respond to the first research question. In other words, the books and online materials were examined to see how many exercises (in the present study used interchangeably with words *activity* and *task*) there were related to pronunciation, what the most treated topics were, whether either suprasegmental or segmental features were emphasized, and what types of exercises were most frequent. The books that I have chosen were published by the two major textbook publishing companies in Finland, Otava and Sanoma Pro, and they are widely used

in schools around Finland, which increases the validity and representativeness of the results. The textbooks are presented below (Table 4).

TABLE 4 The textbooks included in the study

Abbr.	Name	Type	Level	Publisher	Year
GFITB	Go for it! 3 Textbook	Textbook	Beginner	Sanoma Pro	2020 (1st–6th ed.)
GFIEB	Go for it! 3 Workbook	Exercise book	Beginner	Sanoma Pro	2020 (1st–8th ed.)
HFTB	High five! 3 Textbook	Textbook	Beginner	Otava	2015 (6th–8th Rev. ed.)
HFEB	High five! 3 Activity book	Exercise book	Beginner	Otava	2016 (7th Rev. ed.)
OTGTB	On the go! 1 Textbook	Textbook	Intermediate	Sanoma Pro	2020 (3rd–8th ed.)
OTGEB	On the go! 1 Workbook	Exercise book	Intermediate	Sanoma Pro	2020 (1st–6th ed.)
STB	Scene 1 Texts	Textbook	Intermediate	Otava	2015 (2nd–3rd Rev. ed.)
SEB	Scene 1 Exercises	Exercise books	Intermediate	Otava	2015 (2nd–5th Rev. ed.)
OT1	On Track 1	Textbook + exercise book	Advanced	Sanoma Pro	2019 (1st–6th ed.)
OT2	On Track 2	Textbook + exercise book	Advanced	Sanoma Pro	2019 (2nd–5th ed.)
IC1	Insights Course 1	Textbook + exercise book	Advanced	Otava	2015 (2nd–7th ed.)
IC2	Insights Course 2	Textbook + exercise book	Advanced	Otava	2015 (6th ed.)

The two elementary-level textbooks did not entail activities, but they are still listed above since they were utilized in some of the activities and were thus needed in order to determine the content and focus of those activities.

5.2.2 The questionnaire

The other set of data entails responses to a questionnaire aimed at Finnish EFL teachers in basic education and upper secondary school. The goal of this data was to answer

the second and third research questions. The questionnaire included *factual questions* that were used to get some background information about the respondents (e.g., school level and gender), *behavioral questions* to find out the participants' actions and habits (e.g., how much time they spend on teaching pronunciation), and *attitudinal questions* (e.g., how important they consider the explicit teaching of pronunciation) (Dörnyei, 2007: 102), and it consisted mainly of close-ended questions. However, the respondents had an opportunity to clarify and elaborate on their answers and provide additional information. A questionnaire was chosen as the method of data collection because it is a time-efficient way to gather a large amount of information in a readily processable form and in a systematic and disciplined manner (Dörnyei, 2007: 103). The method was also chosen because I wanted to be able to make generalizations based on my data, and questionnaires aim at describing characteristics of a population (Dörnyei, 2007: 103). Furthermore, the information needed to answer my research questions is easily obtainable via a questionnaire.

The online questionnaire was created with Webropol and answered anonymously. According to Johnson and Christensen (2017: 211), it is important to pilot test a questionnaire with a minimum of five to ten people before using it in a study to ensure that the questionnaire works properly and there is no risk of misunderstandings. This questionnaire was first piloted with three people who all were EFL teachers in Finland, and changes were made based on their feedback. The final version of the questionnaire was then published on a Facebook page intended for English teachers around Finland. However, there were not enough respondents, and I had to search schools' websites for teachers' emails and ask them to participate. Thus, I used *convenience sampling*, which means that the sample consists of people who are available, volunteer, can be easily recruited, or are willing to participate in the study, and it is thus not based on *random sampling* (Johnson & Christensen, 2017: 267). According to Johnson and Christensen (2017: 267), because not everyone in the population has an equal chance to participate (i.e., those who are not in the group or whose information is not available), the results cannot truly be generalized to a population. However, as they point out, it is important to remember that most of the empirical studies are not based on random samples, and the choice is not often made due to convenience but because of practical constraints. Nonetheless, it is crucial to describe the limitations of this type of sample when reporting the results and drawing conclusions while also providing information about the characteristics that the sample shares with the target population (Dörnyei, 2017: 99). Therefore, I paid a lot of attention to the representativeness of the sample, such as the share between genders, teaching experience, and the school level at which the respondents teach when describing the participants.

The responses were collected in February and March 2021, and 97 EFL teachers filled in the questionnaire. The background information involved their gender, age,

teaching experience, and the level at which they teach. In regard to gender, respondents were also allowed to respond: "I do not want to tell". There were five age groups, from 20–29 years old to 60–69 years old, while teaching experience was categorized into six groups. Finally, the school levels naturally included elementary, secondary, and upper secondary schools. However, it is fairly common that teachers teach at more than one school level. Thus, the respondents had an opportunity to choose more than one answer. Table 5 below summarizes the characteristic of the sample.

TABLE 5 The background information of the respondents

Gender	Male	Female	Not told			
n	23	72	2			
%	23.7	74.2	2.1			
Age	20–29	30–39	40–49	50–59	60–69	
n	10	25	23	35	4	
%	10.3	25.8	23.7	36.1	4.1	
Experience (years)	0–5	Over 5	Over 10	Over 20	Over 30	Over 40
n	18	16	20	28	15	0
%	18.5	16.5	20.6	28.9	15.5	0
School level	Elementary	Secondary	Upper secondary			
n=118/n=78*	43 /31	36 / 17	39 / 30			
%	44.3 / 39.7	37.1 / 21.8	40.2 / 38.5			

* Those who teach only at one school level

As can be seen, a clear majority of the respondents were women, but there were no big differences as to the other background factors. Ages 50–59 were well presented in the data, but age groups 30–39 and 40–49 did not come far behind. Clearly younger (20–29 years old) and older (60–69 years old) teachers were less common, which can be easily explained by the fact that these groups represent the two extremes among which many are not yet graduated or are already retired. Although there were no teachers with more than forty years of experience, which is not surprising, the rest of the groups were rather equally represented. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the different school levels did not differ much in size. There were 118 responses to this question as 19 reported teaching English at more than one level. However, these 19 respondents had to be omitted when comparing the school levels to avoid overlapping data between the groups, and after this, there was more variation in the group sizes as there were only 17 teachers who reported teaching only at the secondary level.

I have now presented the data and the characteristics of the respondents. It is time to discuss the methods of analysis for both textbook analysis and the questionnaire.

5.3   Methods of analysis

This study takes the mixed methods approach, which means that the researcher uses both quantitative and qualitative methods, approaches, or concepts within one study or in a set of related studies (Johnson & Christensen, 2017: 51). This method was chosen because it allows multiple objectives and provides a more comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon from different perspectives (Johnson & Christensen, 2017: 34). In addition, according to Johnson and Christensen (2017: 51), it helps improve research as different approaches have their own strengths and weaknesses, and using one or more approaches reduces the risk of mistakes and missing important information. In this study, both sets of data included information that required both quantitative and qualitative methods. In the textbook analysis, the occurrences of pronunciation exercises were analyzed numerically, while the books and online materials were also studied qualitatively to describe the content of the activities. Thus, while counting occurrences played a crucial role, the activities had to be looked at more closely to gain knowledge of the content and the most common topics. In the questionnaire, the close-ended questions were analyzed quantitatively, whereas the open-ended questions required qualitative methods. Therefore, the analysis was multidata-multianalysis, which, according to Johnson and Christensen (2017: 591-592), is the most common type of analysis in mixed methods. They state that in this type of analysis, the data consist of both quantitative and qualitative information, which is then analyzed using both these methods. Nonetheless, as occurrences of pronunciation exercises and their types in the books as well as closed-ended questions in the questionnaire were the main focus of the data, quantitative methods had a more prominent role in the study.

Quantitative data are analyzed by using statistics that can be divided into two broad categories: descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. Dörnyei (2007: 208-214) explains the difference between these two branches. Descriptive methods involve the summarization and presentation of the numerical data via, for example, mean, mode, medium, range, variance, and different types of charts or tables. However, they are restricted to the particular sample and do not allow drawing general conclusions. If one wants to generalize the results to the whole population, inferential statistics are needed. These include different tests that determine whether the results are significant and powerful enough to be generalized to the target population.

The textbook analysis of the present study relies on descriptive statistics. It is largely based on frequency distributions, and tables are used to describe and summarize the numerical data. Thus, making inferences of all EFL textbooks is not the goal although the books are widely used in Finnish schools, and the results can, in fact, give some insight into the role of pronunciation in Finnish EFL textbooks without

inferential statistics. However, the questionnaire was analyzed by using both descriptive and inferential statistics, which will be discussed in more detail in section 5.3.2.

5.3.1 Textbook analysis

The textbooks were analyzed by using content analysis. It is "a research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from texts (or other meaningful matter) to the contexts of their use" (Krippendorff, 2019: 24). According to Krippendorff (2019: 87-90), content analysis consists of six steps: 1) unitizing, 2) sampling, 3) recording/coding, 4) reducing, 5) inferring, and 6) narrating. First, the researcher draws systematic distinctions between texts that are relevant to the analysis, omitting unnecessary matter (unitizing). Then he or she chooses the samples to be studied by limiting observations to a manageable subset of units that is representative of all relevant units (sampling). After this, the observations must be transformed into a durable and analyzable records (recording/coding) and reduced to manageable representations (reducing). Then the researcher can move the analysis outside their data and draw conclusions on the phenomenon based on the data by applying analytical constructs (inferring). Finally, he or she answers the research questions by making the results comprehensible to the reader (narrating).

My analysis followed the above-mentioned logic to a great extent. I first defined what I wanted to find out and whether content analysis was a suitable method for it, after which I decided what type of texts could give answers to my questions (unitizing) and chose the books to be included in the study (sampling). I then started studying the books and transform my observations into analyzable records, such as tables and figures (recording/coding) by using Microsoft Excel and had to leave out information that was not relevant to the study (reducing). However, as my analysis was descriptive, I did not make inferences from the data but moved on to narrate the results.

The analysis was both qualitative and quantitative although quantitative methods had a more prominent role. First, I calculated the total number of activities in the unit studied. Elements were categorized as separate activities if they fit one of the following criteria: 1) A numbered exercise or an assessment form, 2) A separate part or step of a numbered exercise/assessment form (e.g., 1a, 1b, bullet points, or sections in self-evaluation forms) OR different options for one activity, including topic ideas. However, if the activity involved several tasks but the instructions were written together (e.g., "Read the dialogue aloud with your partner AND answer the following questions"), it was counted as only one exercise, 3) Clearly separate instructions after an activity (e.g., instructions below a crossword to choose three words and make sentences using them), 4) Instructions for an activity outside the actual exercises (e.g., speech bubbles or circles involving tasks), 5) Instructions for an activity within text, not in a clear activity format (e.g., activity ideas written among other text in teacher's

guides or in books), and 6) Different versions of the same activity (e.g. Finnish and English versions or multiple-choice and open answer versions). Thus, the total number of activities does not correspond with the numbered activities.

After counting the total number of activities, I reduced the data to those exercises whose focus was on pronunciation and counted how many of the total number of exercises were about pronunciation. Although pronunciation is present in all oral activities, and the teacher can of course use all oral activities to teach pronunciation, this study focuses on more explicit pronunciation exercises. The exercises were considered pronunciation exercises if their focus was on pronunciation and not on, for example, information seeking, revision of vocabulary or grammar, or genuine communication. In order to define this, qualitative methods were needed. 'Read aloud' activities are especially tricky since their goal is not always clear. However, in this study, 'read aloud' activities were regarded as pronunciation exercises if students were asked to read aloud, for example, texts, vocabulary lists or ready-made or already filled dialogues without the need to remember, add, or seek for information. Exercises that involved some pronunciation but had another, stronger, focus were excluded. An example of this could be an exercise in which a student has to read aloud a word or a sentence and his or her partner must translate it. In a similar manner, exercises that had several different phases and pronunciation did not play a big role were not regarded as pronunciation activities. For example, students can be asked to write sentences and then read them to their partner. However, exercises that had several steps but emphasized grapheme-phoneme correspondence or pronunciation in other ways were listed as pronunciation activities. An example could be an exercise in which a student writes the first two letters of a word and his or her partner must write the rest of the word and then pronounce the word. Listening exercises were included as pronunciation exercises if they tested one's ability to distinguish between different sounds or prosodic patterns or were about dictation and spelling. Exercises in which students were asked to listen and repeat or sing along were regarded as pronunciation exercises. Although these exercises can of course be used to revise, for instance, vocabulary, pronunciation is usually particularly paid attention to. If the songs included rhyming words, they were included in the 'rhyme and verse' category.

After having counted the exercises, I categorized each of them into Tergujeff's (2010) exercise type categories presented in section 4.1.2. However, Tergujeff's classification was data-driven and thus it was complemented with some of the teaching methods listed in section 4.2.3. The categories 'games', 'multisensory methods', and 'creative methods' were added to the classification. Furthermore, some other slight changes were made to better distinguish between the categories. For instance, activities involving singing/reading aloud or listening and repeating a song or a poem without rhyming words were categorized as 'read aloud' activities or 'listen and

repeat' rather than 'rhyme and verse'. The classification of the present study, which is slightly adapted from Tergujeff's (2010) classification, is presented below, and examples from the data are provided to better describe the categories.

1. **Phonetic training:** Exercises that aim to explicitly teach the phonetic system of a given language, demonstrate differences between the sound systems of L1 and the target language, or provide information regarding the placement of articulators or the way of pronouncing certain sounds. Examples derived from the data include vocabulary lists utilizing the IPA and with instructions: "Practice"; explanations why a sound or a contrast in sounds is difficult for Finnish learners of English and what type of mistakes they normally make with it; a few activities in which students had to read aloud phonetic transcription or translate it into normal orthography; and exercises involving paying attention to how certain sounds are pronounced. In addition, there were a lot of "Hide and show" activities in online materials intended for practicing pronunciation. These consisted of vocabulary lists with three columns, of which students could hide one or more: the word in English, the word in Finnish, and the phonetic transcription, accompanied by an audio.

2. **Read aloud**: Reading aloud sounds, words, sentences, texts, or dialogues independently or in pairs without an obvious communicative function or a need to remember grammar rules or vocabulary, fill in information, or produce free speech. Some examples from the data include reading aloud the texts or sentences with minimal pairs or other contrasted sounds, enunciating tongue twisters, and asking a partner questions with rising and falling intonation. In addition, there were two activities in which two students have the same list of words and phrases in English, and one of them must think of one of these words/phrases and the other one tries to guess the word/phrase by saying it aloud. Finally, there were activities involving spinning a wheel and getting a word or phrase written in English that students would have to say aloud. However, reading text in different moods is considered a creative technique (see 4.2.3) as it involves using drama methods.

3. **Listen and repeat:** Learners need to imitate sounds, words, or sentences. The data included activities in which students had to, for instance, repeat minimal pairs, dialogues, or different types of questions, or imitate speech in a video.

4. **Rhyme and verse:** Exercises in which rhymes are used to teach pronunciation. In the present study, reading aloud or listening and repeating poems or songs are considered 'rhyme and verse' activities only if they involve rhyming words. Otherwise, they are categorized as 'read aloud' or 'listen and repeat' activities. The books had activities in which students had to sing songs or read poems containing rhyming words. However, there were no activities that would have required deducing missing words based on rhymes.

5. **Rules & instructions:** In this type of material, learners are given explicit rules and instructions on when to use certain sounds or prosodic features. As the data of the study focus on activities, there are not many rules. However, these can be found in some of the instructions or in teacher's guides. For instance, one of the guides discussed when *th* is pronounced as the voiced dental fricative. In addition, there were suggestions that the teacher should tell his/her students that the *-ed* ending is often pronounced too literally, while the correct pronunciation is more often [d] or [t] than [id], and rules were also provided regarding sentence stress and intonation in the videos of the pronunciation sections of *OTG1*.

6. **Awareness-raising activities:** These activities increase students' awareness of different varieties of English as well as different learning styles and habits and encourage them to find methods of learning that suit them. In the data, there were self-evaluation forms containing elements concerning one's learning habits as to pronunciation. Moreover, different accents were dealt with in the advanced-level textbooks. For instance, there were exercises involving distinguishing between different accents and placing them correctly on a map, thinking about the easiness and beautifulness of different accents as well as students' preferences as to different varieties, listening to audios of British and American English and finding differences, and searching for samples of spoken Australian English and other varieties to be shared in class. In addition, one activity involved listening to a tape with different accents and taking notes on what is being said.

7. **Spelling and dictation:** This category entails spelling or dictating words, minimal pairs, or sentences in pairs as well as writing down words/sentences or filling in text based on what is heard, for example, on a tape. Thus, the focus is on letter-to-phoneme correspondence. In Tergujeff's (2010) study, this category also entailed spelling words based on the movements of the mouth. However, in the present study, lip-reading activities belong to the multisensory methods as they include visual reinforcement. In the data, there were a lot of activities involving writing down words or sentences or filling in text or songs based on what is heard. In addition, there were group dictation activities and competitions, in which a member of the group must go to the board/hallway, read a sentence, come back to his/her group and say the sentence aloud, after which another member writes it down. Some activities involved spelling own and classmates' names to a peer who writes them down, or spelling words to a partner who then must either write or say the word aloud and translate it into Finnish. Although these activities entailed translating, the spelling and dictation were the main focuses of the activities, and thus they were counted as pronunciation-specific activities.

8. **Ear training:** These activities involve discriminating between different sounds or prosodic features. In addition, the books had ear training activities that involved,

for example, ticking which sentences or words one hears on a tape; deciding whether a question is amicable or not based on intonation; choosing from minimal pairs based on what is heard; differentiating between voiced and voiceless plosives, different *-ed* endings, and different moods in speech; and distinguishing whether the letter r is pronounced in words or not. Moreover, there were activities in which students had to choose from minimal pairs and then check the answer by listening (e.g., I broke my rip/rib). However, these activities were still considered pronunciation activities as the focus was more on pronunciation than vocabulary.

9. **Games.** Games and plays that focus on pronunciation. For example, in the data, there was a game that involved reading aloud dialogues. In addition, there were some other activities that combined 'games' with some other category, including a few broken telephone games that combined 'listen and repeat' and 'games'.

10. **Multisensory methods.** Pronunciation is taught by using visual, auditory, tactile, or kinesthetic reinforcement (see section 4.2.3). In the books, there were activities which aimed to demonstrate the presence of vocal cord vibration in voiced sounds by touching one's throat. Pieces of paper were also used in front of one's mouth for seeing the presence of aspiration of voiceless sounds, while mirrors were utilized to observe whether they got steamy when pronouncing aspirated sounds or to examine the position of the tongue when pronouncing dental fricatives. Attention was also paid to the position of visible articulators, such as lips and tongue. This was done, for example, in the "lip-reading" activities mentioned above.

11. **Creative techniques.** In the data, creative techniques involved, for instance, developmental approximation drills (see section 4.2.3) and different drama techniques, such as reading Finnish words or sentences with exaggerated intonation or aspiration, and using different moods, tones or characters when reading aloud text.

As some of the categories overlap and certain activities might involve elements of more than one group, some exercises had to be divided between two categories. Examples of these types of activities are given when discussing the results.

Finally, I marked whether the exercises focused on segmental or suprasegmental features and what aspects of them more precisely. Some exercises were labeled under the title 'both' if they could practically be used to teach both segmental and suprasegmental features or did not have a clear focus. For instance, practicing or listening and repeating vocabulary lists can be used to practice both sounds and word stress, and in activities involving reading aloud texts, dialogues, or rhymeless poems/songs, either sounds or prosody can be emphasized. However, poems/songs with rhyming words were regarded as segmental-oriented exercises since they draw attention to individual sounds and grapheme-phoneme correspondence even though they can of course be used to teach, for example, rhythm. Exercises involving spelling and

dictation were considered segmental-oriented for the same reason. In addition, reading aloud words or sentences with the intention of practicing sound contrasts or word stress were of course categorized accordingly. Qualitative methods were used when studying the content of the exercises, meaning the sounds or prosodic features treated. Although the overall focus (sounds, prosody, and 'both') were analyzed numerically, this more detailed content (e.g., intonation in questions or the /p, b/ contrast) was dealt with thematically, without numbers.

To conclude, although content analysis has recently become closely linked to qualitative research despite its quantitative origins (Dörnyei, 2007: 245), I consider my method to be closer to quantitative than qualitative for two reasons. Firstly, the categories used in qualitative content analysis are not predetermined but arise from the data (data-driven content analysis) (Dörnyei, 2007: 245), while the exercise type categories of the present study were derived from Tergujeff's (2010) study although this classification was complemented when needed. Secondly, qualitative content analysis includes a thorough analysis of the deeper meanings of the data (Dörnyei, 2007: 245-246). However, I was interested in the content of the exercises only to be able to categorize them since a deeper analysis was not needed to answer the research questions.

5.3.2 Analysis of the questionnaire

As mentioned above, the close-ended questions in the questionnaire were analyzed with both descriptive and inferential statistics by using IBM SPSS Statistics. These both methods were chosen for being able to say something about the EFL teachers in Finland in general and not just discuss the results in the context of my sample. The significance level was $p < 0.05$ in all tests as it has become a convention among researchers in various fields (Johnson & Christensen, 2017: 545). However, the open-ended questions were analyzed qualitatively. The responses were carefully read to search for reoccurring elements, which were then categorized into different themes.

Before the data can be analyzed, it must be prepared for the analysis. This entails the systematic coding of the data into numerical form, entering the data into a computer file, and screening, cleaning, and manipulating it in case there are mistakes (e.g., typing a wrong number) in the data (Dörnyei, 2007: 198-203). However, the questionnaire was in digital form, and the data could be automatically transferred to SPSS. Nonetheless, some alterations had to be made, for example, concerning eliminating some respondents when comparing the different school levels.

Several different methods were used in the analysis depending on the type of the data. There are four different data types: nominal, ordinal, interval, and ratio (Johnson & Morgan, 2016: 100). The independent variable of the study (the school levels) is nominal data as it is categorical and has no order or structure, whereas most of the dependent variables, meaning the rest of the questions, are ordinal data, signifying

that the data have order but the space between the points on scale is not equal (Johnson & Morgan, 2016: 100-101). For example, respondents were asked to evaluate how often they teach pronunciation on a scale from 'never' to 'approximately every class'. As the intervals between the options are not equal, and it would have been impossible to include so many options that they would be, the data of this question are ordinal, and the mathematical analysis is thus restricted to frequencies, medians, and correlations (Johnson & Morgan, 2016: 101). Thus, a mean is not provided for that question. Likert scales were used to find out how often teachers teach certain elements of pronunciation and how frequently they use certain methods and tools. Likert scales are ordinal data, but they are often treated as interval data (Peer, Hakemulder & Zyngier, 2012: 114), and according to Johnson and Morgan (2016: 101), several researchers have demonstrated that ordinal data often function similarly to interval data, which allows for more mathematical calculation. However, the intervals between the options should be equal (Peer et al., 2012: 114). In the present study, the options are *never*, *rarely*, *sometimes*, and *often* as to the estimation of frequency, and *totally disagree*, *disagree to a certain extent*, *not disagree or agree*, *agree to a certain extent*, and *totally agree* when responding to statements. Although it is somewhat impossible to prove that the intervals between these response options are equal, the questions are treated as interval data to the extent that means are provided to better describe the overall results. However, the statistical test chosen for the analysis between the independent and the ordinal dependent variables, the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance, can be used also on ordinal data as it compares the distributions between groups based on the data ranks rather than means (Johnson & Morgan, 2016: 216-219). Thus, ordinal data were treated as quasi-interval in the present study, so that means were provided to enrich the representation of results, while the statistical tests did not require continuous data.

A non-parametric test was chosen for two reasons: non-parametric tests do not assume normal distribution, and they may work better with data collected from small samples (Johnson & Morgan, 2016: 216). The current data often had problems with normal distribution, which was tested with the Shapiro-Wilk test. In addition, some of the groups were rather small. For instance, when comparing the different school levels, the respondents who had chosen multiple levels had to be omitted to avoid overlapping data. After this, there were only 17 secondary school teachers. Thus, parametric tests might not have given reliable results. The Kruskal-Wallis H test was chosen of the non-parametric tests because it is used when comparing multiple groups (i.e., the school levels) (Johnson & Morgan, 2016: 216-219).

There were also some nominal dependent variables. For example, respondents had to evaluate whether they teach enough pronunciation, the options being "yes", "no", and "I do not know". When comparing the results between the groups, both variables were thus nominal. The chi-square test was used to detect significant

relationships between the two nominal variables. There were also checklists and other multiple-response question items that are nominal. Significant differences between groups were searched for with the Fisher's exact test, which is otherwise similar to the chi-square test, but it does not have requirements concerning the values of the cells. The Chi-square test assumes that no cell has a value below 5 in 2x2 tables, and in larger tables, no more than 20% of the cells should have a value less than 5. Thus, the Fisher's exact test should be used when this assumption cannot be met (Reynolds, 1984: 19).

5.4   Reliability, validity, and ethical concerns

In any study, it is important to evaluate *reliability* and *validity*. The first one refers to the presumption that the research procedure and the results would stay the same regardless of the measuring event, instrument, or researcher, whereas the latter means that the measuring instruments really measure what they are claimed to measure (Krippendorff, 2019: 277&361). Regarding content analysis, Krippendorff (2019: 280-282) divides reliability into *stability*, *replicability*, and *accuracy* or *surrogacy*. Stability means the degree to which the analysis is unchanging over time, and it can be ensured by repeated trials. Replicability refers to the degree to which the study can be repeated by another researcher, despite the conditions, location, or measuring instruments. Finally, accuracy and surrogacy mean the degree to which the process yield what it is designed to yield.

In the textbook analysis, reliability was secured by doing several recounts and following strictly the criteria, methods, and categorizations decided at the beginning. The different classification methods were explained in detail to ensure that the study is reproducible. Nonetheless, there are still some problems as to reliability. Firstly, the coding was done manually, and thus some errors in numbers of activities are possible. Secondly, activities may consist of very different elements, and choosing whether pronunciation is the main focus or not is rather a subjective matter. Thirdly, some of the categories overlap, and thus many exercises were divided between two groups. Despite the instructions for categorization, it is possible that other researchers might categorize some of them slightly differently. In short, due to the variance in activities, deciding on the categorization is sometimes done on a case-by-case basis. Regarding validity, the present study aimed to achieve it by choosing textbooks that are widely used in Finland to make the results more representative and paying special attention so that categorizations would represent the nature of activities as well as possible. In fact, many activities were categorized in two groups to better manifest their content.

With regard to the questionnaire, reliability was achieved through a relatively large sample size and by ensuring that both genders, different age and experience

groups as well as the different school levels are well represented. Although there were a lot more female respondents, this does not necessarily harm reliability as there are more female teachers in the whole population as well (Opetushallitus, 2020a: 11, 2020b: 10). Concerning the school levels, teachers were able to choose more than one level. Overall, all levels were quite equally numbered. However, only the teachers who teach at one level could be included in the comparisons to avoid overlapping data. This revealed that there were fewer teachers teaching only at the secondary level compared to the two other levels, which might be problematic when drawing conclusions from the data. Moreover, it must be taken into account that because the sample was not random as the questionnaire was sent to those EFL teachers who were available either in the Facebook group or by email, it is possible that teachers who are particularly interested in pronunciation or consider it important were more eager to take part. This should be kept in mind when reporting the results. However, this type of risk is not often easy to omit since people are probably more likely to participate in questionnaires, interviews, and other types of data collections if the topic is of interest to them. In the analysis phase, reliability was easier to secure compared to the textbook analysis due to the automatic treatment of the data in SPSS, meaning that the calculations and tests were run by the software. Thus, human calculation errors could be avoided.

Furthermore, validity was considered when planning and analyzing the questions. Firstly, questions were planned so that each question asked only one thing at a time. Secondly, the respondents often had a chance to respond "I do not know" in order to avoid uncertain or hesitant answers. Thirdly, when asking about the use of different methods and tools, they were provided with short explanations and examples to ensure that the participants understand the question. However, it must be kept in mind that some of the questions, for instance, the sufficiency of one's own pronunciation teaching, is rather a subjective matter and people can evaluate these types of things quite differently. In addition, due to the lack of space, no comprehensive explanations of each method could be provided, which can of course harm the validity of the results if some respondents misunderstood some aspects. In the analysis part, validity was aimed at by carefully choosing tests that matched both the data type and its properties as well as the goals of the study.

Although ethical issues did not play a big role in the textbook analysis for not having human participants, there were certain ethical aspects that had to be considered as to the survey. Firstly, the questionnaire was filled in anonymously and no identifiable information of the participants was collected. Secondly, in the analysis, it was important to treat especially the open-ended answers carefully so that the respondents' words were not misunderstood, perverted, or changed too much when they were translated. In addition, it was crucial to report the results so that conclusions were not drawn without explicit evidence emerging from the data.

6 RESULTS

In this section, I will present the results from both the textbook analysis and the teacher questionnaire. The findings related to each research question will be discussed separately, beginning with the first research question for which the findings were obtained from the textbook analysis. After this, the results from the teacher questionnaire will be presented to respond to the second and third research questions.

6.1 Pronunciation exercises in EFL textbooks

In this part, the results from the textbook analysis of the study will be presented to answer the first research question. Thus, it deals with the number of pronunciation exercises in textbooks, exercise books and online materials; the frequency of different exercise types; and the focus and content of the chosen exercises. The questions will be answered level by level, starting with the beginner-level textbooks and ending with the advanced-level ones. Despite the categorical nature of the analysis, it is important to remember that teachers can modify the exercises to better meet their needs. However, this analysis will concentrate strictly on the visible and explicit aspects of the activities. After the results concerning each book have been presented, the final part of this section draws the findings from the different levels together. The possible differences between the books of the same level will also be briefly discussed.

6.1.1 Beginner-level textbooks

The two beginner-level textbooks studied, aimed mainly at third graders, are *Go for it! 3* and *High Five! 3*. They both include a textbook, an exercise book, a teacher's guide and other online materials. The online materials included in the study as to GFI3 consist of a teacher's guide and its attachments (i.e., extra activities and work cards that

students can use to test and self-evaluate their progress), ready-made exam exercises for both unit and oral exams, sections called "Practice and play" to practice vocabulary, "Find out" to learn about culture, and "Go for it!", which provides opportunities for multidisciplinary learning and learning by doing. In addition, Sanoma Pro provides students with a digital world called Bingel, in which they can create their own avatar and practice their skills based on the textbook series. However, this is not restricted to *GFI* because students can practice other subjects in Bingel as well. In regard to *HF3*, the online materials included in the study consist of extra materials for both teachers and students, such as games and activities, a separate culture section, ready-made tests, and a teacher's guide. Some of the extra activities in the teacher's and students' materials were the same and are thus treated together.

6.1.1.1　　Go for it! 3

The number of exercises: The exercise book and online materials provided altogether 1,404 activities, of which 256.5 (+5) (18.4–18.8%) were pronunciation activities. The textbook did not contain activities. Although one of the five games in the textbook included reading aloud short dialogues with a partner, four of which did not require filling in information or memorization of vocabulary and were thus focused on pronunciation, the instructions could be found at the end of *GFIEB*, so the activity was listed as an activity of the exercise book. The game was regarded as partly a pronunciation activity and is thus marked as 0.5 in the 'games' group. In regard to the number five in parenthesis, there were five oral exam activities that involved reading aloud ready-made dialogues with a partner, either in English or Finnish. As the latter option entails translating, it cannot be considered explicitly pronunciation exercise. Thus, these five activities are marked in parenthesis.

　　GFIEB had a total of 473 exercises (including the five game instructions at the end of the book), of which 54.5 (11.5%) can be regarded as pronunciation-specific exercises. The online materials of *GFI* had 202.5 exercises that can be considered to focus on pronunciation. Sections "Practice and play" as well as "Go for it" did not entail pronunciation activities, which is not surprising considering their focuses on vocabulary and multidisciplinary learning. Although the teacher's guide did not have actual numbered activities, it provided activity ideas and tips for teaching the contrast between the phonemes treated in each chapter. In addition to these sounds, the material for chapter 13 also included the voiced dental fricative /ð/. The tips followed a somewhat consistent pattern: First there was an explanation why the sound or the contrast is difficult for Finnish learners of English, and what type of mistakes they normally make with it and what the sound entails (phonetic training). Then there were some

tips to practice the sounds and demonstrate the difference, for instance, with multi-sensory methods or creative techniques, such as developmental approximation drills and exaggerated aspiration when producing Finnish. Finally, there were minimal pairs and short tongue twisters to be used in 'listen and repeat' activities. Thus, these different steps were counted as separate activities.

The most common exercise types: The exercise types and their frequency in the exercise book and each part of the online materials are presented below (Table 6).

TABLE 6 Pronunciation exercise types and their frequency in *Go for it! 3*

	PT	RA	L&R	R&V	R&I	ARA	S&D	ET	Games	MM	CT	TOTAL	PRON
GFIEB	**0**	**17.5**	**30**	**5**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0.5**	**0.5**	**0**	**473**	**54.5 (11.5%)**
Online materials													
Teacher's guide	9	2	16.5	1	1	0	2	3	1	9	2.5	154	47 (30.5%)
At-tach-ments	0	46	2	10	0	0	65	0	0	0	0	374	123 (32.9%)
Exams (incl. oral)	0	5 (5)	0	0	0	0	14	1	0	0	0	224	20 (5) (8.9%)
Prac-tice and play	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0
Find out	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	1 (2.9%)
Go for it	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0
Bingel	0	0	0	0.5	0	0	1	11.5	0	0	0	120	13 (10.8%)
TO-TAL online	**9**	**54 (+5)**	**18.5**	**11.5**	**1**	**0**	**82**	**15.5**	**1**	**9**	**2.5**	**931**	**204 +5 (21.9%)**
TO-TAL	**9**	**71.5(+5)**	**48.5**	**16.5**	**1**	**0**	**82**	**16.5**	**1.5**	**9.5**	**2.5**	**1,40 4**	**258. 5+5**

all												(18.4%)

PT= Phonetic training; RA= Read aloud; L&R= Listen and repeat, R&V= Rhyme and verse; R&I= Rules and instructions; ARA= Awareness-raising activities; S&D= Spelling and dictation; ET= Ear training; MM= Multisensory methods; CT= Creative techniques. NB! The percentages in the table are counted so that the (+5) activities are omitted.

Although traditional exercises like 'listen and repeat' and 'read aloud' seem to dominate in the *Go for it! 3* books, the online materials and especially the teacher's guide provided more versatile methods to learn pronunciation. When the online materials are included, 'spelling and dictation' (82) is clearly the most common activity type even though it was lacking in the books. This was a particularly common type in the attachments. 'Read aloud' (71.5+5) comes in second, followed by 'listen and repeat' (48.5), 'rhyme and verse' (16.5) and 'ear training' (16.5). There were five exercises in total that were divided between two groups. Firstly, one activity in *GFIEB* was divided between 'read aloud' and 'multisensory methods' because it involved both tactile reinforcement and reading aloud: a student writes one word from a vocabulary list on his/her partner's back and the partner must say the word in English. Secondly, there were three divided activities in the teacher's guide. The first one combined singing with playing (listen and repeat + games), the second one involved 'listen and repeat' and 'games' in the form of a broken telephone game, and the third one combined listening and singing (listen and repeat) with using different tones of voice (drama technique, i.e., creative technique). Finally, in Bingel, one exercise was divided between 'ear training' and 'rhyme and verse' as it required students to choose correct words for a rhyme based on what they heard.

The small number of creative techniques, pronunciation games, explicit rules, and awareness-raising activities suggests that more traditional exercises and methods still dominate, while more creative techniques were brought up mainly in the teacher's guide. There were not many rules/instructions embedded in the activities besides the short introduction in the teacher's guide, which might indicate that children at this level are believed to absorb pronunciation without being given explicit rules. On the other hand, it does not mean that rules would not be used outside the activities.

The focus and content of the pronunciation exercises: Most of the activities drew learners' attention to individual sounds as 167 (63.4–64.6%) of them were labeled as segmental-oriented, while 90.5 + 5 (35–36.2%) activities could be used to train either individual sounds or prosody. Only one activity was labeled as being focused explicitly on prosody. This was the activity in the teacher's guide combining 'listen and repeat' with 'creative methods', in which students listen and sing by using different tones of voice. Although there was a section called "Intonation" in the oral exams,

these 'read aloud' activities were grouped under 'both' since it is likely that the teacher pays attention to sounds as well. The segmented-oriented exercises involved, for example, listening and repeating rhymes or minimal pairs, all ear training activities, the spelling and dictation activities, and the activity combining tactile reinforcement and reading aloud. The 'both' category, on the other hand, entailed, for instance, listening and repeating or reading aloud vocabulary lists, dialogues, or poems/songs that do not have rhyming words, and the broken telephone game.

While prosodic features were not explicitly introduced in the book, a great number of phonetic symbols were. They were all consonant sounds. All voiced stops were contrasted with their voiceless counterparts, and the /p/ and /b/ contrast was dealt with in two different chapters. The phoneme /ʃ/was contrasted with phonemes /s, z, and ʧ/. The last-mentioned phoneme was also contrasted with /dʒ/. The phoneme choices will be discussed in more detail in section 6.1.1.3.

To conclude, although a clear majority of the exercises in *GFIEB* are very traditional, the online materials provide teachers with more varying activities and methods. In addition, even though prosody was not treated explicitly in the exercises except for one activity, the teaching of it was encouraged, for example, via the "Intonation" section of the oral exams.

6.1.1.2 High five! 3

The number of pronunciation activities: The exercise book and the online materials contained altogether 1,474 exercises, of which 177.5 (12%) were pronunciation activities. Like *GFITB*, *HFTB* did not entail activities, either. Thus, the analysis will again focus on the exercise book and the online materials. *HFEB* had a total of 565 exercises, 75.5 (13.4%) of which were considered pronunciation-specific exercises. Thus, it had proportionally only slightly more pronunciation exercises than *GFIEB*. One activity (a game) in *HFEB* was considered only partly pronunciation-specific since it entailed reading aloud sentences based on the number shown by a die. The online materials had 909 activities, of which 102 (11.2%) were pronunciation exercises. The culture section was the only part of the online materials that did not entail a single pronunciation activity. However, the extra activities that were in the students' materials but not in those of the teacher's did not have pronunciation activities, either. Nonetheless, the possibility to record one's speech and then replay it was also offered in several exercises. However, this opportunity could not be counted as an activity since it was not required in order to complete the exercise. Thus, it is likely that students skip it.

The most common exercise types: The exercise types and their frequency are presented below (Table 7).

TABLE 7 Pronunciation exercise types and their frequency in *High Five! 3*

	PT	RA	L&R	R&V	R&I	ARA	S&D	ET	Games	MM	CT	TOTAL	PRON
HFEB	13	15.5	28	3	0	0	5	5	0.5	3	2.5	565	75.5 (13.4%)
Online materials													
Teacher's guide	0	14	30.5	1	0	0	1	0	0.5	3	1	292	51 (17.5%)
Attachments	0	8	0	0	0	1	4	1	0	0	0	272	14 (5.1%)
Exams	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	0	0	0	136	6 (4.4%)
Extras	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	190	31 (16.3 %)
Culture	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	0
TOTAL online	31	22	30.5	1	0	2	9	2	0.5	3	0	909	102 (11.2%)
TOTAL all	44	37.5	58.5	4	0	2	14	7	1	6	3.5	1,474	177.5 (12%)

PT= Phonetic training; RA= Read aloud; L&R= Listen and repeat, R&V= Rhyme and verse; R&I= Rules and instructions; ARA= Awareness-raising activities; S&D= Spelling and dictation; ET= Ear training; MM= Multisensory methods; CT= Creative techniques. NB! "Extras" include both teacher's and students' extra activities.

Like in *GFIEB*, 'listen and repeat' and 'read aloud' were again the most common exercise types in the exercise book. However, there was more variation in the exercise types. For instance, unlike in *GFIEB*, there were also exercises in which students had to fill in sentences based on what is heard (spelling and dictation), and some creative techniques were utilized as well. When the online materials are added to the equation, the three clearly most common exercise types were 'listen and repeat' (58.5), 'phonetic training' (44) and 'read aloud' (37.5). However, there was only one explicitly 'phonetic training' exercise in which students had to translate words from phonetic transcription to normal letters. The rest of the 'phonetic training' were "Hide and show" activities that were discussed in section 5.3.1.

The differences between the phonemes introduced were practiced, for example, by combining multisensory methods and creative methods. These five activities divided between multisensory and creative methods were given more specific instruction in the teacher's guide, and they consisted of several different elements. Students, led by the teacher, had to imagine different stories in which the different sounds occurred and act in them by repeating the two phonemes (drama/creative techniques)

and associate the sounds to different actions or elements (audial reinforcement). For instance, the phonemes /t/ and /d/ were embedded in a story in which learners have to imagine and act being asleep when woken up by a sound [t], which was in fact a wall clock making the sound *tic toc, tic toc*. The rest of the story involves, for example, two songs filled with each of the phonemes.

In addition, there were four more activities that were divided between two groups. Another exercise in *HFEB* was divided between 'read aloud' and 'multisensory methods' for the same reason as in *GFIEB*: it involved writing a word on a partner's back who then had to say it aloud. Furthermore, the teacher's guide had a broken telephone game (games + listen and repeat), and two activities in which vocabulary lists were read by whispering them (listen and repeat + creative technique).

Although there were neither explicit rules or instructions related to pronunciation nor awareness-raising activities per se, it does not mean that these would not have been provided outside the activities. Moreover, 'awareness-raising' was taken into account in the exam materials and in the attachments in the form of self-assessments.

The focus and content of the pronunciation exercises: Up to 142.5 (80.3%) of the pronunciation activities were focused explicitly on neither sounds nor prosody, while the rest 35 (19.7%) were segmental-oriented. In other words, there were no activities focusing on prosody. The segmental-oriented activities included, among others, all 'ear training' and 'spelling and dictation' exercises, the tasks combining multisensory and creative methods, the activity combining 'read aloud' and tactile reinforcement, and the lip-reading activities. The activities that could be used to teach both sounds and prosody included, for example, all the "Hide and show" activities, exercises involving reading out loud, the broken telephone game, and the self-assessments. All in all, HF3 introduced ten phonemes. They were /p/ and /b/, /k/ and /g/, /t/ and /d/, /s/ and /ʃ/, and /θ/ and /ð/.

To conclude, traditional exercise types were dominant in both the exercise book and the online materials, but more creative methods were also utilized. There were no activities focusing on prosody nor was it even mentioned, for example, in the teacher's guide or in the oral exams.

6.1.2   Intermediate-level textbooks

The two intermediate-level textbooks, *On the Go 1* and *Scene 1*, are most often used in the seventh class. The material included in the study consists of their textbooks, exercise books, and online materials. Besides the exercise books, both textbooks also entailed exercises. The online materials of *On the Go 1* included in the study consist of the teacher's guide, exam materials, and students' extra activities. In addition, the interactive digital book has a lot of extra activities behind the title "Go" that have also

been taken into account. *Scene 1* does not have an actual teacher's guide, but it does provide teachers with teaching tips and suggestions. The online materials studied includes these tips, extra activities in both the teacher's and students' materials, digital exams for both unit and oral exams, some handouts, and holiday quizzes in a section called "Holiday Package". The results regarding *On the Go 1* will be treated first, after which I will move on to *Scene 1*.

6.1.2.1 On the Go 1

The number of pronunciation activities: *On the go 1* provided altogether 98.5 pronunciation activities, which is 7.7% of the total amount of activities (1,277). Thus, it had a lot fewer pronunciation-specific activities than the beginner-level textbooks and their online materials. The textbook contained 60 activities, of which 22 (36.7%) were related to pronunciation, whereas 46.5 (10.1%) of the 459 activities in the exercise book were about pronunciation. Most of the activities were found in the sections devoted to pronunciation. These sections had 4-6 activities focusing on certain features, for example, intonation or voiceless plosives. These always had an instruction to watch a video that introduced the topic, after which the feature was practiced with 'listen and repeat' and 'read aloud' activities. The final activity was divided between 'read aloud' and 'awareness-raising' as students were asked to read aloud or record sentences to a partner who then gives feedback on their pronunciation. Finally, the online materials entailed 766 activities, of which 30 (3.9%) were about pronunciation. One of the self-assessment forms in the exercise book included several elements related to pronunciation and was thus counted as partly an awareness-raising activity.

The most common exercise types: The pronunciation exercise types and their frequency are shown in the table below (Table 8).

TABLE 8 Pronunciation exercise types and their frequency in *On the Go 1*

	PT	RA	L&R	R&V	R&I	ARA	S&D	ET	Games	MM	CT	TO-TAL	PRON
OTGTB	0	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	22 (36.7%)
OTGEB	4.5	16.5	8.5	0	2.5	3.5	5	5	0	1	0	451	46.5 (10.3%)
Online materials													
Teacher's material	6	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	314	11 (3.5%)
Exams	0	5	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	374	11 (2.9%)
SEA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	0

	PT	RA	L&R	R&V	R&I	ARA	S&D	ET	MM	CT	SEA		
"GO" activities	0.5	4.5	0	0	0	0	0	2.5	0	0.5	0	**48**	**8 (16.7%)**
TOTAL online	**6.5**	**11.5**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**9**	**2.5**	**0**	**0.5**	**0**	**766**	**30 (3.9%)**
TOTAL all	**11**	**38**	**20.5**	**0**	**2.5**	**3.5**	**14**	**7.5**	**0**	**1.5**	**0**	**1,277**	**98.5 (7.7%)**

PT= Phonetic training; RA= Read aloud; L&R= Listen and repeat, R&V= Rhyme and verse; R&I= Rules and instructions; ARA= Awareness-raising activities; S&D= Spelling and dictation; ET= Ear training; MM= Multisensory methods; CT= Creative techniques. SEA= Students' extra activities

As can be seen, 'read aloud' (38) dominated in the exercise books as well as in the online materials, and it is the most frequent type overall. It is followed by 'listen and repeat' (20.5), 'spelling and dictation' (14) and 'phonetic training' (11), while 'rhyme and verse', pronunciation games, or creative methods were not utilized at all.

Up to fifteen activities were divided between two groups. Six of these were the last activities of the pronunciation sections, in which students had to record themselves reading aloud sentences, after which their partner gives them feedback on their pronunciation (read aloud + awareness-raising). In addition, two of the videos in the same section introducing phonemes combined 'phonetic training' and 'multisensory methods' by presenting the sounds and bringing forth their differences compared to Finnish phonemes, mentioning common mistakes that Finnish students make with these sounds, and finally asking to study aspiration with a sheet of paper and the position of a tongue in *th*-sounds via mirror (visual reinforcement). A few more examples of these combined methods include asking students to listen to different phrases and pay attention to how /s/, /z/ and /ʃ/ are pronounced, after which they had to repeat the phrases (phonetic training + listen and repeat); providing rules for how the *-ed* ending can be said and then distinguishing between the sounds (rules + ear training), and saying aloud a word that was missing a part corresponding to one sound (e.g., __icken), and then checking it by showing the whole word (read aloud + phonetic training).

The focus and content of the pronunciation activities: Almost an equal number of the activities *On the Go 1* focused either on sounds or could be used to teach both sounds and prosody: 42 (42.6%) of the exercises were labeled as segment-oriented and 42.5 (43.1%) as 'both'. Thus, 14 activities were explicitly focused on prosody. Even though sounds still have a firmer status compared to prosody, suprasegmental features seem to gain more prominence in intermediate-level textbooks. The segmental-oriented activities involved, for instance, reading aloud sentences filled with minimal pairs, paying attention to what certain phonemes sound like and training their pronunciation with multisensory methods, dictation exercises, and spinning a wheel to

get words and phrases that trained certain phonemes and had to be said aloud. The activities in the 'both' category entailed, for example, listening and repeating words, and acting out conversations. Finally, the activities focusing on prosody involved, for instance, an ear training activity in which students had to place word stress correctly, reading aloud or listening and repeating words and sentences in which the focus was on intonation or word stress, asking questions with a falling and raising intonation, and deciding whether a question was amicable or not based on intonation. Finally, the topics treated in *OTG1* were voiceless plosives, dental fricatives, intonation in questions, the phonemes /s/, /z/ and /ʃ/, affricates, and word stress.

To conclude, *OTG1* has far fewer pronunciation activities compared to the beginner-level books. All the exercises in *OTGTB* were either 'read aloud' or 'listen and repeat' activities. In *OTGEB*, they were again the most common exercise types. Nonetheless, there was more variation, and there were, for instance, 'phonetic training', 'ear training' and 'awareness-raising' activities. The online materials had only five types of activities, of which 'read aloud' was again the most common, followed by 'spelling and dictation'. 'Rhyme and verse' activities, pronunciation games, or creative techniques were not found within the books or online materials. On the other hand, prosody appeared to have gained more coverage compared to the beginner-level books.

6.1.2.2   Scene 1

Number of pronunciation activities: *Scene 1* contained altogether 1,743 activities, of which 99 (5.7%) were related to pronunciation. Thus, it had almost the same number of pronunciation activities as *OTG1*. However, as Scene had more activities in total, the proportion of pronunciation activities was somewhat smaller. The textbook had 216 activities, of which only 15 (6.9%) focused on pronunciation. Of the 618 activities in the exercise book, 56 (9%) were related to pronunciation. In regard to the online materials, there were 909 exercises, of which only 28 (3%) treated pronunciation. The "Holiday Package" and the handouts did not contain pronunciation exercises at all.

The most common exercise types: The pronunciation exercise types and their frequencies are shown below (Table 9).

TABLE 9 Pronunciation exercise types and their frequency in *Scene 1*

	PT	RA	L&R	R&V	R&I	ARA	S&D	ET	Games	MM	CT	TO-TAL	PRON
STB	0	12	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	216	15 (6.9%)

SEB	6	16.5	10.5	0	1	1.5	9	10	0	0	1.5	618	56 (9.1%)
Online materials													
EMFTS	4	2.5	0	0	1.5	1	2	0	0	0.5	2.5	377	14 (3.7%)
HP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	0
Handouts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0
SEA	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	165	2 (1.2%)
Exams	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	320	6 (1.9%)
Oral ex-ams	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	6 (50%)
TOTAL online	4	8.5	0	0	1.5	3	8	0	0	0.5	2.5	909	28 (3.1%)
TOTAL all	10	37	11.5	0	2.5	4.5	19	10	0	0.5	4	1,743	99 (5.7%)

PT= Phonetic training; RA= Read aloud; L&R= Listen and repeat, R&V= Rhyme and verse; R&I= Rules and instructions; ARA= Awareness-raising activities; S&D= Spelling and dictation; ET= Ear training; MM= Multisensory methods; CT= Creative techniques. NB! EMFTS= Extra materials for the set, in the teacher's materials; HP= Holiday Package; SEA= Students' extra activities

The table shows that 'read aloud' dominated in both books and the online materials. While 'listen and repeat' and 'ear training' were the second most common categories in *SEB*, it was 'spelling and dictation' in the online materials. When the books and the online materials are combined, 'read aloud' (37) was by far the most common exercise type, followed by 'spelling and dictation' (19), 'listen and repeat' (11.5), 'phonetic training' (10) and 'ear training' (10). There were no 'rhyme and verse' activities or pronunciation games, and multisensory methods were almost completely lacking as well.

Twenty-three activities were divided between two groups. In *SEB*, these entailed, to mention a few, filling in sentences with minimal pairs based on what is heard on a tape (dictation + ear training); recording one's reading of a text and giving it to a classmate to receive feedback, and reading aloud sentences with one's own natural intonation and paying attention to how it sounds (read aloud + awareness-raising); and reading aloud sentences in the highest and lowest tone possible or by using different moods (read aloud + creative techniques). In "Extra materials for the set", six activities were divided between two groups. There were, for instance, two activities which involved reading aloud texts in character or in different speeds and moods according to instructions (read aloud + creative technique); one activity in which students were told how to use intonation in debates and practiced it with exaggeration (rules + creative technique); and reading aloud a text and changing intonation based on the movements of a peer's arms (read aloud + multisensory methods).

The focus and content of the pronunciation activities: Most of the activities in *Scene 1* were segmental-oriented (46, 46.5%), while 37 (37%) did not have a clear focus, and 16 (16%) were considered prosody-oriented. This supports the idea discussed when treating *OTG1* that although sounds still have more prominence, intermediate-level books seem to give more space to explicit prosody teaching as well. The activities focusing on individual sounds entailed, for example, spelling and dictation exercises, activities in which students must listen and repeat minimal pairs or read aloud dialogues with plenty of them, exercises concerning the pronunciation of the past tense endings, while the category 'both' included activities involving, for example, reading aloud words based on their phonetic transcriptions, reading aloud and recording a text and then receiving feedback on it, and self-assessments. Finally, some examples of the prosody-focused exercises are listening and repeating or reading aloud questions and paying attention to intonation in them, reading aloud sentences in different moods, choosing the correct mood based on what is heard, listening discriminations regarding word stress, reading Finnish words with exaggerated intonation, and reading aloud texts in character or in different speeds and moods according to instructions. Finally, the elements explicitly treated were the contrasts between sibilant sounds (except for /z/) and /v/ and /b/, affricates, voiced and voiceless plosives, the pronunciation of past tense verb ending *-ed*, word stress, and intonation in different types of questions, moods, and emotions.

To conclude, especially 'read aloud' activities dominated in *Scene 1*, while neither rhymes and verses nor games were utilized, and multisensory methods were almost completely lacking as well. However, *Scene 1* seems to continue the trend detected in *On the Go 1* relating to the increase of activities focusing on prosody as students get older.

6.1.3 Advanced-level textbooks

The advanced-level textbooks, *On Track 1&2* and *Insights 1&2,* all have only one book, containing both the texts and the exercises. The online materials of *OT1&2* included in the study consist of their teacher's guides, some extra activities in both the teacher's and students' materials, and unit and oral exams. In addition, *OT1* had extra activities for pronunciation training. *Insights 1&2* have "For the teacher" sections, unit exams, and extra activities in the teacher's materials. The online materials of the same series will be treated together. The *On Track* books will be discussed first, after which I will move on to the *Insights* series.

6.1.3.1 On Track 1 & 2

Number of pronunciation activities: Both books and their online materials contained altogether 1,083 activities, of which 60 (5.5%) focused on pronunciation. Thus, they have so far provided the smallest number of pronunciation activities. Of the 255 activities in the textbook of *OT1*, 29 (11.4%) were about pronunciation, while 10 (4.2%) of the 236 activities in *OT2* treated pronunciation. Finally, there were 592 activities in the online materials, and 21 (3.5%) of them focused on pronunciation. Neither the extra activities in the teacher's materials nor the exam exercises included pronunciation activities.

The most common exercise types: The pronunciation exercise types and their frequencies are presented below (Table 10).

TABLE 10 Pronunciation exercise types and their frequency in *On Track 1 & 2*

	PT	RA	L&R	R&V	R&I	ARA	S&D	ET	Games	MM	CT	TO-TAL	PRON
OT1	0.5	10	5	0	0	1	2	8.5	0	2	0	**255**	**29 (11.4%)**
OT2	0	4.5	2	0	0	0	2	1.5	0	0	0	**236**	**10 (4.2%)**
Online materials													
Teacher's guides	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**33**	**2 (6.1%)**
TEA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**105**	**0**
SEA	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	0	0	0	**249**	**12 (4.8%)**
Exams	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**198**	**0**
EAFP (OT1)	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	**7**	**7 (100%)**
TOTAL online	**2**	**4**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7**	**7**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**592**	**21 (3.5%)**
TOTAL all	**2.5**	**18.5**	**8**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**11**	**17**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**1,083**	**60 (5.5%)**

PT= Phonetic training; RA= Read aloud; L&R= Listen and repeat, R&V= Rhyme and verse; R&I= Rules and instructions; ARA= Awareness-raising activities; S&D= Spelling and dictation; ET= Ear training; MM= Multisensory methods; CT= Creative techniques. TEA=Teacher's extra activities, SEA= Student's extra activities, EAFP= Extra activities for pronunciation

The table shows that in the books, 'read aloud' was the most common exercise type, whereas in the online materials 'spelling and dictation' and 'ear training' dominated. When the books and online materials are combined, the three clearly most

frequently encountered exercise types were 'read aloud' (18.5), 'ear training' (17), and 'dictation and spelling' (11). However, there were no 'rhyme and verse' activities, rules or instructions within the exercises, pronunciation games, or creative activities.

One activity was hard to categorize: It asked students to try reading aloud a dialogue written in abbreviations (e.g., "Ru free 2nite?" *OT1*, p. 104). Finally, this was labeled as being partly a 'read aloud' and partly 'phonetic training' activity as it involved creating links between elements that are pronounced the same or similarly despite their different orthographies (e.g., R instead of 'are' or l8r in place of 'later'). In addition, one activity combined reading aloud with ear training. It involved a list of minimal pairs from which one of the pair chooses one and forms a sentence using that word (read aloud), after which the partner says a sentence containing the word that his/her partner did not use (ear training). Although this involves generating sentences and thus requires other skills besides pronunciation, it was considered a pronunciation-specific activity because it was included in one of the pronunciation chapters and involved minimal pairs. Furthermore, forming sentences should not be too demanding at this level so that it would become the main learning objective of the activity.

The content and focus of the pronunciation exercises: There were no exercises focusing explicitly on prosody, and only four activities in total were considered suitable for teaching both sounds and prosody. These involved, for example, reading aloud sentences and paying attention to the use of articles, and an activity involving imitating speech in a video. Thus, segmental features obviously dominated in *On Track 1* and *2*. The sounds dealt with in the books were the contrasts between /p/ and /b/, /v/ and /w/, /t/ and /d/, the two affricatives, long and short vowels, and /f/ and /v/.

To conclude, *On Track 1* provided clearly more pronunciation activities compared to *On Track 2*, both in the book and online. There was also more variation in the types of exercises. However, the total number of pronunciation exercises in both books and their online materials was only 60, which is the smallest among the books analyzed so far. When all material is combined, the dominant exercise groups were 'read aloud' and 'ear training', while 'spelling and dictation' and 'listen and repeat' were also encountered several times. However, there were no 'rhyme and verse' exercises, activities utilizing creative techniques, pronunciation games, or rules or instructions within the exercises. Regarding the focus of the activities, there were no exercises dealing explicitly with prosody, and only four activities were considered suitable for teaching both sounds and prosody.

6.1.3.2 Insights 1 & 2

The number of pronunciation activities: The books and the online materials offered altogether 1,051 activities, of which 53.5 (5%) focused on pronunciation. This is the smallest number in all the books studied. *IC1* had 245 activities in total, of which 15 (6.1%) were about pronunciation, while *IC2* also contained 15 (6.3%) pronunciation exercises among the total number of 237 activities. One activity in the online materials was considered only partly a pronunciation exercise (read aloud): it involved writing past tenses for regular verbs and then reading them aloud.

The most common exercise types: The pronunciation exercise types and their frequencies are presented below (Table 11).

TABLE 11 Pronunciation exercise types and their frequency in *Insights 1 & 2*

	PT	RA	L&R	R&V	R&I	ARA	S&D	ET	Games	MM	CT	TO-TAL	PRON
IC1	1	2.5	0	0	0	1	7.5	1	0	2	0	**245**	**15 (6.1%)**
IC2	0.5	3	1.5	0	0	4.5	3.5	1.5	0	0	0.5	**237**	**15 (6.3%)**
Online materials													
Extras	15	0.5	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	0	**205**	**16.5 (8%)**
Exams	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**364**	**7 (1.9%)**
TOTAL online	**15**	**7.5**	**0.5**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0.5**	**0**	**0**	**569**	**23.5 (4.1%)**
TOTAL all	**16.5**	**13**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**5.5**	**11**	**2.5**	**0.5**	**2**	**0.5**	**1,051**	**53.5 (5.1%)**

PT= Phonetic training; RA= Read aloud; L&R= Listen and repeat, R&V= Rhyme and verse; R&I= Rules and instructions; ARA= Awareness-raising activities; S&D= Spelling and dictation; ET= Ear training; MM= Multisensory methods; CT= Creative techniques.

The three most prominent exercise types were 'phonetic training' (16.5), 'read aloud' (13), and 'spelling and dictation' (11), while 'rhyme and verse' and 'rules and instructions' were not used in the activities, and pronunciation games and creative methods were also almost non-existent. In the *IC1* book, the most common group was 'spelling and dictation', whereas in *IC2* it was quite surprisingly 'awareness-raising'. However, the dominance of 'phonetic training' in the online materials led to it being the most common type when all materials are combined. Most of these activities involved vocabulary lists that had the words in English, Finnish and in phonetic symbols so that learners could hide one or two columns and practice the words. Thus, these were similar to the "Hide and show" activities in *High Five! 3*.

The awareness-raising activity in *IC1* consists, in fact, of two quizzes that had some elements concerning pronunciation and were thus regarded as partly pronunciation activities. The first one involved distinguishing between different accents and placing them correctly on a map, while the second one asked students what accent they consider the most beautiful and why. The awareness-raising activities in *IC2* treated the differences between British, American, and Australian English.

There were 11 activities that were divided between two groups. Examples of these include reading aloud words with difficult orthography, then closing the books and trying to write down correctly as many of the words as possible (read aloud + spelling and dictation), reading aloud a sentence first without aspiration and then with aspiration (read aloud + phonetic training), listening to tag questions and marking whether there is a rising or falling intonation and then reading the questions with a partner (ear training + read aloud), listening and repeating words and then placing stress or the schwa sound correctly (listen and repeat + ear training), reading aloud sentences in different speech and moods (read aloud + creative technique), and a broken telephone game (listen and repeat + games).

The focus and content of the pronunciation exercises: In total, most of the activities (27, 50.5%) did not either have a clear focus or could be used for practicing both sounds and prosody, while 21.5 (40.2%) exercises focused more on segmental features. Thus, only five activities treated prosody explicitly. The 'both' category involved, for example, discussing the different accents and finding samples of them, filling in a conversation according to what is heard and then reading aloud the dialogue, the "Hide and show" type of activities, and the broken telephone game. The activities focused on sounds entailed, for instance, listening to audios of British and American English and finding differences (the differences are usually found in the way certain sounds are pronounced), and reading aloud past tenses of verbs. Finally, the exercises that concentrated on prosodic features involved, for instance, listening to tag questions and marking whether there is a rising or falling intonation and then reading the questions with a partner, listening to and repeating words and then placing stress correctly, and consulting a dictionary for the correct placement of word stress. In addition, the instructions for independent completion for *IC2* had 5 pronunciation activities, all of which included reading aloud and recording. Four of them could be used to evaluate both sounds and prosodic features, while one focused on word stress. Finally, the topics explicitly treated in activities were the differences between some English varieties, word stress and the schwa sound as well as the contrasts between voiceless and voiced plosives, /t/ and dental fricatives, affricatives, /s/ and /ʃ/, and the phonemes /f/, /v/, and /w/.

To conclude, *Insights 1* and *2* provided the smallest number of pronunciation activities. 'Phonetic training', 'read aloud' and 'spelling and dictation' dominated, while 'rhyme and verse' or 'rules and instructions' were not utilized in the activities. Most of the activities could be used to train either sounds or prosodic features, while there were only four activities focusing explicitly on suprasegmental features.

6.1.4 Summary

After having presented the findings in a detailed manner, it is now time to summarize the results in order to answer the research questions more concisely. I will first discuss the number of pronunciation exercises, after which the frequency of different exercise types will be dealt with. Finally, the focus and content of pronunciation activities in the books will be addressed.

Firstly, the eight books (involving also possible exercise books) and their online materials entailed 747 (+5) pronunciation exercises in total, which is 9.3% of the total number of activities (8,032). The results are summarized below (Table 12).

TABLE 12 The number of pronunciation activities in the books

Beginner / Elementary school	Go for it! 3	258.5 (+5*) (18.4–18.8%)
	High Five! 3	177.5 (12%)
Intermediate / Secondary school	On the Go 1	98.5 (7.7%)
	Scene 1	99 (5.7%)
Advanced / upper secondary school	On Track 1 & 2	60 (5.5%)
	Insights 1 & 2	53.5 (5.1%)

* The five activities in oral exams that could be conducted with or without translation

As can be seen, there is a decreasing trend between the different levels. In fact, the differences between the levels are quite drastic, which indicates that the number of pronunciation activities decreases significantly when learners get older. This, of course, can have an impact on how much pronunciation is taught since textbooks guide teaching to a great extent (e.g., Tergujeff, 2013: 38; Luukka et al., 2008: 97). However, as the total number of activities also decreases level by level, the differences as to the percentages are not as radical. In addition, there were no big differences between the series of the same level besides the beginner-level textbooks. In fact, *High Five! 3* had more pronunciation activities in the exercise book compared to *Go for it! 3*. Nonetheless, *GFI* had more online materials and more pronunciation activities among them, which resulted in the numbers seen above.

In regard to the exercise types, the results from the books and their online materials are summarized below (Table 13).

TABLE 13 Pronunciation exercise types in the books

Book	PT	RA	L&R	R&V	R&I	ARA	S&D	ET	Games	MM	CT
GFI3	9	71.5(+5)	48.5	16.5	1	0	82	16.5	1.5	9.5	2.5
HF3	44	37.5	58.5	4	0	2	14	7	1	6	3.5
ELE tot	**53**	**109 (+5)**	**107**	**20.5**	**1**	**2**	**96**	**23.5**	**2.5**	**15.5**	**6**
OTG	11	38	20.5	0	2.5	3.5	14	7.5	0	1.5	0
Scene	10	37	11.5	0	2.5	4.5	19	10	0	0.5	4
SEC tot	**21**	**75**	**32**	**0**	**5**	**8**	**33**	**17.5**	**0**	**2**	**4**
OT 1&2	2.5	18.5	8	0	0	1	11	17	0	2	0
IC 1&2	16.5	13	2	0	0	5.5	11	2.5	0.5	2	0.5
US tot	**19**	**31.5**	**10**	**0**	**0**	**6.5**	**22**	**19.5**	**0.5**	**4**	**0.5**
ALL tot	**93**	**215.5 (+5)**	**149**	**20.5**	**6**	**16.5**	**151**	**60.5**	**3**	**21.5**	**10.5**

The table shows that the three by far most frequent pronunciation exercise types were 'read aloud', 'spelling and dictation', and 'listen and repeat', while especially pronunciation games and rules or instructions embedded in activities were scarce. Although 'read aloud' was the most common type at each school level, there was slightly more variation as to the second and third most common types. At the elementary level, 'listen and repeat' was more common than 'spelling and dictation', while at the secondary level, 'spelling and dictation' activities were slightly more numerous than 'listen and repeat' exercises, and in the advanced books, 'listen and repeat' was not even among the three most frequent types. Instead, 'read aloud' was followed by 'spelling and dictation' and 'ear training'. Nonetheless, it is worth mentioning that the *Insights* books often combined 'listen and repeat' with, for example, 'ear training', for which the activity was divided between these methods. This, of course, reduces the number of 'listen and repeat' activities although it would have been embedded in some more activities along with other exercise types.

While in the elementary-level books all exercise types were encountered at least once, the intermediate-level books lacked 'rhyme and verse' activities and pronunciation-related games. The advanced-level textbooks, on the other hand, did not contain 'rhyme and verse' activities or 'rules and instructions', and there was only one activity that was considered partly a pronunciation game. The lack of rules might be surprising considering the age of the learners. However, it must be remembered that the study focuses on activities, and some books do not embed rules into the activities or their instructions. Thus, this result does not indicate that these books would not entail explicit rules – they simply just are not included in the activities themselves.

Nonetheless, these results suggest that the use of rhymes, poems, and songs as well as pronunciation games and plays decreases when students get older. Even though these types of games were not numerous at the elementary level either, rhymes and verses were quite heavily utilized.

There were no radical differences between the books of the same level. In fact, at each level, two of the three most common exercise types were the same, while one was different. In *GFI*, they were 'read aloud', 'spelling and dictation', and 'listen and repeat', while in *HF* the most common exercise types entailed 'listen and repeat', 'phonetic training', and 'read aloud'. 'Read aloud', 'listen and repeat', and 'ear training' dominated in *OTG*, while in *Scene*, the most frequently encountered exercises were categorized as 'read aloud', 'spelling and dictation', and 'listen and repeat'. Finally, the most common exercise types in *OT* were 'read aloud', 'ear training', and 'spelling and dictation', whereas in *IC* they were 'phonetic training', 'read aloud', and 'spelling and dictation'.

Finally, the content and focus of the activities will be discussed. We will first look at the distribution of exercises as to the division between segmental-, suprasegmental- and both/neither-oriented activities (Table 14).

TABLE 14 The focus of pronunciation activities in the books

Level	Book	Focus		
		Sounds	**Prosody**	**Both/neither**
Beginner / Elementary school	Go for it! 3	167	1	90.5 (+5)
	High Five! 3	35	0	142.5
Intermediate / Secondary school	On the Go 1	42	14	42.5
	Scene 1	46	16	37
Advanced / upper secondary school	On Track 1 & 2	56	0	4
	Insights 1 & 2	21.5	5	27
TOTAL		**367.5 (49%)**	**36 (5%)**	**343.5 (46%) (+5)**

The results show that almost half of the exercises focused on individual sounds, followed quite closely by those activities that can be suitable for teaching both aspects or not having a clear focus. Only 5% of the pronunciation exercises focused explicitly on prosody, and *High Five! 3* and the *On Track* books had no activities concerning prosody at all. There was a quite significant rise in the number of prosody-related exercises between the beginner- and intermediate-level books, but this trend did not continue in the advanced-level books. Thus, it seems that secondary school EFL textbooks and their online materials have more exercises focusing on prosody compared to the books used at the elementary and upper secondary levels. There were no drastic

differences between the books of the same level although *Insights 1 & 2* had some activities focusing on prosody, while *On Track 1 & 2* had none. In addition, *GFI* had more activities focusing on sounds, while most of the exercises in *HF* could be used to train both sounds and prosody. This was also the case between *OT* and *Insights*: in *OT*, a clear majority of the activities focused on sounds, while in *Insights*, the 'sounds' and 'both' categories were more balanced.

With respect to the topics treated in pronunciation activities, table 15 summarizes the main pronunciation-related content of each book.

TABLE 15 The pronunciation topics treated in the books

Level	Book	Topics
Beginner / Elementary school	Go for it! 3	- /p, b, k, g, t, d, ʃ, s, z, tʃ, dʒ, v, w, f, θ/ - / ð/ in the teacher's guide
	High Five! 3	- /p, b, k, g, t, d, s, ʃ, θ, ð/
Intermediate / Secondary school	On the Go 1	- the pronunciation of -ed endings - sibilants (except for /ʒ/) - affricates - voiceless plosives - both dental fricatives - word stress - intonation in different types of questions and moods
	Scene 1	- the pronunciation of -ed endings - sibilants (except for /z/) - affricates - voiced and voiceless plosives - /v/ and /b/ contrast - word stress - intonation in different types of questions and moods
Advanced / upper secondary school	On Track 1 & 2	- voiced and voiceless plosives (except for /k/ and /g/) - affricates - /f/ and /v/ + /w/ and /v/contrast - long and short vowels
	Insights 1 & 2	- voiced and voiceless plosives - affricates - /f/, /v/ and /w/ contrast - dental fricatives - /s/ and /ʃ/ - word stress

The table reveals that affricates were treated in all the other books except for *High Five! 3*. Other common topics seem to be sibilants, plosives and the contrast between voiced and voiceless stops, the contrast between the sounds /v/, /w/, and /f/, and

80

dental fricatives. However, none of the books treated all the sibilants. While activities concerning intonation could be found only in the intermediate-level textbooks, word stress was dealt with also in *Insights 2*. Quite surprisingly, vowels were treated in only one of the books, *On Track 2*, but vowel quality was not discussed at all.

There were also some differences between the books of the same level. Firstly, there was variance as to the introduction of sibilants at all the levels. Secondly, *GFI* treated more phonemes than *HF*, and affricates were lacking in the latter book. Thirdly, even though the content of the intermediate-level books was relatively similar, dental fricatives were introduced in *OTG* but not in *Scene*, while the contrast between the sounds /v/ and /b/ was dealt with in *Scene* but lacked in *OTG*. Finally, *Insights* treated dental fricatives, a few sibilants, and word stress, which were not dealt with in *OT*. On the other hand, *OT* discussed long and short vowels that lack in *Insights*. The topics will be treated in more detail when discussing the results in light of the recommendations given by the CEFR, the NCCs, and a few other sources.

6.2   Pronunciation in teaching

In this part, the second research question will be answered based on the responses to the teacher questionnaire. In other words, this section deals with the amount of time spent on pronunciation in EFL classrooms, the content and focus of pronunciation teaching, and the methods and tools used in its teaching. The results will be compared between the different school levels.

6.2.1   Amount of time spent on pronunciation teaching

The teachers were asked to estimate how often they teach pronunciation per one class or group. There were seven options: 1= every lesson, 2= approximately every second lesson, 3= approximately every third lesson, 4= approximately every fourth lesson, 5= approximately every fifth lesson, 6= less than every fifth lesson, and 7= never. The answers are summarized below (Table 16).

TABLE 16 The amount of time spent on pronunciation teaching

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
n (97)	32	23	18	7	4	13	0
%	33	23.7	18.6	7.2	4.1	13.4	0

The results indicate that most of the teachers teach pronunciation regularly, and in fact "every lesson" was the most common answer (mode: 1, median: 2). Although

no one reported never teaching pronunciation, 13 people admitted teaching it less than every fifth lesson. Thus, it seems that although pronunciation is frequently taught by a majority of the teachers, there are also teachers who teach it rather rarely. However, it should be noted that people may have quite subjective views on what teaching pronunciation means in practice, which can of course affect the results.

For the comparison of the school levels, the data had to be limited to those teachers who had responded teaching only at one level to avoid overlapping data, leaving 78 respondents. Table 17 shows the distribution of responses between the teachers of different levels. It reveals that elementary school teachers seem to teach pronunciation more often, as up to 61% of the respondents reported teaching it in every lesson, while none of them reported teaching it every fifth lesson or less frequently. The responses of teachers at the two other levels were more scattered, and as can be seen, 'approximately every fifth lesson' or 'less than every fifth lesson' were responded by around every third of the respondents in both groups, and 'less than every fifth lesson' was the most common answer among the upper secondary school teachers.

TABLE 17 The amount of time spent on pronunciation at different school levels

Answer option	Elementary (n=31)	Secondary (n=17)	Upper secondary (n=30)	The Kruskal-Wallis test
1	19 (61%)	2 (11.8%)	4 (13%)	H= 20.437
2	5 (16%)	5 (29.4%)	7 (24%)	df = 2
3	4 (13%)	4 (23.5%)	6 (20%)	p= .000
4	3 (10%)	1 (5.9%)	3 (10%)	
5	0 (0%)	2 (11.8%)	1 (3%)	
6	0 (0%)	3 (17.6%)	9 (30%)	

The Kruskal-Wallis test was conducted to see whether there were significant relations between the variables. The test revealed that there is, in fact, a significant difference between the groups (p= .000). More specifically, there were remarkable differences between the answers between the elementary school teachers and the other teachers. Thus, it can be concluded that English teachers at the elementary level teach pronunciation significantly more often than secondary and upper secondary school teachers.

The teachers were also asked whether they think they teach enough pronunciation. Forty-one respondents (42%) thought that they teach enough pronunciation, while 33 (34%) responded "no" and 23 (24%) "I don't know". Thus, although "yes" was the most common answer, over half of the respondents either thought that they do not teach enough pronunciation or were unsure about its sufficiency. When the different school levels were compared (n=78), some interesting differences could be seen (Table 18). Firstly, most of the elementary school teachers were sure that they

teach enough pronunciation, while the percentage at the secondary level and especially at the upper secondary level was significantly smaller. In addition, the teachers teaching in elementary schools also had by far the smallest proportion of 'no' answers. Table 18 also reveals that the upper secondary school teachers were the most uncertain group as to the sufficiency of their pronunciation teaching.

TABLE 18 The sufficiency of pronunciation teaching between the school levels

Answer option	Elementary (n=31)	Secondary (n=17)	Upper secondary (n=30)
Yes	19 (61.3%)	7 (41%)	6 (20%)
No	6 (19.35%)	8 (47%)	13 (43%)
I do not know	6 (19.35%)	2 (12%)	11 (37%)

The Chi square test was conducted, and it revealed that these differences were, in fact, statistically significant (value= 13.132, df= 4, Exact Sig. 2-sided p=.010).

Those who answered 'no' were asked to elaborate on the reasons. There was a checklist, and the respondents also had a possibility to bring forth other reasons. Table 19 shows the different reasons and the number of answers.

TABLE 19 Teachers' reasons for not teaching enough pronunciation

Reason	Respondents n= 33 Answers n= 62
Lack of time	27
Lack of suitable teaching materials	16
Uncertainty of one's ability to teach pronunciation	5
Lack of testing in exams and the Matriculation Examination	5
Students learn pronunciation in their free time	5
Shortages in teacher education	4
Not considering pronunciation very important	0
Uncertainty of one's own pronunciation	0

Lack of time was clearly the most common reason for not teaching enough pronunciation. On the other hand, there also seems to be a need for more pronunciation teaching material. None of the respondents considered pronunciation unimportant or were uncertain about their own pronunciation skills. However, five reported being uncertain about their skills to teach pronunciation. Five teachers responded having other reasons as well. All of them mentioned slightly different things. However, reasons related to students themselves were mentioned several times: One claimed that some students are very shy and unconfident and might get offended, while another respondent stated that it is students' responsibility to train pronunciation in their free

time. Students' lack of interest was mentioned as well. Furthermore, one respondent argued that pronunciation can be learned through speaking and reading aloud although more attention should be paid to it. In addition, one upper secondary school teacher regarded the oral course sufficient as to pronunciation. Thus, the reasons seem to vary from students' personality traits and responsibilities to lack of time and materials as well as perceptions of how pronunciation is learned.

In regard to the differences between the school levels, there were 27 respondents teaching only at one school level and regarding their pronunciation teaching insufficient. The groups were tested with the Fisher's exact test to detect statistically significant differences. They were found in one of the reasons: "Lack of testing in exams and the Matriculation Examination". The crosstabulation is shown below (Table 20). The zero represents those who did not mark this option, while "1" refers to those who chose this as one of the reasons.

TABLE 20 "Lack of testing…" at the different school levels

Lack of testing in exams and …		Elementary	Secondary	Upper secondary	Total	Fisher's Exact test
	0	5	8	5	18	Exact Sig. (2-sided) p= .006
	1	1	0	8	9	
	Total	6	8	13	27	

This reason was closely linked to upper secondary school teachers, while none of the teachers in secondary school and only one teacher at the elementary level chose it. Thus, it seems that the lack of pronunciation testing affects teachers more in upper secondary school. This is not surprising since the content of the Matriculation Examination is likely to guide teaching to a great extent in upper secondary schools. However, it should be noted that the groups are very small, and thus no definite conclusions can be drawn.

As mentioned above, none of the teachers who reported their pronunciation teaching to be insufficient considered pronunciation unimportant. The importance of pronunciation teaching was manifested in another question as well. The teachers were asked to rate the importance of pronunciation teaching on a scale including options 1. "Not important at all", 2. "Not very important", 3. "Quite important", and 4. "Very important". The results are presented below (Table 21).

TABLE 21 The importance of pronunciation teaching

Option	n=97 (%)	Mean	SEM	SD	Median
1	0 (0%)	3.6186	.05373	0.52922	4
2	2 (2%)				

84

3	33 (34%)				
4	62 (64%)				

SEM= Standard error of mean, SD= Standard deviation

The results show that a clear majority of the respondents considered pronunciation teaching very important, while none of them reported thinking that it is not important at all. The mean was 3.6186, and the standard deviation was 0.5292, indicating that there was not a lot of variance in the answers. The Kruskal-Wallis test revealed that there were no significant differences between the school levels as to this question (H= 2.765, df= 2, Exact Sig. *p*= .247).

The respondents also had a chance to elaborate on their answer about the importance of pronunciation teaching, and 43 teachers did this. There were a few very often reoccurring themes, of which the link between good pronunciation and intelligibility was the most common. Good enough pronunciation was seen crucial in conveying a message successfully but also in understanding the speech of others. However, it was mentioned several times that aiming for a native-like pronunciation is unnecessary. The teaching of pronunciation was seen as important also due to the seemingly unsystematic orthography of English. On the other hand, some respondents emphasized the importance of input outside the school context and students' own responsibility to learn pronunciation. In addition, some upper secondary school teachers admitted that they do not really have time to teach pronunciation, and that students should already be able to pronounce well when starting upper secondary school.

To conclude this section focusing on the amount of time spent on pronunciation teaching and the reasons, it can be stated that most of the teachers reported teaching pronunciation very regularly. However, pronunciation was taught more at the elementary level compared to the two other levels. Although 42% of the respondents thought they teach enough pronunciation, still over half of the teachers either could not estimate this or considered the time they spent on pronunciation insufficient. The differences between the school levels were found to be statistically significant, indicating that elementary-level teachers evaluate the sufficiency of their pronunciation teaching more positively. Those who reported not teaching enough pronunciation were asked for reasons, and lack of time and suitable teaching materials were by far the most common answers. Lack of testing in exams and the Matriculation Examination was a significantly more common reason among the upper secondary school teachers. Finally, a clear majority of the teachers considered the teaching of pronunciation very important, and there were no significant differences between the school levels as to this question.

6.2.2 The content of pronunciation teaching

This section deals with the content of pronunciation teaching. In the questionnaire, the teachers were asked whether they teach their students to recognize or write phonetic symbols and to estimate how often they teach certain sound groups and prosodic features, after which they had to choose from a checklist those factors that guide or influence the content of their pronunciation teaching. The respondents also had a chance to bring forth reasons outside the ready-made list. Finally, they had to answer some statements regarding the sufficiency of their teaching as to segmental and suprasegmental features, their importance, and possible difficulty of teaching.

However, it is relevant to start by looking at what the teachers considered to be the goals of pronunciation teaching. The questionnaire had a short checklist consisting of four items from which the teachers had to check those elements that they regard as the goals of pronunciation teaching. The results are shown below (Table 22).

TABLE 22 Goals of pronunciation teaching

Goal	Respondents n=97 Answers n=185
Intelligibility	85
Smooth communication	85
As native-like pronunciation as possible	8
Getting rid of (Finnish) accent	7

The table demonstrates that intelligibility and smooth communication are particularly valued as the goals of pronunciation teaching, while aiming for native-like pronunciation or getting rid of an accent were checked by only a few respondents. This clearly reflects the idea of CLT, in which communication and intelligibility are in the center rather than errorless speech, as was discussed in section 2.5.

When the different school levels were compared (n=78), the Fisher's exact test found one statistically significant difference (Exact Sig [2-sided] *p*= .033). This was related to the goal of getting rid of (Finnish) accent. It was more favored among the upper secondary school teachers as five of them (17%) chose this option, while none of the elementary-level teachers and only one secondary-level teacher chose it.

Concerning the explicit teaching of pronunciation, the teachers were asked whether they teach their students to recognize or write phonetic symbols. There were three answer options: "yes", "some of them", and "no". The results are presented below (Table 23).

TABLE 23 The teaching of phonetic symbols

Do you teach your students to…	Yes	Some of them	No

…recognize phonetic symbols?	60 (62%)	31 (32%)	6 (6%)
…write phonetic symbols?	2 (2%)	10 (20%)	85 (88%)

The results indicate that while teaching students to recognize at least some of the phonetic symbols seems to be a norm, teaching them to write the symbols is quite rare. There were no significant differences between the school levels according to the Fisher's Exact test (recognizing: Exact Sig. 2-sided p= .142, writing: Exact Sig. 2-sided p= .402).

Next, the frequency of teaching different sound groups and prosodic elements will be discussed. The teachers estimated how often they teach each of the items on a scale from 1 to 4 (1=never, 2=rarely, 3=sometimes, and 4=often). They also had a chance to respond "I do not know" if they could not estimate the frequency, but this response option is omitted from the mean and the test. The table presenting the results is provided in the appendices (Appendix 3). It shows the results from the most frequently taught topics to the least taught ones. This ranking is based on the means. The most frequently taught topics were word stress (mean: 3.47), sibilants (mean: 3.46), dental fricatives (mean: 3.35), affricates (mean: 3.32), plosives (mean: 3.28), and intonation (mean: 3.24), while the lateral (mean: 2), nasals (mean: 2.13), and diphthongs (mean: 2.37) were the least taught ones. The inclusion of word stress and intonation among the most taught topics indicates that the teaching of prosody is not neglected. These choices will be discussed in more detail when discussing the results in the next chapter.

In regard to the differences between the three school levels (n=78), it is worth mentioning that the elementary level had the highest mean in all items except for word stress. In word stress, both elementary and secondary level had a mean of 3.35, and the upper secondary level had a mean of 3.50. Thus, it could be inferred that the rest of the topics are more taught at the elementary level. However, the trend was not decreasing from level to level as in many items there seemed to be a drop at the secondary level, after which the mean rose at the upper secondary level. The teaching of intonation, however, decreased level by level. The most often and least often taught topics of each level are shown below (Table 24).

TABLE 24 The most often and least often taught topics per school level

The most often taught topics (mean)		
Elementary	Secondary	Upper secondary
Sibilants (3.61)	Word stress (3.35)	Word stress (3.5)
Dental fricatives + plosives (3.45)	Dental fricatives + plosives (3.24)	Sibilants (3.34)
Affricates + word stress (3.35)	Sibilants (3.18)	Affricates (3.27)
The least often taught topics (mean)		

Elementary	Secondary	Upper secondary
Lateral (2.10)	Nasals (1.82)	Lateral (1.96)
Nasals (2.45)	Lateral (2)	Nasals (2.03)
Diphthongs (2.61)	Vowel quality + approximants (2.29)	Diphthongs (2.25)

As can be seen, word stress and sibilants are among the most taught topics at each level, and the lateral and nasals are the two least taught sound groups at all the levels. However, dental fricatives did not make it to the top three in the upper secondary level, while affricates were less taught among the secondary-level teachers. In addition, while diphthongs were the third least used method at the elementary and upper secondary levels, vowel quality and approximants were taught less at the secondary level. Finally, the Kruskal-Wallis test revealed that there were significant differences concerning two content areas: other fricatives (/f, v, h/) and nasals. The results are shown below (Table 25). Those who responded "I do not know" were omitted from the calculations.

TABLE 25 Topics – differences between the three levels

Topic	Level	Mode	Median	Mean	SEM	SD	Kruskal-Wallis test
Other fricatives (/f, v, h/)	E (n=31)	3	3	3.16	.132	.735	
	S (n=17)	2&3	3	2.59	.193	.795	H value= 6.159
	US (n= 27)	3	3	2.89	.134	.698	df= 2 Exact Sig. p= .044
Nasals	E (n= 29)	3	3	2.45	.137	.736	H value= 7.244
	S (n= 17)	2	2	1.82	.176	.728	df= 2
	US (n= 29)	2&3	2	2.03	.153	.823	Exact Sig. p= .025

SEM= Standard error of mean, SD= Standard deviation

As can be seen, these elements are taught more at the elementary level, after which the mean drops in secondary school and rises again at the upper secondary level. The test showed that the significant difference is only between the elementary and secondary levels. Thus, it can be inferred that these two sound groups are taught more among the elementary school EFL teachers than the secondary school teachers, but the difference is not significant when compared to upper secondary school.

As mentioned at the beginning of this part, the respondents were asked to check factors from a list that they consider to be influencing or guiding the content of their pronunciation teaching. The factors and the number of responses are presented below (Table 26).

TABLE 26 Factors influencing or guiding the content of pronunciation teaching

Factor	Respondents n= 97 Answers n= 468
I emphasize elements that differ or do not exist in Finnish (e.g., different word stress or dental fricatives /θ, ð/ that do not exist in Finnish)	85
The content of the textbook	79
I emphasize practicing sounds that are in opposition and somewhat similar to each other, which means that errors can easily lead to misunderstandings (e.g., 'fan' ja 'van' tai 'buy' ja 'pie')	71
I emphasize elements whose differences in pronunciation and orthography can cause difficulties	62
I emphasize elements whose production requires more motorically and are thus perhaps more difficult to learn	44
Student's age	31
Students' wished and needs	26
I emphasize elements that are close to the Finnish equivalents and are thus easier to accidentally hear and pronounce similarly to Finnish (e.g., pronouncing /ɪ/ sound as the Finnish /i/ sound)	21
Curricula	20
I emphasize elements, that are less universal (i.e., rarer in other languages) and thus perhaps more difficult	10
My own strengths and weaknesses	5
Research and literature of the field concerning what aspects of pronunciation should be taught	3

The results show that the factors that guide the teachers the most are elements that differ or do not exist in Finnish phonology, textbooks, minimal pairs, and the differences in the orthographies. Thus, especially Contrastive Analysis affects what is being taught in schools as to pronunciation. While the theory of markedness seems to also influence many of the teachers (44 answers), language universals (10 answers) are not that often considered. Whereas neither literature and research in the field nor the teacher's own strengths and weaknesses seem to play a big role, students' age, wishes and needs as well as the curricula influence the teaching of pronunciation among several of the teachers.

When the school levels (n=78) were compared, the Fisher's Exact test found two factors that had statistically significant differences. The first one is the emphasis on elements that are similar to the Finnish equivalents but still slightly different (Exact Sig. 2-sided p=.030). While none of the teachers teaching at the secondary level chose this option, 9 (29%) of the elementary-level teachers and 6 of the upper secondary school teachers (20%) chose it. Thus, it could be concluded that while this does not

seem to affect secondary-level EFL teachers, it does influence teachers of the two other levels. The second factor containing statistically significant differences was students' age (Exact Sig. 2-sided p=.000). While up to 19 (61%) of the elementary-level teachers reported this factor affecting their teaching, only 2 (12%) of the secondary-level teachers and 3 (10%) of the upper secondary school teachers chose the option. Therefore, it could be inferred that students' age plays a significantly bigger role at the elementary level compared to the two other levels.

The respondents were also provided with an opportunity to list other factors that they think influence their pronunciation teaching. Firstly, the importance of textbooks and other material rise again in the open-ended answers as several respondents reflected on the question through the material that their textbooks offer, and finding interesting material related to pronunciation was said to guide teaching as well. Some respondents reported that the vocabulary lists in the textbooks guide to a great extent what elements of pronunciation are treated in class. Secondly, a lot of aspects related to the languages themselves were mentioned: practicing aspects that differ between the languages, and training to pronounce long or difficult words or words in which the stress is not on the first syllable or can change the meaning of the word. Thirdly, there were also several answers that were more related to the timing and situation than linguistic aspects or available material. For instance, topical issues, elements that surface in the moment, and reoccurring mistakes in students' production were mentioned. Another common theme was both students' and the teacher's backgrounds. Group differences and strengths, students' different linguistic backgrounds, teacher's memories of what was taught in her or his own school times as well as later educational factors were brought up. Finally, there were some similar answers to those that were already discussed as to the importance of pronunciation teaching, such as lack of time in upper secondary schools and the importance of output outside school.

Finally, there were some statements that the respondents had to answer on a scale from 1 to five (1=Totally disagree, 2=Disagree to a certain extent, 3=Not disagree or agree, 4= Agree to a certain extent, and 5= Totally agree). They also had a chance to respond "I do not know" if they felt like not being able to estimate their opinion. However, this answer was not taken into account when calculating the means or other values or when running the tests. The first three statements were: 1. I teach enough individual sounds, 2. I teach enough prosody, and 3. Prosody and sounds are equally important. If the respondent chose option 1 or 2 in the third statement, two more statements opened: 3.1 Prosody is more important than individual sounds, and 3.2 Individual sounds are more important than prosody. Finally, the last two statements treated the difficulty of teaching of the aspects: 4. Teaching individual sounds is difficult, and 5. Teaching prosody is difficult. The results are presented below (Table 27).

TABLE 27 The role of sounds and prosody in teaching

State-ment	1	2	3	4	5	I do not know	Mean	SEM	SD	Median
1 (n=97)	1 (1%)	16 (16.5%)	19 (20%)	45 (46%)	15 (15.5%)	1 (1%)	3.5938	.09998	.97956	4
2 (n=97)	4 (4%)	15 (16%)	32 (33%)	34 (35%)	7 (7%)	5 (5%)	3.2717	.10147	.97331	3
3 (n=97)	1 (1.03%)	7 (7.22%)	27 (27.84%)	41 (42.26%)	11 (11.34%)	10 (10.31%)	3.6207	.09138	.85238	4
3.1 (n=8)	0 (0%)	2 (25%)	1 (12.5%)	4 (50%)	1 (12.5%)	0 (0%)	3.5	.37796	1.06904	4
3.2 (n=8)	1 (12.5%)	4 (50%)	1 (12.5%)	1 (12.5%)	1 (12.5%)	0 (0%)	2.6250	.46049	1.30247	2
4 (n=97)	20 (20.6%)	39 (40.2%)	18 (18.6%)	17 (17.5%)	2 (2.1%)	1 (1%)	2.3958	.10930	1.07095	2
5 (n=97)	10 (10%)	26 (27%)	32 (33%)	20 (21%)	5 (5%)	4 (4%)	2.8280	.10985	1.05936	3

SEM= Standard error of mean, SD= Standard deviation

The results indicate that more teachers are prone to think they teach enough sounds compared to prosody. However, the most common answer in both statements was "I agree to a certain extent", and there was not a big difference in the means, either. On the other hand, there were slightly more teachers who had difficulties in determining whether they teach enough prosody. In the third statement, over half of the respondents also either agreed totally or to a certain extent on the equal importance of both aspects. However, there were eight people who responded that they disagree totally or to a certain extent. The results of the two additional statements aimed at these respondents reveal that five of them considered prosody to be more important (options 4 or 5), while two of them regarded sounds as more important. One respondent answered the somewhat neutral option 3 to both statements. The results of the last two statements reveal that teaching prosody is considered slightly more difficult. However, it must be noted that still 37% of the respondents chose either option 1 or 2, while only 26% agreed either totally or to a certain extent. All in all, it seems that although the teachers consider the teaching of prosody more challenging than the teaching of individual sounds, prosody is still very valued among the teachers and they are worried that they do not teach it enough.

The school levels (n=78) were compared to see whether there are significant differences. Statistically significant differences were found as to the first statement: I

teach enough sounds. Table 28 shows that the teachers teaching at the elementary level were the most confident about the sufficiency of their pronunciation teaching as to sounds, while especially teachers at the upper secondary level seemed to be less certain. The significant difference was found between elementary and upper secondary schools only. The lack of significant difference as to the equal importance of sounds and prosody indicates that both aspects are equally valued at all the levels. The results from those respondents who did not agree (options 1 or 2) on their equal importance (n=6) are presented in the table as well although no tests can be run on such a small sample. However, the elementary-level teachers seemed to root more for the importance of prosody, while the secondary school teachers tended to favor sounds more. Nonetheless, as there were only six respondents, no real conclusions can be drawn.

TABLE 28 The role of sounds and prosody in teaching between the school levels

Statement	Level	Mode	Median	Mean	SEM	SD	Kruskal-Wallis test
1 (n=77*)	E (n=31)	4	4	3.87	.195	1.088	H value = 8.569
	S (n=16)	4	4	3.63	.259	.957	df= 2
	US (n=30)	4	3	3.20	.155	.847	Exact Sig. *p*= .012
3.1 (n=6)	E (n=2)	2	2	2	.000	.000	
	S (n=2)	4&5	4.5	4.5	.500	.707	
	US (n=2)	3&4	3.5	3.5	.500	.707	
3.2 (n=6)	E (n=2)	4&5	4.5	4.5	.500	.707	
	S (n=2)	1&2	1.5	1.5	.500	.707	
	US (n=2)	2&3	2.5	2.5	.500	.707	

SEM= Standard error of mean, SD= Standard deviation. *One respondent answered "I do not know" and was omitted from the calculations.

To conclude, in teachers' views, smooth communication and intelligibility clearly dominate as the goals of pronunciation teaching. Getting rid of (Finnish) accent was chosen significantly more by the upper secondary school teachers. Regarding the teaching of phonetic symbols, teaching to recognize them seems to be the norm, while teaching students to write them is somewhat rare. There were no significant differences between the school levels as to this question. The most taught topics were word stress, sibilants, dental fricatives, affricates, plosives, and word stress. Thus, the results did not indicate that prosody would have been neglected in any way. However, nasals and /f,v,h/ were taught significantly more at the elementary level compared to secondary school, but the trend did not continue in upper secondary school. The factors

that were reported to guide pronunciation teaching the most included elements that are different or do not exist in Finnish, the content of the textbook, and sounds that can be easily confused and are in opposition to each other. Students' age influenced pronunciation teaching significantly more at the elementary level. In addition, elements that only slightly differ from Finnish equivalents had more prevalence among the elementary and upper secondary school teachers. Finally, it seems that teachers are slightly more satisfied with the sufficiency of their pronunciation teaching as to sounds than prosody. However, over half of the respondents considered these two aspects equally important. Most of those who disagreed with that (n=8) considered prosody more important although its teaching was considered slightly more difficult compared to the teaching of sounds.

6.2.3 The methods and tools in pronunciation teaching

In this part, the methods and tools used in pronunciation teaching will be discussed. The respondents estimated how often they use certain pronunciation teaching methods and different tools and technologies on a scale from one to four (1= never, 2=rarely, 3= sometimes, and 4=often), but if they had difficulty with estimating the frequency, they could also respond "I do not know". However, these responses were not taken into account in the calculations or the tests. At the end, they had a chance to list other methods and tools that they use. The methods are otherwise similar to those presented in section 4.2.3, but the four different multisensory methods as well as developmental approximation drills and drama techniques are dealt with separately. We will first discuss the different methods and their frequency, after which the tools and technologies will be dealt with.

There were 19 pronunciation teaching methods. In the questionnaire, these were accompanied by short explanations and examples. For the explanations and examples, see the translated questionnaire (Appendix 2). The results are presented in the appendices (Appendix 4), the methods ranked from the highest to the lowest mean. The most used methods according to the mean were 'listen and repeat' (mean: 3.82), 'read aloud' (mean: 3.55), 'corrective feedback' (mean: 3.22), and 'ear training' (mean: 3), while the least used methods included 'developmental approximation drills' (mean: 1.07), 'visual reinforcement' (mean: 1.28), 'drama techniques' (mean: 1.36), 'games and plays' (mean: 1.68), and 'kinesthetic reinforcement' (mean: 1.77). In fact, drama techniques, visual reinforcement, and developmental approximation drills are never used by a majority of the respondents. Thus, the most favored methods tend to be somewhat traditional. On the other hand, it must be noted that despite the short explanations, there are probably respondents who did not fully understand what some of the methods entail due to the fact that no exhaustive list of examples could be provided. For instance, 'phonetic training' does not involve only activities but also, for example,

describing and practicing how to produce a certain sound. Similarly, besides vowel charts and cards, visual reinforcement can also mean using sheets of paper or feathers to demonstrate aspiration. Moreover, drama techniques entail using different tones of voice. Thus, it is likely that these categories could have ranked higher if a more comprehensive description had been given.

Table 29 shows the most often and least often used pronunciation teaching methods at each level. The three least methods were the same at all the levels, involving a tie between 'drama techniques' and 'visual reinforcement' at the secondary level. While 'listen and repeat' and 'read aloud' were among the three most used methods at all levels, 'corrective feedback' came in second instead of 'read aloud' at the elementary level. The third most utilized method was 'ear training' as to the teachers teaching at the secondary level and 'corrective feedback' among the upper secondary school teachers.

TABLE 29 The most and least often used methods at each school level

The most often used methods (mean)		
Elementary	**Secondary**	**Upper secondary**
Listen and repeat (4)	Listen and repeat (3.76)	Listen and repeat (3.59)
Corrective feedback (3.71)	Read aloud (3.5)	Read aloud (3.54)
Read aloud (3.58)	Ear training (3.12)	Corrective feedback (3.03)
The least often used methods (mean)		
Elementary	**Secondary**	**Upper secondary**
Developmental approximation drills (1.07)	Developmental approximation drills (1)	Developmental approximation drills (1.10)
Visual reinforcement (1.19)	Drama techniques + visual reinforcement (1.18)	Visual reinforcement (1.17)
Drama techniques (1.47)	Games and plays (1.53)	Drama techniques (1.20)

A Kruskal-Wallis test was run to detect any significant differences within the answers. The test revealed that eight methods were used significantly more among the elementary-level teachers. The statistics are presented in Appendix 5. As to 'listen and repeat', 'ear training', 'kinesthetic reinforcement' and 'games and plays' the difference was significant only compared to the upper secondary school teachers, while in 'corrective feedback', 'poems, rhymes, and songs', 'auditory reinforcement', and 'tactile reinforcement', it applied also to the secondary-level teachers. Thus, it seems that the use of these methods declines significantly from elementary school to the upper secondary school, and in some methods, there is a significant difference already between the elementary and secondary levels.

The questionnaire had a separate section for different materials, tools, and technologies, in which the respondents had to estimate the frequency of use of each of

these materials and tools. Short descriptions and examples can be found in the questionnaire (Appendix 2), while the results are shown in more detail in Appendix 6. The clearly most utilized resources were 'exercises and materials in textbook' and 'online materials of textbooks', which demonstrates the huge influence that textbooks have on language teaching. 'Audios and videos', 'websites', 'songs and poems' were used sometimes by a majority of the respondents, while most of the teachers reported never using rubber bands, kazoos, mirrors, language labs, feathers, visual aids, or mobile application or software. The reason why language laboratories are not used is probably because hardly any schools have them anymore. However, there also seems to be a trend of not using physical non-technological objects in the teaching of pronunciation.

Table 30 shows the most often and least often used materials, tools, and technologies at each school level. As can be seen, the three most utilized tools are the same at the secondary and upper secondary levels, whereas the third most frequently used tool at the elementary level is 'songs and poems'. In regard to the least used tools, it seems that while kazoos and rubber bands are almost never used at any of the levels, feathers and mirrors are more benefitted from among the elementary-level teachers. On the other hand, visual aids are used more at least at the upper secondary level.

TABLE 30 The most and least often used resources at each school level

The most often used materials, tools, and technologies (mean)		
Elementary	**Secondary**	**Upper secondary**
Textbook (3.97)	Textbook (3.88)	Textbook (3.80)
Online materials of textbooks (3.77)	Online materials of textbooks (3.24)	Online materials for textbooks (3.59)
Songs and poems (3.26)	Audios and videos (2.88)	Audios and videos (2.73)
The least often used materials, tools, and technologies (mean)		
Elementary	**Secondary**	**Upper secondary**
Kazoo + rubber bands (1)	Kazoo + rubber bands (1)	Kazoo + rubber bands + feather (1.03)
Language lab (1.10)	Mirror (1.06)	Mirror (1.10)
Visual aids (1.16)	Feather (1.12)	Language lab (1.23)

It was somewhat surprising that of the physical tools, meaning kazoos, mirrors, rubber bands, and feathers, only the use of feathers decreased level by level. As seen above, rubber bands and kazoos were, in fact, slightly more used at the upper secondary level. However, as Appendix 6 shows, this is due to only one respondent. The Kruskal-Wallis H test was run to see whether there were any significant differences. The test revealed that there were significant differences regarding two tools: 'songs and poems' and 'feathers'. The results are presented below (Table 31).

TABLE 31 The use of resources between the school levels

Resource	Level	Mode	Median	Mean	SEM	SD	Kruskal-Wallis test
Songs and poems	E (n=31)	3&4	3	3.26	.131	.729	H value= 30.786
	S (n=17)	2	2	2.29	.187	.772	df= 2
	US (n=30)	1	2	1.87	.150	.819	Exact Sig. *p*= .000
Feathers	E (n=31)	1	1	1.48	.160	.890	H value= 7.957
	S (n=17)	1	1	1.12	.118	.485	df= 2
	US (n=30)	1	1	1.03	.033	.183	Exact Sig. *p*= .017

SEM= Standard error of mean, SD= Standard deviation

Regarding the use of songs and poems, there was a statistically significant difference between the elementary level and the two other levels. No significant differences were found between the secondary and upper secondary levels. Thus, it can be concluded that songs and poems are used significantly more at the elementary level compared to the two other levels. In respect to the use of feathers, there was a significant difference only between the elementary and upper secondary levels, so it can be stated that feathers are used significantly more in elementary school compared to upper secondary school.

Finally, the respondents had a chance to list more methods and tools that they use. These were two separate open-field questions, but they will be discussed together as the responses contained somewhat overlapping ideas. Firstly, many respondents reported using either a thin sheet of paper or students' own hands instead of a feather to feel aspiration. As this was categorized as part of visual reinforcement in the present study, it could be deduced, as discussed already before, that this method might be more used than was reported. Secondly, phonetic training was also involved in some of the answers. One reported making quizzes concerning phonetic symbols by using Quizlet, and another told that he or she uses the webpage tophonetics.com so that students must guess a song based on the lyrics written in phonetic alphabets. One respondent reported making vocabulary tests in which students must decode words written in phonetic alphabets to normal orthography and then translate them into Finnish. Some of the respondents seemed to utilize technology in creative ways. The Oxford Learner's Dictionaries webpage was used so that students choose a word that they consider difficult to pronounce and go to the webpage to see and listen how the word is pronounced correctly. Another teacher mentioned using Siri, the virtual assistant of Apple products that is based on speech recognition and OneNote's dictation system in teaching so that students check whether the software are able to understand their speech. In addition, videos related to pronunciation as well as recording students'

production were mentioned. Therefore, most of these ideas could be classified within the categories of the present study. All in all, the open answers indicate that some teachers teach pronunciation rather systematically and have come up with creative solutions to enrich the teaching. In addition, technology and different webpages seem to provide a lot of opportunities for pronunciation teaching.

To sum up this section, 'listen and repeat', 'read aloud', 'corrective feedback', and 'ear training' were the most common teaching methods, while 'drama techniques', 'visual reinforcement', and 'developmental approximation drills' were never used by a majority of the teachers. 'Listen and repeat', 'ear training', 'kinesthetic reinforcement', and 'games and plays' were used significantly more at the elementary level compared to the upper secondary level, whereas as to 'poems, rhymes, and songs', 'tactile reinforcement', 'auditory reinforcement', and 'corrective feedback', the difference was also between the elementary and secondary levels. Regarding the tools and materials, textbooks and their online materials were clearly the most utilized ones, while (mobile) application and software, visual aids, feathers, language labs, mirrors, kazoos, and rubber bands were rarely used. Poems, rhymes, and songs were significantly more popular among the elementary-level teachers compared to the two other levels, whereas the difference as to 'feather' was significant only between the elementary and upper secondary levels. Finally, the open-ended question revealed that the respondents use phonetic training and visual aids (or reinforcement) more than they probably have understood and that also technology is very well benefitted from by many of the teachers.

6.3 The teachers' views on the sufficiency of pronunciation material in EFL textbooks

This section answers the last research question, which was studied with three different questions. The respondents first had to answer two statements: 1. Textbooks offer enough material for the teaching of individual sounds, and 2. Textbooks offer enough material for the teaching of prosody. After that, they had a chance to write what aspects they were particularly satisfied with as to pronunciation in EFL textbooks and what aspects would need improvements or additions. The two statement questions will be treated first, after which the open-ended question will be discussed.

Firstly, teachers evaluated the sufficiency of pronunciation teaching materials on a scale from 1 to 5 (1= Totally disagree, 2= Disagree to a certain extent, 3= Not disagree or agree, 4= Agree to a certain extent, and 5= Totally agree). They also had a chance to respond: "I do not know", but this response was of course omitted from the mean and the test. The results from all respondents (n=97) are presented below (Table 32).

Question 1 refers to the statement "EFL textbooks provide enough material for the teaching of individual sounds", and question 2 signifies the statement "EFL textbooks provide enough material for the teaching of prosody".

TABLE 32 The sufficiency of pronunciation material in EFL textbooks

Que stion	1	2	3	4	5	I do not know	Mean	SEM	SD	Me-dian
1	7 (7.2%)	24 (24.8 %)	13 (13.4 %)	43 (44.3 %)	10 (10.3 %)	0%	3.2577	.11750	1.15721	4
2	10 (10.3%)	36 (37.1 %)	19 (19.6 %)	20 (20.6 %)	5 (5.2%)	7 (7.2%)	2.7111	.11638	1.10407	2

SEM= Standard error of mean, SD= Standard deviation

The results reveal that textbooks are considered to provide more material concerning individual sounds than prosody: The mode and median of Question 1 were 4, while in the second question they were both 2. In addition, there was a 0.5 difference in the means. Thus, it seems that teachers are longing for more material especially concerning prosody. Moreover, over 7% of the respondents were unsure about whether the books provide enough material for the teaching of prosodic features or not, while no one answered "I do not know" in the first question. Although very broad conclusions cannot be drawn from this, the difference might indicate that the teachers have not paid attention to the sufficiency of prosodic material in the books, which, on the other hand, can imply that individual sounds are taken more into account. Nonetheless, the amount of material concerning sounds is not necessarily regarded as sufficient, either. After all, 32% of the respondents were at the "disagree" end of the scale, which indicates that there is a need for improvements as to sounds as well. The different school levels (n=97) were compared with the Kruskal-Wallis test, and no statistically significant differences were found (statement 1: H=2.799, df= 2, Exact Sig. p= .249; statement 2: H=3.271, df= 2, Exact Sig. p= .197).

As mentioned above, the sufficiency of pronunciation material was studied also with another question, in which respondents were asked to list things that they are particularly satisfied with as to pronunciation in EFL textbooks and to bring forth aspects that would need improving. The question treating the pronunciation material was an open-ended question and it was not compulsory. In total, 46 of the respondents provided an answer for the question. There were several re-occurring themes in the responses. Firstly, the systematic use of phonetic symbols in vocabulary lists and glossaries, clear themes, and ease of use as well as the quality of pronunciation models

were often mentioned as positive aspects. In addition, some respondents wrote that they consider textbooks to contain enough pronunciation material and exercises. A few respondents pointed out that textbooks have developed and improved in recent years, the activities have become more diverse, and digital materials offer new possibilities for pronunciation training as well. On the other hand, there were a lot of suggestions for improving the presence of pronunciation in EFL textbooks, and a few respondents claimed that they are not satisfied with anything concerning the treatment of pronunciation in EFL textbooks. Many respondents longed for more pronunciation activities, and more variation was hoped particularly for upper secondary school books. Furthermore, several teachers mentioned a need for more material about the differences between British and American pronunciations, while some respondents longed for more poems and rhymes, humoristic or funny materials, and practices involving elements that are particularly challenging for Finnish learners of English. Moreover, some suggested that pronunciation should be better integrated to the overall content and not seen as a separate area or as something extra. In addition, more material concerning prosody was asked for by several respondents. For instance, some hoped for practices involving longer units than individual words to better practice prosodic features. Finally, it should be mentioned that all the textbook series of the present study were brought up. *High Five!* was thanked for its coherence, videos, tapes of good quality as well as for its activities that embed the treatment of sounds in stories in which students "act", while *Go for it!* was blamed for weak pronunciation training. The videos of *On the Go* were considered funny, and *Scene* was thanked for its clear continuum of pronunciation exercises. While one of the books belonging to the *Insights* series was claimed to be too theoretical as to pronunciation, *On Track* was considered to have clear themes and enough material relating to the different varieties of English.

To conclude this section, it seems that Finnish EFL teachers long for more pronunciation material in the textbooks, especially concerning prosody. However, there were no statistically significant differences between the school levels. The open-ended questions revealed that some of the teachers seem to be satisfied with the amount of pronunciation material in textbooks, but a few respondents reported not having anything positive to say about the topic. While textbooks were thanked for the inclusion of phonetic symbols, clear themes, ease of use, and quality of pronunciation models, improvements were suggested regarding, for example, more varying activities, the use of poems and rhymes, humoristic or funny material, and material concerning prosody and the different varieties of English.

After having presented the results, it is now time to sum up the study, bring the results together and discuss them in relation to the previous studies. Implications are drawn based on the results, after which the study will be critically evaluated and suggestions for future studies will be provided.

7 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This final chapter of the thesis summarizes the aims of the study, the research process, and the main results, draws together the findings from the textbook analysis and the teacher survey and discusses the most important results in light of the previous studies and the overall background. Finally, the implications and limitations of the study as well as suggestions for future research are discussed.

7.1 A review of the aims and research process of the present study

The previous chapters of the thesis have demonstrated that there was a need for a study that would provide updated and more comprehensive information regarding the status of pronunciation in textbooks and teaching. The aim of the present study was to find out how pronunciation is treated in Finnish EFL textbooks and teaching in elementary, secondary, and upper secondary schools. In more detail, the goal was to answer the following research questions: 1. *How many and what type of exercises do Finnish EFL textbooks have concerning pronunciation?* 2. *How much and how do Finnish EFL teachers teach pronunciation? What are the reasons behind this?* and 3. *According to the teachers, do Finnish EFL textbooks provide enough materials for the teaching of pronunciation?* The aim was to then compare the results between the different school levels and to contrast them with previous studies, especially the research done by Tergujeff (2010, 2012a, 2012b), to see whether there has been a change in the way pronunciation is dealt with in textbooks and in teaching. In addition, the results from both data sets are compared to see whether the role of pronunciation is similar in textbooks and in the classroom.

Both a textbook analysis and a teacher survey were conducted to response to the questions. In the former one, eight popular Finnish EFL textbooks were chosen for the analysis, including also their possible separate exercise books and online materials.

There were two books from both elementary and secondary levels and four books from upper secondary school, which were analyzed by using content analysis and mainly quantitative methods. First the total number of activities and the frequency of pronunciation exercises were counted. Then the pronunciation activities were categorized into different exercise types based on Tergujeff's (2010) classification. Finally, their content was studied, and the number of exercises treating either sounds or prosody or having no clear focus was calculated. In regard to the survey, an online questionnaire intended for Finnish EFL teachers teaching in basic education and upper secondary school was created to find out, for example, how often and how pronunciation is taught and what topics are treated the most. The questionnaire was responded by 97 teachers, after which the data were analyzed with SPSS. The analysis was mostly quantitative due to the large proportion of close-ended questions, but the answers to the few open-ended questions were analyzed qualitatively by searching for reoccurring themes. The quantitative analysis combined descriptive and inferential statistics: the data were described in tables, for instance, via frequencies and means, while inferential statistics involved the comparison of the school levels with statistical tests.

The study managed to answer all the research questions. In regard to the first one, 747 pronunciation exercises were found in the textbooks, which was 9.3% of the total number of activities. Most of the exercises dealt with sounds or had no clear focus, while only 5% treated prosody. Prosody was neglected especially in the beginner-level textbooks and *On Track*. The most common topics included affricates, plosives, sibilants, and dental fricatives, which were dealt with in most of the books, whereas word stress and intonation were also treated in some of them. The most frequent exercise types were 'read aloud', 'spelling and dictation', and 'listen and repeat'.

Regarding the second research question, most teachers seem to teach pronunciation quite regularly even though 58% of the respondents either thought that they do not teach it enough or were unsure of its sufficiency. However, pronunciation was taught significantly more among the elementary-level teachers. The most common reasons for not teaching it enough were lack of time and lack of suitable teaching materials. Prosody did not seem to be neglected among the teachers although they were slightly more worried about the sufficiency of their teaching concerning prosodic features than sounds. However, the most taught topics included word stress, sibilants, dental fricatives, affricates, plosives, and intonation, which indicates that prosody is actually frequently taught. In addition, it shows that textbooks play a huge role in what is taught as these were also the most frequently encountered topics among the exercises. The aspects that seem to guide the teachers' pronunciation teaching the most include the emphasis on elements that differ or do not exist in Finnish, highlighting the influence of Contrastive Analysis; the content of the textbook; the emphasis on minimal pairs; English orthography; situational factors; students' reoccurring errors;

and students' and teachers' backgrounds. Emphasizing elements that are similar to the Finnish equivalents but still slightly different seem to influence secondary-level teachers significantly less than teachers of the two other levels, while students' age has a stronger effect on teachers at the elementary level. Finally, the most common teaching methods were 'listen and repeat', 'read aloud', and 'corrective feedback'.

With respect to the third question, more material was longed for especially as to prosody. Although some respondents were satisfied with the role of pronunciation in EFL textbooks, suggestions for improvements were also made. These included, for example, more varying activities, poems, rhymes, and humoristic or funny materials as well as materials dealing with prosody and the different varieties of English.

The most central findings of the study will now be discussed in more detail by comparing the results with previous studies to see if the role of pronunciation in textbooks and in teaching has changed. The differences between the school levels and the possible relationship between the books and the way of teaching will be dealt with. Although a separate section is not devoted to the third research question, its results are treated along the text and when discussing the implications of the study.

7.2 The status and focus of pronunciation

In this section, the most important findings concerning the status and focus of pronunciation in the textbooks and teaching will be brought together and compared. Firstly, one of the main findings of the study was that pronunciation and especially prosody are given quite low priority in textbooks. Even though the sufficiency of pronunciation material is rather a subjective matter, and there are no guidelines on how many pronunciation exercises textbooks should entail, it is obvious that the role of pronunciation was quite small compared to other parts, such as grammar and vocabulary. Furthermore, only 5% of all the pronunciation activities treated prosody, which was completely neglected in some of the books. The number of pronunciation exercises also decreased level by level, and the beginner-level textbooks had much more pronunciation exercises, which is in line with the results of Pasanen's (2007) study of German textbooks. Prosody, on the other hand, was more common in the exercises of the secondary school books, while being basically completely neglected in the beginner-level textbooks. The upper secondary school books also had only a few exercises concerning it, *On Track* having none. Although this variance did not transfer to the teachers' views as no significant differences were found in the answers of the teachers of different levels, they generally wished for more pronunciation material in textbooks, especially concerning prosody, and a few of them had nothing good to say about the role of pronunciation in textbooks. On the other hand, some were satisfied with the

current situation, and for example the systematic use of phonetic symbols, clear themes, and the quality of pronunciation models received positive feedback.

Nonetheless, the higher percentage of the present study (9.3%) compared to those of Derwing et al. (2012: 28) and Hietala (2013: 107) may indicate that pronunciation has gained slightly more prominence in textbooks. Tergujeff (2010: 194) found 829 occurrences of pronunciation-specific material in 16 Finnish EFL textbooks. Nevertheless, no clear conclusion can be drawn due to different methods of the studies. For instance, Derwing et al. (2012) and Tergujeff (2010) studied all material in the books, while both series in Hietala's study (2013) had a separate section devoted to pronunciation that was not included in the data. Regarding prosody, previous results concerning its status in textbooks are somewhat conflicting. In studies conducted abroad, prosody has in fact often dominated in textbooks (Derwing et al., 2012: 28; Henderson & Jarosz, 2014: 271; Szpyra-Kosłoswka, 2015: 111-112), while in Finland the results have varied from total ignorance of some prosodic features (Tergujeff, 2010: 201) to the inclusion of them all (Salenius, 2011: 114). The findings of the present study seem to support those of Tergujeff (2010) as neither sentence stress nor rhythm were treated in the activities, and prosody did not receive much attention overall. Thus, the role of prosody in Finnish EFL textbooks does not seem to have improved since 2010.

However, the low priority given to pronunciation and especially to prosody in textbooks does not seem to affect the overall frequency of their teaching despite the huge role that textbooks play in language teaching (Luukka et al., 2008: 97; Sobkowiak, 2012: 112; Tergujeff, 2013: 38). Most of the respondents reported teaching pronunciation regularly and considered its teaching very important, which is in line with Kauppinen's (2015: 33) findings, while word stress was the most often taught topic, and intonation was also among the topics with the highest means. In addition, even though the teachers still evaluated the sufficiency of their teaching as to prosody less positively than that of sounds and regarded the teaching of it more difficult, most of them agreed on the equal importance of both aspects, which supports Kauppinen's (2015: 40) findings, and a majority of those who disagreed considered prosody more important. Thus, the findings do not support the claims that pronunciation is not taught enough (Derwing & Munro, 2015: 78; Kaski-Akhawan, 2013; Kauppinen, 2015: 34; MacDonald, 2002: 5; Pennington & Rogerson-Revell, 2019: 173; Szpyra-Kozłowska, 2015: 5) or that prosody is neglected in teaching (Derwing & Munro, 2015: 80; Szpyra-Kozłowska, 2015: 111; Tergujeff et al., 2010: 66; Tergujeff, 2012b: 605), which could indicate that the roles of pronunciation and prosody in teaching have grown. However, most of the studies above come from abroad, while Kaski-Akhawan (2013) and Kauppinen (2015) studied only a few teachers, which complicates the comparison.

In addition, a few things should be kept in mind. Firstly, a third of the respondents of the present study still considered their pronunciation teaching insufficient, and

many were uncertain whether they teach it enough or not. Thus, it seems that although pronunciation is taught regularly, many teachers still feel like they do not teach it enough or are uncertain of its sufficiency. Secondly, despite the overall frequency of teaching, pronunciation was much less taught at the secondary and upper secondary levels, and the elementary-level teachers also evaluated the sufficiency of its teaching more positively. This suggests that the number of activities in textbooks is likely to affect teaching. On the other hand, it might also be a result of older students not needing as much pronunciation training anymore. However, there were no significant variance between the school levels as to the teaching of prosody despite the differences in the books. In fact, word stress was among the three most taught topics at each level. Regarding the importance of pronunciation teaching, there were no differences between the school levels, which indicates that despite the differences in the amount of teaching, pronunciation is still equally valued regardless of the students' age. The teachers of all levels also seemed to value sounds and prosody equally.

Nonetheless, 34% of the teachers still reported that they do not teach enough pronunciation. Numerous reasons have been suggested for the ignorance of pronunciation teaching, ranging from lack of time to teachers' skills and preferences and shortages in teacher training (see section 4.2.1). In the present study, the most common reasons among those considering their pronunciation teaching insufficient were lack of time, which supports Kauppinen's (2015: 34) findings, and lack of suitable teaching materials, which was mentioned by Derwing and Munro (2015: 78-80), MacDonald (2002: 11) and Szpyra-Kozłowska (2015: 5-6). However, lack of testing was a significantly more frequent answer among the upper secondary school teachers, which is logical as the Matriculation Examination tends to influence a great deal what is being taught in upper secondary schools. In Tergujeff's study (2013: 41), the Finnish EFL teachers considered their own pronunciation training sufficient but claimed that they had not received training in how to teach it, while in the present study neither of these seemed to explain shortages in pronunciation teaching. Thus, it seems that the reasons are external to the teacher and his/her skills and preparedness. However, in the open-ended answers, the fear of embarrassing students, the great deal of input they receive outside school and their lack of interest in pronunciation were brought up, which suggests that factors related to students themselves may, in fact, be one reason behind the negligence of pronunciation teaching.

7.3   The content of pronunciation exercises and teaching

This section draws together the findings from the textbook analysis and the teacher survey regarding the content of the pronunciation exercises and teaching. Firstly, the

most common topics in exercises and teaching, which were basically the same, follow the recommendations to a great extent. As was discussed in section 3.3.4, the hardest phonemes to Finnish learners seem to be sibilants, affricates, and dental fricatives, of which only the sibilant /s/ exists in Finnish. Besides sibilants and affricates, Tergujeff (2017a: 171) highlights the importance of teaching the contrasts between voiced and voiceless plosives and the sounds /v/ and /w/. The former contrast was treated in nearly all the books, and plosives were also a popular topic in teaching, while the latter contrast was dealt with in half of the books even though it did not belong to the most taught themes. Furthermore, the lateral, nasals, and diphthongs were the least taught topics, and the books did not contain exercises treating these sound groups, either, which seems logical since the nasal sounds and the lateral /l/ all exist in Finnish. Similarly, diphthongs do not seem to pose a great difficulty for Finnish students.

However, there were also some differences. Firstly, vowels were not very often taught and only *On Track* had activities treating them although vowel length was considered important by Jenkins (2000), Rogerson-Revell (2011), and Tergujeff (2017a), and the two latter also emphasized vowel quality. In addition, as discussed in section 3.3.4, Finnish and English vowels differ quite a lot. This finding is also contradictory to those of Derwing et al. (2012: 28), Henderson and Jarosz (2014: 272), and Szpyra-Kosłoswka (2015: 112) in whose studies vowels were the most common segmental feature in textbooks. Secondly, the popularity of dental fricatives is somewhat surprising as they were deemed noncrucial by Jenkins (2000). Thirdly, the rhythm and sentence stress were not encountered in the textbooks or taught very often even though the latter is crucial to intelligibility (e.g., Celce-Murcia et al., 2010: 212; Jenkins, 2000; Tergujeff, 2017a: 170), and rhythm was also emphasized by Celce-Murcia et al. (2010: 163) and Tergujeff (2017a: 170). Most importantly, the lack of prosody in some of the books is not in line with the recommendations. Regarding the beginner-level books, prosody might be considered more difficult than sounds and is thus left for a later time. However, the NCC for Basic Education states that learners in classes 3–6 should already practice topics such as word and sentence stress, rhythm, and intonation (Finnish National Board of Education, 2016a: 238) even though it was not specified in which class each of these aspects should be introduced. These books are normally used in the third grade. However, according to the CEFR, in proficiency levels A1–A2, the learner must already be able to place stress correctly on familiar words and phrases although errors in prosody can still cause challenges to intelligibility (Council of Europe, 2018: 172).

There were also some other interesting findings. Firstly, 88% of the respondents considered intelligibility and smooth communication the goals of pronunciation teaching, which demonstrates the influence of Communicative Language Teaching and are also in line with the updated recommendations of the CEFR (Council of Europe, 2018: 47). These were also emphasized by the teachers interviewed by

Kauppinen (2015: 35). Secondly, although Tergujeff et al. (2010: 63-65) suggest that phonetic symbols are not systematically used in Finland, the results of present study are more in line with Tergujeff (2012a: 38) as nearly all the teachers reported teaching students to recognize at least some of the symbols, while teaching to write them was much rarer. This indicates that phonetic symbols might have gained more prominence in teaching in Finland since 2010 although teaching learners to write them is still rare.

7.4   The pronunciation exercise types and teaching methods

Now it is time to bring together the results concerning the pronunciation exercise types and teaching methods. The most common methods in exercises and teaching seem to be interrelated as 'read aloud' and 'listen and repeat' were among the three most popular ones in both. On the other hand, 'spelling and dictation' that was the second most used exercise type and 'phonetic training' that came in fourth were less utilized in teaching. However, regarding 'phonetic training', it may be a result of the respondents not fully understanding that besides activities, the method also entails, for instance, describing and practicing how to produce a certain sound. Concerning the least used exercise types and teaching methods, pronunciation games as well as developmental approximation drills and drama techniques that were labeled as 'creative technique' in activities were among the least used methods in both exercises and teaching. On the other hand, rules and instructions were far more common in teaching, which is not surprising since embedding rules in activities is not very frequent. However, visual and kinesthetic reinforcement were also among the least used methods in teaching despite especially the former being relatively common in the exercises.

Moreover, there was no clear association between the methods in exercises and teaching at different school levels. For example, 'listen and repeat' was not among the three most common exercise types in upper secondary school, but 'ear training' was, while in teaching, the former was the most used method also in upper secondary school, while the latter was more common among secondary school teachers. On the other hand, six of the eight methods significantly more used at the elementary level (listen and repeat; poems, rhymes, and songs; games; and auditory, tactile, and kinesthetic reinforcements) were also more numerous in the exercises of the beginner-level textbooks, which again highlights the influence that textbooks have on teaching.

The results support the findings of previous studies to a great extent. Firstly, 'listen and repeat', 'teacher correction', and 'read aloud' were often used teaching methods among Kauppinen's (2015: 44-49) interviewees and in Tergujeff's (2012b: 603) classroom observations. However, 'spelling and dictation' and 'ear training' were rare in Tergujeff's (2012b: 603) observations and the least common exercise types in her

textbook analysis (2010: 195). Thus, it seems that there has been a remarkable rise in the use of these methods in both textbooks and teaching. On the other hand, 'ear training' was much more used in another study by Tergujeff (2012a: 40). Secondly, two of the three most common exercise types were the same as in Tergujeff's (2010) study: 'read aloud' and 'listen and repeat'. These types of controlled practices were the most frequent exercises also in Henderson and Jarosz's study (2014: 270), and 'read aloud' seems to dominate in French textbooks as well (Järvinen, 2017: 77). Thus, it seems that traditional exercise types still prevail in textbooks. Although the most common type in Tergujeff's (2010) study, 'phonetic training', came in fourth in the present study, it should be noted that Tergujeff counted all material, including vocabulary lists utilizing the IPA, which may explain the large number of 'phonetic training' occurrences. However, her data did not include pronunciation games, developmental approximation drills, or recordings of students' production, while multisensory methods were also scarce, including only tactile reinforcement. All these were found in the data of the present study, including all the four types of multisensory methods, although 'recordings of students' production' was not a group of its own. Therefore, even though traditional methods still dominate, there seems to be more variation in the exercises.

The content of textbooks and their online materials were the most frequently used resources in general and at each school level, which manifests again the great effect that textbooks have on teaching. Mobile applications and software, visual aids, feathers, language labs, mirrors, kazoos, and rubber bands were never used by most of the respondents, and kazoo and rubber bands were the least utilized ones at all three levels, which points to a relatively infrequent use of different props. However, songs and poems and feathers were used significantly more at the elementary level. On the other hand, the open answers revealed that visual tools, 'visual reinforcement', and 'phonetic training' may, in fact, be more utilized than was reported. Firstly, many reported using a sheet of paper instead of a feather to demonstrate aspiration, which was categorized as 'visual reinforcement' in the present study. Secondly, aspects that could be classified as 'phonetic training' were mentioned by several teachers. The answers also brought forth the quite creative use of technology and different webpages, which does not support the findings of Hismanoglu and Hismanoglu (2010: 988).

7.5 Implications and limitations of the study and suggestions for further research

The results manifest the huge influence that textbooks have on teaching. In pronunciation, they seem to have a great effect on how and how often it is taught and what topics are treated. On the other hand, despite the relatively small number of

pronunciation activities in the books especially concerning prosody, it seems that pronunciation, prosody included, is overall frequently taught in Finnish EFL classrooms. However, pronunciation exercises were more numerous in the beginner-level books, which correlated positively with the amount of teaching. Thus, considering the crucial role of textbooks in teaching, the following suggestions for improvements regarding textbooks are also likely to enhance and facilitate the actual teaching of pronunciation.

Despite the changes in the CEFR and the curricula, pronunciation activities still have rather a small role in textbooks compared to, for instance, grammar and vocabulary. Especially prosody was given low priority in the books and was completely neglected in some of them, and the teachers also evaluated the sufficiency of material concerning prosody in textbooks quite negatively. Thus, more pronunciation activities, particularly regarding prosody, should be added to Finnish EFL textbooks. In addition, vowels were treated in only one of the books, while vowel quality was not addressed in the activities at all, which indicates that there is also a need for more vowel activities. With regard to the exercise types, even though creative techniques and games were encountered, and multisensory methods were, in fact, quite common, traditional exercises still dominated. Therefore, more versatile exercise types should perhaps be provided. Besides more varying activities and materials concerning prosody, the teachers also hoped for more poems and rhymes, humoristic or funny materials, and more material treating the different varieties of English.

With respect to teaching, pronunciation is in general taught quite frequently although many of the teachers are worried or uncertain of its sufficiency. However, the results indicate that more attention should be paid to pronunciation at the later levels as well. The most common reasons for not teaching enough pronunciation were lack of time and lack of suitable teaching materials. While the former problem refers to a deeper level issue, the latter could be solved by offering teachers more pronunciation teaching materials. Moreover, although some prosodic features were among the most taught topics, the teachers were still more unsure about the sufficiency of their prosody teaching compared to the teaching of sounds and considered the teaching of prosody more difficult. Although only a few people considered shortages in teacher education to be the reason behind teaching too little pronunciation, this finding might indicate that teachers and future teachers need more training in how to teach suprasegmental features. On the other hand, the most often treated topics in the classroom were quite in line with the recommendations even though vowels, sentence stress, and rhythm might deserve more attention. Finally, traditional teaching methods dominated, and more diverse methods could be used more to better meet students' different needs and to make the teaching of pronunciation more interesting, while physical objects or props, such as kazoos, mirrors, and rubber bands, could be benefitted more to enrich teaching.

As was discussed in more detail in section 5.4., the study has its limitations. In regard to the textbook analysis, despite the several recounts, some errors in numbers of activities are possible due to manual coding. Additionally, activities may consist of very different elements, for which choosing whether an activity focuses explicitly on pronunciation and categorizing the activity is rather a subjective matter. Thus, it cannot be guaranteed that another researcher would end up with the exact same results with the same data. Moreover, the analysis focused solely on activities and does not necessarily give a reliable picture of the overall role of pronunciation in the books.

Regarding the teacher survey, there are some aspects that may harm the reliability and validity of the study despite the relatively large size and representativeness of the sample. Firstly, when comparing the school levels, those who had chosen more than one level had to be omitted to avoid overlapping responses. The smaller proportion of respondents teaching only in secondary school (n=17) may decrease the representativeness of the comparisons. Secondly, since the sample was not completely random, it is possible that teachers who are more interested in pronunciation were more eager to take part, which may affect the results. Finally, there are some possible risks as to the responses themselves. Firstly, estimates of the frequency of teaching are not completely reliable since teachers may have different perceptions of what teaching in fact means. Some could have estimated that they teach pronunciation in every lesson if they correct one phonetic mistake, while others may have assumed that the question referred to a more explicit way of teaching. Thus, it would have been wise to define this question in more detail. Furthermore, it is possible that some respondents did not fully comprehend what the different methods entailed despite the short explanations and examples. For instance, the open-ended questions implicated that at least 'phonetic training' and 'visual reinforcement' are probably used more than was reported. Thus, more exhaustive descriptions of the methods should have perhaps been given.

To conclude, more studies on the role of pronunciation in textbooks and teaching in Finland are needed to form a comprehensive picture of the issue. As this thesis has demonstrated, studies on the topic have so far utilized quite varying methods, for instance, when choosing the data and ways of collecting it, which complicates the comparison of the findings. Although different methods enable researchers to study the topic from diverse perspectives, to better compare the results and make conclusions, future studies should perhaps follow a more consistent pattern. In addition, the present study revealed two possible problems as to the status of pronunciation: the extremely weak presence of activities focusing on prosodic features in EFL textbooks, and the fact that pronunciation is taught significantly less after elementary school. Thus, more research should be conducted concerning these aspects and the reasons behind them. Finally, studies comparing the situation between different languages or countries could provide more insight into the role of pronunciation.

REFERENCES

The textbooks analyzed:

Daffue-Karsten, L., Davies, M., Kae, T., Myller, R., Rantanen, P. & Vuorinen, P. (2019a). *On Track 1* (1st-6th ed.). Helsinki: Sanoma Pro Oy.

Daffue-Karsten, L., Davies, M., Kae, T., Myller, R., Rantanen, P. & Vuorinen, P. (2019b). *On Track 2* (2nd-5th ed.). Helsinki: Sanoma Pro Oy.

Daffue-Karsten, L., Haapala, M., Ojala, A-M., Ojala, S., Peuraniemi, J., Rappold, P. & Semi, L. (2020a). *On the Go 1 : Textbook* (3rd–8th ed.). Helsinki: Sanoma Pro Oy.

Daffue-Karsten, L., Haapala, M., Ojala, A-M., Ojala, S., Peuraniemi, J., Rappold, P. & Semi, L. (2020b). *On the Go 1 : Workbook* (1st–6th ed.). Helsinki: Sanoma Pro Oy.

Hiitti, A., Lumiala, J., Parikka, E., Sloan, C. & Tolkki, N. (2015a). *Scene 1 : Texts* (2nd-3rd Rev. ed.). Helsinki: Otava.

Hiitti, A., Lumiala, J., Parikka, E., Sloan, C. & Tolkki, N. (2015b). *Scene 1 : Exercises* (2nd-5th Rev. ed.). Helsinki: Otava.

Kalaja, M., Korpela, N., Kuja-Kyyny-Pajula, R., Mäkinen, J. & Pelli-Kouvo, P. (2015). *High Five! 3 : Texts* (6th–8th Rev. ed.). Helsinki: Otava.

Kalaja, M., Korpela, N., Kuja-Kyyny-Pajula, R., Mäkinen, J. & Pelli-Kouvo, P. (2016). *High Five! 3 : Activities* (7th Rev. ed.). Helsinki: Otava.

Kanervo, P., Laukkarinen, A., Paakkinen, J., Sarlin, H. & Westlake, P. (2020a). *Go for it! 3 : Textbook* (1st–6th ed.). Helsinki: Sanoma Pro Oy.

Kanervo, P., Laukkarinen, A., Paakkinen, J., Sarlin, H. & Westlake, P. (2020b). *Go for it! 3 : Workbook* (1st–8th ed.). Helsinki: Sanoma Pro Oy.

Karapalo, E., Keltto, P., Kilmer, M., Kuusivaara, P., Päkkilä, T. & Suonio, A. (2015a). *Insights : Course 1* (2nd-7th ed.). Helsinki: Otava.

Karapalo, E., Keltto, P., Kilmer, M., Kuusivaara, P., Päkkilä, T. & Suonio, A. (2015b). *Insights : Course 2* (6th ed.). Helsinki: Otava.

Other references:

Bygate, M. (1987). *Speaking*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, *1*(1), 1–47. doi:10.1093/applin/I.1.1

Council of Europe (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge, U.K: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.

Council of Europe (2018). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume with New Descriptors*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Celce-Murcia, M., Brinton, D. M. & Goodwin, J. M. (Eds.) (2010). *Teaching pronunciation: A course book and reference guide* (2nd ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Derwing, T. M., Diepenbroek, L. G. & Foote, J. A. (2012). How well do general-skills ESL textbooks address pronunciation? *TESL Canada Journal 30*(1), 22–44. doi:10.18806/tesl.v30i1.1124

Derwing, T. M. & Munro, M. J. (2015). *Pronunciation fundamentals: evidence-based perspectives for L2 teaching and research*. Amsterdam, Netherlands; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Deterding, D. (2015). Segmentals. In M. Reed & J. M. Levis (Eds.), *The handbook of English pronunciation* (pp. 69–84). Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Henderson, A., Curnick, L., Frost, D., Kautzsch, A., Kirkova-Naskova, A., Levey, D., Tergujeff, E., & Waniek-Klimczak, E. (2015). The English Pronunciation Teaching in Europe Survey : Factors Inside and Outside the Classroom. In J. A. Mompean, & J. Fouz-González (Eds.), *Investigating English Pronunciation : Current Trends and Directions* (pp. 260–291). Palgrave Macmillan. doi:10.1057/9781137509437_12

Henderson, A. & Jarosz, A. (2014). Desperately seeking a communicative approach: English pronunciation in a sample of French and Polish secondary school textbooks. *Research in Language 12*(3), 261–278. doi:10.2478/rela-2014-0015

Hietala, J. (2015). *Finnish upper secondary school EFL teachers' satisfaction with current textbooks*. Unpublished Pro Gradu Thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of Languages and Communication Studies. https://jyx.jyu.fi/handle/123456789/45950

Hietala, M. (2013). *Practicing oral skills in Finnish upper secondary school EFL textbooks.* Unpublished Pro Gradu Thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of Languages and Communication Studies. https://jyx.jyu.fi/handle/123456789/41235

Hildén, R. (2000). Vieraan kielen puhuminen ja sen harjoittelu. In P. Kaikkonen & V. Kohonen (Eds.), *Minne menet, kielikasvatus?: Näkökulmia kielipedagogiikkaan* (pp. 169–180). Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopistopaino, opettajankoulutuslaitos.

Hirvonen, P. (1970). *Finnish and English communicative intonation*. Turku: University of Turku.

Hismanoglu, M. & Hismanoglu, S. (2010). Language teachers' preferences of pronunciation teaching techniques: traditional or modern? *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences 2*(2), 983–989. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.138

Jenkins, J. (2000). *The phonology of English as an international language: New models, new norms, new goals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Johnson, R. B. & Christensen, L. (2017). *Educational research : Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches* (6th ed. International student edition). Los Angeles: SAGE.

Johnson, R. L. & Morgan, G. B. (2016). *Survey scales : A guide to development, analysis and reporting*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Järvinen, A. (2017). *La prononciation du français dans les séries de manuels scolaires Escalier et J'aime.* Unpublished Pro Gradu thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of Languages and Communication Studies. https://jyx.jyu.fi/handle/123456789/54670#

Kaski-Akhawan, H. (2013). *Teaching and learning oral skills in Finnish upper secondary school: A study of students' and teachers' views on oral skills education* Unpublished Pro Gradu thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of Languages and Communication Studies. https://jyx.jyu.fi/handle/123456789/41259#

Kauppinen, J. (2015). *"Kattokaa nyt missä se kieli on": English and French teachers' views on pronunciation and its teaching*. Unpublished Pro Gradu thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of Languages and Communication Studies. https://jyx.jyu.fi/handle/123456789/45914

Krippendorff, K. (2019). *Content analysis: an introduction to its methodology* (4th ed.) Los Angeles: SAGE.

Kuronen, M. (2017). Ääntämisen foneettiset oppimiskohteet. In E. Tergujeff & M. Kautonen (Eds.), *Suullinen kielitaito: Opi, opeta arvioi* (pp. 59–74). Helsinki: Otava.

Lee, L. (2008). Enhancing learners' communication skills through synchronous electronic interaction and task-based instruction. *Foreign Language Annals 35*(1), 16–24. doi:10.1111/j.1944-9720.2002.tb01829.x

Levis, J. M. (2005). Changing contexts and shifting paradigms. *TESOL Quarterly, 39*(3), 369–377. doi:10.2307/3588485

Lintunen, P. & Dufva, H. (2017). Suullinen kielitaito: mallit ja tavoitteet. In E. Tergujeff & M. Kautonen (Eds.), *Suullinen kielitaito: Opi, opeta arvioi* (pp. 42–58). Helsinki: Otava.

Luukka, M-R., Pöyhönen, S., Huhta, A., Taalas, P., Tarnanen, M. & Keränen, A. (2008). *Maailma muuttuu – mitä tekee koulu? Äidinkielen ja vieraiden kielten tekstikäytänteet koulussa ja vapaa-ajalla*. University of Jyväskylä: Centre for Applied Language Studies.

MacDonald, S. (2002). Pronunciation: Views and practices of reluctant teachers. *Prospect*, *17*(3), 3–18. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285517759_Pronunciation-views_and_practices_of_reluctant_teachers

Morris-Wilson, I. (1992). *English segmental phonetics for Finns*. Helsinki: Finn Lectura.

Odisho, E. Y. (2003). *Techniques of teaching pronunciation in ESL, bilingual & foreign language classes*. München: Lincom Europa.

Finnish National Board of Education (2004). *National core curriculum for basic education 2004: National core curriculum for basic education intended for pupils in compulsory education*. Helsinki: National Board of Education.

Finnish National Board of Education (2016a). *National core curriculum for basic education 2014*. Helsinki: Finnish National Board of Education.

Finnish National Board of Education (2016b). *National core curriculum for general upper secondary schools 2015*. Helsinki: Finnish National Board of Education.

Opetushallitus (2019). *Lukion opetussuunnitelman perusteet 2019*. Helsinki: Finnish National Board of Education. https://www.oph.fi/sites/default/files/documents/lukion_opetussuunnitelman_perusteet_2019.pdf

Opetushallitus (2020a). *Opettajat ja rehtorit Suomessa 2019: Esi- ja perusopetuksen opettajat*. Finnish National Board of Education.

https://www.oph.fi/sites/default/files/documents/opettajat_ja_rehtorit_suo messa_2019_esi-_ja_perusopetuksen_opettajat.pdf

Opetushallitus (2020b). *Opettajat ja rehtorit Suomessa 2019: Lukiokoulutus*. Finnish National Board of Education. https://www.oph.fi/sites/default/files/documents/opettajat_ja_rehtorit_suo messa_2019_lukiokoulutus.pdf

Paananen-Porkka, M.M. (2007). *Speech rhythm in an interlanguage perspective. Finnish adolescents speaking English.* Helsinki: University of Helsinki.

Pasanen, E. (2007). *Ausspracheübungen in finnischen DaF-Lehrwerken : Eine Untersuchung an sechs Lehrwerkserien für die Anfängerstufe*. Unpublished Pro Gradu thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of Languages and Communication Studies. https://jyx.jyu.fi/handle/123456789/11449

Peer, W. v., Hakemulder, J. & Zyngier, S. (2012). *Scientific methods for the humanities*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Pennington, M. C. & Rogerson-Revell, P. (2019). *English pronunciation teaching and research: Contemporary perspectives*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Reynolds, H. T. (1984). *Analysis of nominal data* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc. https://www.doi.org/10.4135/9781412983303

Rivers, W. M. (1981). *Teaching foreign language skills* (2nd ed.). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Rogerson-Revell, P. (2011). *English phonology and pronunciation teaching*. London: Continuum.

Salenius, A. (2011). *Taking it a tad further : Comparing English and Swedish course materials in terms of presenting prosody and accent variation*. [Master's Thesis, University of Jyväskylä]. JYX. https://jyx.jyu.fi/handle/123456789/37172

Salo-Lee, L. (1991). Vieraiden kielten puheviestintä. In K. Yli-Renko & L. Salo-Lee (Eds.), *Vieraiden kielten puheviestintä ja sen oppiminen käytännössä* (pp. 1–24). Turku: Turun yliopiston opettajankoulutuslaitos.

Sobkowiak, W. (2012). This is Tom = /zyzys'tom/. Pronunciation in beginners' EFL textbooks then and now. *Research in Language 10*(1), 111–122. doi:10.2478/v10015-011-0028-7

Suomi, K., Toivanen, J. & Ylitalo, R. (2006). *Fonetiikan ja suomen äänneopin perusteet*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Szpyra-Kozłowska, J. (2015). *Pronunciation in EFL instruction: A research-based approach.* Bristol ; Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.

Tergujeff, E. (2010). Pronunciation teaching materials in Finnish EFL textbooks. In A. Henderson (ed.), *English Pronunciation: Issues and Practices (EPIP): Proceedings of the First International Conference, June 3–5 2009, Université de Savoie, Chambéry, France.* Université de Savoie: Laboratoire LLS, 189–205.

Tergujeff, E., Ullakonoja, R. & Dufva, H. (2011). Phonetics and Foreign Language Teaching in Finland. In S. Werner & T. Kinnunen (Eds.), *XXVI Fonetiikan päivät 2010* (pp. 63–68). Joensuu: Itä-Suomen yliopisto.

Tergujeff, E. (2012a). The English Pronunciation Teaching in Europe Survey: Finland. *Apples – Journal of Applied Language Studies 6*(1), 29–45. JYX. https://jyx.jyu.fi/handle/123456789/40607

Tergujeff, E. (2012b). English pronunciation teaching: Four case studies from Finland. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research* 3(4), 599–607. doi:10.4304/jltr.3.4.599-607

Tergujeff, E. (2013). *English pronunciation teaching in Finland.* Jyväskylä Studies in Humanities 207. University of Jyväskylä. https://jyx.jyu.fi/handle/123456789/41900

Tergujeff, E. & Kautonen, M. (2017). Suullinen kielitaito ja sen tärkeys. In E. Tergujeff & M. Kautonen (Eds.), *Suullinen kielitaito: Opi, opeta arvioi* (pp. 12–21). Helsinki: Otava.

Tergujeff, E. (2017a). Ääntäminen – keskeiset kielikohtaiset oppimiskohteet: Englanti. In E. Tergujeff & M. Kautonen (Eds.), *Suullinen kielitaito: Opi, opeta arvioi* (pp. 170–171). Helsinki: Otava.

Tergujeff, E. (2017b). Materiaalit suullisen kielitaidon opetuksessa. In E. Tergujeff & M. Kautonen (Eds.), *Suullinen kielitaito: Opi, opeta arvioi* (pp. 85–95). Helsinki: Otava.

Trofimovich, P., Kennedy, S. & Foote, J. A. (2015). Variables affecting L2 pronunciation development. In M. Reed & J. M. Levis (Eds.), *The handbook of English pronunciation* (pp. 353–373). Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.

Ullakonoja, R. & Dufva, H. (2017). Ääntämisen oppiminen ja siihen vaikuttavat tekijät. In E. Tergujeff & M. Kautonen (Eds.), *Suullinen kielitaito: Opi, opeta arvioi* (pp. 22–41). Helsinki: Otava.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: PRONUNCIATION IN THE CEFR (2018: 136)

PHONOLOGICAL CONTROL	OVERALL PHONOLOGICAL CONTROL	SOUND ARTICULATION	PROSODIC FEATURES
C2	Can employ the full range of phonological features in the target language with a high level of control – including prosodic features such as word and sentence stress, rhythm and intonation – so that the finer points of his/her message are clear and precise. Intelligibility and effective conveyance of and enhancement of meaning are not affected in any way by features of accent that may be retained from other language(s).	Can articulate virtually all the sounds of the target language with clarity and precision.	Can exploit prosodic features (e.g. stress, rhythm and intonation) appropriately and effectively in order to convey finer shades of meaning (e.g. to differentiate and emphasise).
C1	Can employ the full range of phonological features in the target language with sufficient control to ensure intelligibility throughout. Can articulate virtually all the sounds of the target language; some features of accent retained from other language(s) may be noticeable, but they do not affect intelligibility.	Can articulate virtually all of the sounds of the target language with a high degree of control. He/she can usually self-correct if he/she noticeably mispronounces a sound.	Can produce smooth, intelligible spoken discourse with only occasional lapses in control of stress, rhythm and/or intonation, which do not affect intelligibility or effectiveness. Can vary intonation and place stress correctly in order to express precisely what he/she means to say.
B2	Can generally use appropriate intonation, place stress correctly and articulate individual sounds clearly; accent tends to be influenced by other language(s) he/she speaks, but has little or no effect on intelligibility.	Can articulate a high proportion of the sounds in the target language clearly in extended stretches of production; is intelligible throughout, despite a few systematic mispronunciations. Can generalise from his/her repertoire to predict the phonological features of most unfamiliar words (e.g. word stress) with reasonable accuracy (e.g. whilst reading).	Can employ prosodic features (e.g. stress, intonation, rhythm) to support the message he/she intends to convey, though with some influence from other languages he/she speaks.
B1	Pronunciation is generally intelligible; can approximate intonation and stress at both utterance and word levels. However, accent is usually influenced by other language(s) he/she speaks.	Is generally intelligible throughout, despite regular mispronunciation of individual sounds and words he/she is less familiar with.	Can convey his/her message in an intelligible way in spite of a strong influence on stress, intonation and/or rhythm from other language(s) he/she speaks.
A2	Pronunciation is generally clear enough to be understood, but conversational partners will need to ask for repetition from time to time. A strong influence from other language(s) he/she speaks on stress, rhythm and intonation may affect intelligibility, requiring collaboration from interlocutors. Nevertheless, pronunciation of familiar words is clear.	Pronunciation is generally intelligible when communicating in simple everyday situations, provided the interlocutor makes an effort to understand specific sounds. Systematic mispronunciation of phonemes does not hinder intelligibility, provided the interlocutor makes an effort to recognise and adjust to the influence of the speaker's language background on pronunciation.	Can use the prosodic features of everyday words and phrases intelligibly, in spite of a strong influence on stress, intonation and/or rhythm from other language(s) he/she speaks. Prosodic features (e.g. word stress) are adequate for familiar, everyday words and simple utterances.
A1	Pronunciation of a very limited repertoire of learnt words and phrases can be understood with some effort by interlocutors used to dealing with speakers of the language group concerned. Can reproduce correctly a limited range of sounds as well as the stress on simple, familiar words and phrases.	Can reproduce sounds in the target language if carefully guided. Can articulate a limited number of sounds, so that speech is only intelligible if the interlocutor provides support (e.g. by repeating correctly) and by eliciting repetition of new sounds).	Can use the prosodic features of a limited repertoire of simple words and phrases intelligibly, in spite of a very strong influence on stress, rhythm, and/or intonation from other language(s) he/she speaks; his/her interlocutor needs to be collaborative.

APPENDIX 2: THE TRANSLATED QUESTIONNAIRE

The role, content, methods, and tools in the teaching of English pronunciation in basic education and upper secondary school

This questionnaire is part of a master's thesis in which the aim is to research the role of pronunciation in English textbooks and teaching in basic education and upper secondary school. The role of pronunciation in textbooks is studied with textbook analysis, while its role in teaching is researched with this questionnaire that is aimed at teachers who teach English in basic education or in upper secondary school. The major themes of the questions regard the time spent on pronunciation teaching in classroom, the contents of the teaching, and the methods and tools used in pronunciation teaching. The questionnaire consists of multiple-choice questions, Likert scale questions and open-ended questions. The response time is around 15-20 minutes.

The questionnaire will be filled in anonymously, and the respondent cannot be identified based on the background variables (gender, age, school level, and teaching experience). No identifiable personal information is collected. The responses of the questionnaire are solely for the data of the study, and they will be treated only by the researcher. The data obtained from the questionnaire will be destroyed after finishing the study.

By responding this questionnaire, you give permission to use your responses in the study.

The contact information of the thesis writer and her instructor: not included in this version

Background information

1. **Gender**
   □ Male
   □ Female
   □ I do not want to tell

2. **Age**
   □ 20–29 years
   □ 30–39 years
   □ 40–49 years
   □ 50–59 years
   □ 60–69 years

3. **I teach in... (you can choose more than one option if you teach at more than one level)**
   □ Elementary school
   □ Secondary school
   □ Upper secondary school

4. **Teaching experience**
   □ 0–5 years
   □ Over 5 years
   □ Over 10 years
   □ Over 20 years
   □ Over 30 years
   □ Over 40 years

The role of pronunciation in your teaching

This section deals with your views on the importance, difficulty, and goals of teaching English pronunciation. In addition, you will evaluate the amount of time you spend on teaching pronunciation.

5. **How important do you consider the teaching of pronunciation?**
   □ Not important at all
   □ Not very important
   □ Quite important
   □ Very important

6. **You can elaborate on the previous answer if you want.**

7. **Do you consider the teaching of pronunciation difficult?**
   □ Yes
   □ Yes, some parts of it
   □ Not

8. **You can elaborate on the previous answer if you want.**

9. **In your opinion, what should be the goal or goals of pronunciation teaching? You can choose more than one option.**
   □ As native-like pronunciation as possible
   □ Intelligibility
   □ Smooth communication
   □ Getting rid of (Finnish) accent

10. **Approximately, how often do you teach pronunciation?**

□ Every lesson
□ Approximately every second lesson
□ Approximately every third lesson
□ Approximately every fourth lesson
□ Approximately every fifth lesson
□ Less than every fifth lesson
□ Never

11. **If you teach English at more than one level, does the amount of pronunciation teaching vary between the different levels? How?**

12. **Do you think you teach enough pronunciation?**
    □ Yes
    □ No
    □ I do not know

13. **You responded that you think that you do not teach enough pronunciation. Check the factors that you consider to be the reasons behind this.**
    □ I do not consider pronunciation very important
    □ Lack of time
    □ Uncertainty of my own pronunciation
    □ Uncertainty of my skills to teach pronunciation
    □ Shortages in teacher education
    □ Lack of suitable teaching materials
    □ Lack of testing in exams and the Matriculation Examination
    □ Students learn pronunciation in their free time
    □ Other reasons, what?

The content of pronunciation teaching

This section focuses on the content of your pronunciation teaching and the factors that influence or guide it. In this questionnaire, 'content' refers to the teaching of individual sounds and prosodic features (stress, intonation, and rhythm) and the use of phonetic symbols. In addition, your thoughts about the importance and difficulty of teaching sounds and prosody will be treated.

14. **Do you teach your students to <u>recognize</u> phonetic symbols?**
    □ Yes
    □ Some of them
    □ No

15. **Do you teach your students to <u>write</u> phonetic symbols?**

□ Yes
□ Some of them
□ No

16. **If you teach English at more than one level, does your use of phonetic symbols differ between the levels? How?**

17. **How often do you teach the following sounds or prosodic features?**
    1= never, 2= rarely, 3= sometimes, 4= often

	1	2	3	4	I do not know
Diphthongs (e.g. /eɪ/ ja /aɪ/) *	○	○	○	○	○
Vowel quality (the way of pronouncing, the position of articulatory organs) *	○	○	○	○	○
Vowel length *	○	○	○	○	○
Plosives /p,b,t,d,k,g/ *	○	○	○	○	○
Sibilants /s,z,ʃ,ʒ/ *	○	○	○	○	○
Dental fricatives /θ,ð/ *	○	○	○	○	○
Other fricatives /f,v,h/ *	○	○	○	○	○
Affricates /tʃ,dʒ/ *	○	○	○	○	○
Nasals /m,n,ŋ/ *	○	○	○	○	○
Lateral /l/ *	○	○	○	○	○
Approximants /w,r,j/ *	○	○	○	○	○
Intonation *	○	○	○	○	○
Word stress *	○	○	○	○	○
Sentence stress *	○	○	○	○	○
Rhythm *	○	○	○	○	○

18. **If you teach at more than one level, does the content of your pronunciation teaching vary between the different levels? How?**

19. **Which of the following factors guide or influence the content of your pronunciation teaching the most? You can choose multiple options.**
    □ The content of the textbook
    □ Curricula
    □ Research and literature of the field concerning what aspects of pronunciation should be taught
    □ I emphasize elements that differ or do not exist in Finnish (e.g., different word stress or dental fricatives /θ, ð/ that do not exist in Finnish)

□ I emphasize elements that are close to the Finnish equivalents and are thus easier to accidentally hear and pronounce similarly to Finnish (e.g., pronouncing /ɪ/ sound as the Finnish /i/ sound)
□ I emphasize elements whose production requires more motorically and are thus perhaps more difficult to learn
□ I emphasize elements, that are less universal (i.e., rarer in other languages) and thus perhaps more difficult
□ I emphasize elements whose differences in pronunciation and orthography can cause difficulties
□ I emphasize practicing sounds that are in opposition and somewhat similar to each other, which means that errors can easily lead to misunderstandings (e.g., 'fan' ja 'van' tai 'buy' ja 'pie')
□ Students' wishes and needs
□ Students' age
□ My own strengths and weaknesses
□ Other factors, what?

20. **If you want, you can tell more about factors guiding your pronunciation teaching and/or elaborate on your thoughts regarding the options in the previous question.**

21. **Answer the following statements**
    1 = I totally disagree, 2 = I disagree to a certain extent, 3 = I do not disagree or agree, 4 = I agree to a certain extent 5 = I totally agree

	1	2	3	4	5	I do not know
I teach enough individual sounds *	○	○	○	○	○	○
I teach enough prosody *	○	○	○	○	○	○
Prosody and sounds are equally important *	○	○	○	○	○	○
Prosody is more important than sounds *	○	○	○	○	○	○
Sounds are more important than prosody *	○	○	○	○	○	○
Teaching sounds is diffcult *	○	○	○	○	○	○
Teaching prosody is diffult *	○	○	○	○	○	○

22. **You responded that you do not teach enough sounds or prosody (options 1 and 2). What are, in your opinion, the reasons behind this?**

Teaching methods

This section of the questionnaire deals with the different methods that can be used in pronunciation teaching. Your task is to estimate how often you use each method in pronunciation teaching. If you cannot estimate this, you can answer " I do not know". Most of the methods have been explained and provided with an example to better demonstrate the idea. At the end of the page, you have an opportunity to tell about other possible methods that you use.

23. **How often do you use each of these methods when teaching English pronunciation? 1= never, 2= rarely, 3= sometimes, 4= often**

	1	2	3	4	I do not know
Listen and repeat (sounds, words, sentences) *	○	○	○	○	○
Reading aloud alone or with a parner. Sounds, words, sentences, texts, dialogues etc. No communicative meaning or information seeking, **the focus is on pronunciation.** *	○	○	○	○	○
Phonetic training. Practicing pronunciation with the help of phonetic symbols. Students can, for example, write sounds/words/sentences they hear in phonetic symbols or write in normal orthography/read aloud text written in phonetic symbols. *	○	○	○	○	○
Minimal pair drills *	○	○	○	○	○
Tongue twisters *	○	○	○	○	○
Corrective feedback. Either direct or indirect correction of a student's incorrect pronunciation. *	○	○	○	○	○
Ear training/listening discrimination (e.g., recognizing or distinguishing between different sounds, or placing word stress based on what is heard). *	○	○	○	○	○
Spelling and dictation. Student writes down sounds/words/sentences based on what is heard. *	○	○	○	○	○
Rules. Giving explicit rules on the placement of sounds or prosodic features. *	○	○	○	○	○
Poems and rhymes so that the focus is on pronunciation. *	○	○	○	○	○
Practices that raise students' awareness. Awareness of the status of English and its different variants or of different learning styles regarding pronunciation, etc. Learning journals, questionnaires, and self-evaluations concerning pronunciation can be utilized. *	○	○	○	○	○
Visual reinforcement. For example, linking sounds to colors or using large sound cards that have the phonetic symbol, a word in which it occurs, and a picture showing how the sound is produced in mouth. The cards can be classified according to different attributes. *	○	○	○	○	○
Auditory reinforcement. For instance, associating the /tʃ/ sound with the sound of a moving train. *	○	○	○	○	○

Tactile reinforcement. Fostering learning through the sense of touch. For example, focusing on the position of the tongue or feeling the vibration of vocal cords or aspiration in front of the mouth. *	○	○	○	○	○
Kinesthetic reinforcement. Learning through movement. For example, rising intonation -> raising hands, or stress -> thumping one's feet. *	○	○	○	○	○
Games and plays focusing on pronunciation *	○	○	○	○	○
Recording students' production. Recordings can be used for evaluation, self-assessments or feedback from the teacher and peers. *	○	○	○	○	○
Drama techniques. For example, techniques related to voice control and the use of voice, and relaxation and breathing techniques. *	○	○	○	○	○
"Developmental approximation drills" = developing students' pronunciations by following the typical learning path of native speakers. For instance, native speakers of English usually learn the sound /w/ before the sound /r/. Thus, students who have difficulties with /r/ can start by practicing sounds that start with /w/ and then move on to words starting with /r/	○	○	○	○	○

24. **If you teach English at more than one level, do your methods differ between them? How?**

25. **Do you use other techniques? What? How often?**

Materials, tools, and technology

In this last section of the questionnaire, the materials, tools, and technologies that you use in pronunciation teaching will be dealt with. After the list, you have an opportunity to tell freely about other possible tools that you use. Finally, your opinion about pronunciation materials provided by EFL textbooks will be asked. There is an open text field at the end of the questionnaire that you can utilize by adding anything to any of the sections or themes of this questionnaire or, for example, by giving feedback on the questionnaire itself.

26. **How often do you use the following materials, tools, and technologies when teaching pronunciation? 1= never, 2= rarely, 3= sometimes, 4=often**

	1	2	3	4	I do not know
The exercises and materials in the textbook *	○	○	○	○	○
The digital/online materials of the textbook *	○	○	○	○	○
Different websites *	○	○	○	○	○
Songs, poems, and rhymes *	○	○	○	○	○
Audios or videos *	○	○	○	○	○
Language lab *	○	○	○	○	○
Mobile phones or tablets *	○	○	○	○	○
Mobile applications or different software related to pronunciation *	○	○	○	○	○
Different visual aids (e.g. vowel charts or pictures of the positions of articulatory organs) *	○	○	○	○	○
Kazoo (a musical instrument that changes the voice of the speaker with the help of a vibrating membrane; can be used for example to better observe intonation) *	○	○	○	○	○
Mirror (e.g., to show the positions of articulatory organs) *	○	○	○	○	○
Rubber bands (e.g., to demonstrate stress) *	○	○	○	○	○
Feather (e.g., to demonstrate aspiration) *	○	○	○	○	○

27. **Do you use other materials, tools, or technologies in pronunciation teaching and how often?**

28. **If you teach English at more than one level, do the materials, tools, and technologies that you use differ between the levels? How?**

29. **Pronunciation materials in textbooks. Answer the following statements. 1= I totally disagree, 2= I disagree to a certain extent, 3= I do not disagree or agree, 4= I agree to a certain extent, 5= I totally agree**

	1	2	3	4	5	I do not know
Textbooks offer enough material for the teaching of individual sounds *	○	○	○	○	○	○
Textbooks offer enough material for the teaching of prosody *	○	○	○	○	○	○

30. **What are you particularly satisfied with when it comes to pronunciation materials in textbooks? What aspects would need improvements or additions?**

31. **Other comments or additions? You can complement your responses to any of the questions, discuss your thoughts related to pronunciation, or give feedback on the questionnaire.**

APPENDIX 3: THE CONTENT OF PRONUNCIATION TEACHING

Content	1	2	3	4	I do not know	Mean	SEM	SD	Me-dian
Word stress	1 (1%)	4 (4%)	40 (41%)	52 (54%)	0 (0%)	3.4742	.06404	0.6307	4
Sibilants /s, z, ʃ, ʒ/	2 (2%)	5 (5%)	36 (37%)	53 (55%)	1 (1%)	3.4583	.07089	0.6946	4
Dental fric-atives/θ, ð/	2 (2%)	9 (9%)	39 (40%)	47 (49%)	0 (0%)	3.3505	.07479	0.7366	3
Affricates /tʃ, dʒ/	3 (3.1%)	6 (6.2%)	45 (46.4%)	43 (44.3%)	0 (0%)	3.3196	.07407	0.7295	3
Plosives /p, b, t, d, k, g/	0 (0%)	11 (11%)	47 (49%)	38 (39%)	1 (1%)	3.2812	.06738	0.6602	3
Intonation	1 (1%)	16 (17%)	39 (40%)	41 (42%)	0 (0%)	3.2371	.07723	0.7607	3
Other frica-tives /f, v, h/	3 (3.1%)	21 (21.6%)	50 (51.6%)	20 (20.6%)	3 (3.1%)	2.9255	.07748	0.7512	3
Sentence stress	5 (5%)	31 (32%)	35 (36%)	25 (26%)	1 (1%)	2.8333	.08967	0.8786	3
Vowel length	4 (4.1%)	26 (26.8%)	47 (48.5%)	17 (17.5%)	3 (3.1%)	2.8191	.07998	0.7755	3
Rhythm	8 (8%)	33 (34%)	34 (35%)	20 (21%)	2 (2%)	2.6947	.09234	0.9	3
Approxi-mants /w, r, j/	9 (9.3%)	33 (34%)	40 (41.2%)	9 (9.3%)	6 (6.2%)	2.5385	0.8460	0.807	3
Vowel quality	16 (17%)	28 (29%)	35 (36%)	14 (14%)	4 (4%)	2.5054	.09864	0.9512	3
Diphthongs (e.g., /eɪ/ and /aɪ/)	19 (20%)	27 (28%)	37 (38%)	8 (8%)	6 (6%)	2.3736	.09588	0.9147	2
Nasals/m, n, ŋ/	21 (22%)	41 (42%)	31 (32%)	1 (1%)	3 (3%)	2.1277	.07893	0.7653	2
Lateral /l/	23 (23.71%)	47 (48.45%)	21 (21.65%)	1 (1.03%)	5 (5.16%)	2	.07572	0.7263	2

SEM= Standard error of mean, SD= Standard deviation. NB! Those who responded "I do not know" have been omitted from the calculations.

APPENDIX 4: THE FREQUENCY OF USE OF DIFFERENT PRO-
NUNCIATION TEACHING METHODS

Method	1	2	3	4	I do not know	Mean	SEM	SD	Median
Listen and re-peat	0 (0%)	2 (2%)	13 (13%)	81 (84%)	1 (1%)	3.8229	.04441	0.4352	4
Read aloud	4 (4%)	3 (3%)	26 (27%)	64 (66%)	0 (0%)	3.5464	.07618	0.75029	4
Correc-tive feed-back	2 (2%)	11 (11%)	47 (49%)	36 (37%)	1 (1%)	3.2188	.07434	0.7284	3
Ear train-ing	2 (2.1%)	21 (21.6%)	48 (49.5%)	25 (25.8%)	1 (1%)	3	.07695	0.7539	3
Tongue twisters	5 (5%)	31 (32%)	44 (45%)	15 (16%)	2 (2%)	2.7263	.08120	0.7915	3
Minimal pair drills	11 (11.3%)	25 (25.8%)	44 (45.4%)	13 (13.4%)	4 (4.1%)	2.6344	.09017	0.8696	3
Spelling and dicta-tion	9 (9%)	37 (38%)	35 (36%)	16 (17%)	0 (0%)	2.5979	.08873	0.87393	3
Tactile re-inforce-ment	16 (16.5%)	33 (34%)	30 (30.9%)	16 (16.5%)	2 (2.1%)	2.4842	.09911	0.9661	2
Record-ing stu-dents' produc-tions	20 (21%)	26 (27%)	36 (37%)	14 (14%)	1 (1%)	2.4583	.10035	0.9832	3
Poems, rhymes, and songs	21 (22%)	42 (43%)	24 (25%)	10 (10%)	0 (0%)	2.2371	.09242	0.91028	2
Rules	21 (22%)	40 (41%)	29 (30%)	5 (5%)	2 (2%)	2.1895	.08635	0.8417	2
Auditory reinforce-ment	40 (41.2%)	20 (20.6%)	19 (19.6%)	18 (18.6%)	0 (0%)	2.1546	.11755	1.15777	2
Aware-ness-rais-ing	29 (30%)	35 (36%)	29 (30%)	4 (4%)	0 (0%)	2.0825	.08875	0.87405	2
Phonetic training	18 (18.56%)	51 (52.58%)	25 (25.77%)	3 (3.09%)	0 (0%)	2.1340	.07563	0.74483	2

Kines-thetic re-inforce-ment	47 (48.5%)	30 (31%)	15 (15.5%)	5 (5%)	0 (0%)	1.7732	.09094	0.89565	2
Games and plays	45 (46.4%)	39 (40.2%)	12 (12.4%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	1.6804	.07407	0.72953	2
Drama tech-niques	70 (72%)	19 (19%)	5 (5%)	2 (2%)	1 (1%)	1.3646	.06965	0.6824	1
Visual re-inforce-ment	79 (81.4%)	11 (11.3%)	5 (5.2%)	2 (2.1%)	0 (0%)	1.2784	.06675	0.65737	1
Develop-mental approxi-mation drills	90 (93%)	4 (4%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	2 (2%)	1.0737	.03739	0.3644	1

SEM= Standard error of mean, SD= Standard deviation. NB! Those who responded "I do not know" have been omitted from the calculations.

APPENDIX 5: THE USE OF DIFFERENT PRONUNCIATION TEACHING METHODS BETWEEN THE SCHOOL LEVELS

Method	Level	Mode	Me-dian	Mean	SEM	SD	Kruskal-Wallis test
Listen and re-peat	E (n=31)	4	4	4	.000	.000	H value= 12.331
	S (n=17)	4	4	3.76	.106	.437	df= 2
	US (n= 29)	4	4	3.59	.117	.628	Exact Sig. *p*= .002
Correc-tive feed-back	E (n=31)	4	4	3.71	.083	.461	H value= 21.936
	S (n=17)	3	3	2.82	.214	.883	df= 2
	US (n=29)	3	3	3.03	.116	.626	Exact Sig. *p*= .000
Ear training	E (n=31)	4	3	3.26	.154	.855	H value= 8.942
	S (n=17)	3	3	3.12	.169	.697	df= 2
	US (n=29)	3	3	2.72	.110	.591	Exact Sig. *p*=.010
Poems, rhymes, songs	E (n=31)	3	3	2.84	.154	.860	H value= 25.431
	S (n=17)	2	2	1.82	.154	.636	df= 2
	US (n=30)	2	2	1.73	.135	.740	Exact Sig. *p*= .000
Audi-tory re-inforce-ment	E (n=31)	3	3	2.94	.191	1.063	H value= 26.093
	S (n=17)	1	1	1.65	.226	.931	df= 2
	US (n=30)	1	1	1.47	.157	.860	Exact Sig. *p*= .000
Tactile rein-force-ment	E (n=30)	3	3	2.97	.155	.850	H value= 13.336
	S (n=17)	2	2	2.24	.235	.970	df= 2
	US (n=29)	2	2	2.07	.178	.961	Exact Sig. *p*= .001
Kines-thetic rein-force-ment	E (n=31)	1	2	2.16	.186	1.036	H value= 10.407
	S (n=17)	1	1	1.59	.173	.712	df= 2
	US (n=30)	1	1	1.40	.132	.724	Exact Sig. *p*= .005
Games and plays	E (n=31)	2	2	2.10	.156	.870	H value= 13.021
	S (n=17)	1	1	1.53	.151	.624	df= 2
	US (n=30)	1	1	1.37	.778	.556	Exact Sig. *p*= .001

SEM= Standard error of mean, SD= Standard deviation. NB! Those who responded "I do not know" have been omitted from the calculations.

APPENDIX 6: THE FREQUENCY OF USE OF DIFFERENT RESOURCES IN PRONUNCIATION TEACHING

Material/tool/technology	1	2	3	4	I do not know	Mean	SEM	SD	Median
Exercises and materials in textbooks	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	10 (10%)	86 (89%)	0 (0%)	3.876	.03666	.36107	4
Online materials of textbooks	3 (3%)	5 (5%)	20 (21%)	68 (70%)	1 (1%)	3.5938	.07489	.7338	4
Audios and videos	10 (10%)	25 (26%)	34 (35%)	27 (28%)	1 (1%)	2.8125	.09858	.9659	3
Websites	11 (11%)	31 (32%)	40 (41%)	15 (16%)	0 (0%)	2.6082	.08981	.88455	3
Songs and poems	15 (15.5%)	31 (32%)	32 (33%)	19 (19.5%)	0 (0%)	2.5670	.09930	.97796	3
Mobile phones and tablets	22 (23%)	31 (32%)	30 (31%)	13 (13%)	1 (1%)	2.3542	.10041	.9839	2
(Mobile) applications and software	52 (54%)	31 (32%)	8 (8%)	5 (5%)	1 (1%)	1.6458	.08632	.8458	1
Visual aids	74 (76%)	15 (16%)	7 (7%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	1.3299	.06671	.65704	1
Feathers	84 (87%)	5 (5%)	7 (7%)	1(1%)	0 (0%)	1.2268	.06304	.62091	1
Language lab	84 (87%)	7 (7%)	3 (3%)	2 (2%)	1 (1%)	1.1979	.06037	.5915	1
Mirror	86 (89%)	10 (10%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1.1237	.03666	.36107	1
Kazoo	96 (99%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1.0103	.01031	.10153	1
Rubber bands	96 (99%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1.0103	.01031	.10153	1

SEM= Standard error of mean, SD= Standard deviation. NB! Those who responded "I do not know" have been omitted from the calculations.