〈原著論文〉

Raising awareness of L1 interference: Implicit versus explicit consciousness raising activities

Robert J. S. ROWLAND

Abstract

This pilot study examines the effect of explicit focus on form and implicit meaning focused instruction on improvement of L1 pronunciation interference in English of a L1 Farsi speaker. Treatment over a 4-week treatment period was designed to increase consciousness of typical English pronunciation errors for L1 Farsi speakers. Data gathered during treatment and the results of the post-treatment test indicate potential for short-term improvement in both reception and production of challenging phonemes, especially through explicit, focus on form teaching.

Key words: English pronunciation, L1 interference, Explicit instruction, Implicit instruction, Focus on form

Many second language learners try to develop a native-like accent in their second language. However, gaining a native-like accent is difficult for most learners who start learning a second language after puberty. That said, students turn to their teachers for guidance on how to improve their accent, and there exists little advice in the literature as to how to guide learners from certain first-language backgrounds to better English pronunciation in a short period of time. As Jenkins (2001) noted, it is most practical and relevant to focus language learning effort on pronunciation issues that are essential for intelligibility rather than to reduce all foreign accent. The current study examined the effect of implicit and explicit consciousness raising activities on a learner's ability to both notice and correct first-language artifacts in English that impede communication. This study also facilitates an argument for a specific type of course and material design which may lead learners to timely improvement of first language influence.(1)

Literature Review

Research to date on teaching pronunciation to second language learners can be divided into

人文学部・欧米文化学科
論文受理日 2020 年 11 月 20 日

two different strands. The first has examined the effectiveness of different instructional approaches. Derwing, Munro and Wiebe (1998), for instance, examined the effectiveness of teaching focused on suprasegmental aspects of speech and overall speaking habits of learners versus traditional pronunciation instruction focused on individual sounds and segments. Instruction in the treatment group was explicit and focused on word stress, rhythm, intonation, and fluency. It was found that this explicit instruction benefitted the learners' development of more comprehensible pronunciation. The second stream of pronunciation teaching research has examined the effectiveness of raising learner awareness of linguistic elements of the L2. Couper (2011) designed a study in which learners and the teacher agreed upon metalinguistic descriptors to be used when discussing pronunciation in an intensive listening environment. This study found that learner awareness of how pronunciation functions at its most basic level facilitated L2 skill development in both production and reception. Major (1987) suggested that the learners' conscious awareness will enable them to improve particular pronunciation errors. In their study, once learners had become consciously aware of a certain problematic pronunciation, they were more easily able to overcome it.

Although there have been studies about the effectiveness of metacognitive instruction on the acquisition of listening skills (Vandergrift & Goh, 2012), there has been comparatively little research into how awareness instruction facilitates L2 pronunciation improvement, beyond metalinguistic instruction (Kennedy, Blanchet, Trofimovich, 2014). Kennedy et. al further suggest through their study of French-as-L2 learners that learners instructed in a mix of focus on form, meaning, and fluency activities may be able to develop higher accuracy and fluency in their pronunciation.

In terms of instructional frameworks for L2 pronunciation instruction, Celce-Murcia, Brinton, and Goodwin (1996) proposed a communicative framework containing five stages; description and analysis, listening discrimination, controlled practice, guided practice, and communicative practice. This framework guides learners to practice from a more controlled phase of repetition to a more creative and communicative phase, gradually gaining more control over the target feature. Therefore, explicit pronucnation teaching such as form-focused teaching, self-monitoring practice, and listening discrimination was carried out first. Then, implicit pronunciation teaching, such as a gap fill exercise, role play and free speech followed.

Research into L2 English pronunciation instruction in Iran lacks robustness. Although it is widely recognized in the literature that issues with pronunciation can result in communicative breakdown (Brown, 2007), English instruction in Iran is largely focused on preparing students

for exams on which pronunciation has little effect on the outcome (Ghorbani, 2011). As a result, Iranian high school teachers rarely prioritize pronunciation in their curricula (Jahangard, 2007) which can then result in the learners' failure to communicate effectively due to fossilized mispronunciation later in their English education (Farhady, Jafarpoor, & Birjandi, 1994). Therefore, adult L1 Farsi English language learners, like the subject of this study, are highly likely to have fossilized L1 influence in their English pronunciation that may only be repairable through extensive effort, if at all.

This study examined a single L1 Farsi of learner for 4 weeks to determine whether or not fossilized L1 influence in L2 English pronunciation could be improved over a short period of time, despite a lack of explicit pronunciation instruction prior to the study. The research question for this study was as follows:

What kind of activities (explicit vs implicit instruction) are most effective for raising learner consciousness of fossilized L1 interference in a short time?

Methods

Participant

Hamid (pseudonym) was a 30 year-old Iranian refugee living in Glasgow, Scotland. His native language was Farsi, and he had been living in the UK for 1 year and 3 months at the time of the study. He had studied English formally for 11 years: 3 years in junior high school, 4 years in high school and 4 years at university. He finished his university studies 6 years prior to the study with a BA in English Translation, but had not studied English formally since. Hamid was planning to start a 2-year vocational program at a local college with a focus in computer science. He was interested in reducing the L1 influence of Farsi on his English pronunciation to better integrate into his education. He was particularly interested in "Americanizing" his accent because he felt that the local dialect in Glasgow was difficult to understand and was "too rural" to be widely comprehensible. He wanted to be understood by a wide range of speakers of English. At his university, he scored approximately 500 points on the TOEIC exam but felt that his ability at the time of the study was lower due to lack of practice. On the Common European Framework for Referencing Languages Self Assessment Grid, he rated himself as between B1 and B2 proficiency in both spoken interaction and production.

Administration of *The Vocabulary Size Test* (Nation & Beglar, 2007) indicated that Hamid had some gaps in his knowledge of the first 1,000 most frequently used English words, but displayed

a high degree of familiarity with the 2,000 and 3,000 frequency word list. This type of biased vocabulary knowledge is typical of learners who have spend more time in the language classroom than the natural L2 environment.

Potential problems in L1

Avery and Ehrlich (1992) described the possible problems of Farsi speakers with English consonant and vowel sounds. In particular, Farsi speakers are likely to substitute a /v/-like sound for /w/. They also generally substitute /t/ for /Θ/ and /d/ or even /t/ for /ð/. In addition, Farsi speakers may pronounce retroflex /r/ as a trill. They tend to insert a vowel between consonants when pronouncing words with initial consonant clusters, and add a vowel to words beginning with /s/, both in as a single consonant and as the first sound in consonant cluster. Farsi speakers produce vowel sounds between the tense and lax vowels of English because Farsi does not have this distinction. In addition, Farsi speakers may have difficulty distinguishing /ɛ/ and /æ/, and /ʌ/ and /a/.

Farsi has stress on the final syllable of words, so Farsi speakers may have difficulty producing stress on non-final syllables in English words. Moreover, unlike English, which is a stress-timed language, Farsi is a syllable-timed language and has no reduced vowels similar to the English schwa. Therefore, Farsi speakers may have difficulty producing the natural rhythmic pattern of English. A discussion of Hamid's particular pronunciation issues is included below.

Instruments

Several different diagnostic instruments were used to perform a needs analysis. First, a casual interview was conducted to assess pronunciation difficulties in free speech. This conversation included a brief self-introduction, an account of Hamid's English learning experience, a description of his current living situation and a self-diagnosed needs analysis. This interview was analyzed to determine which of the typical L1 Farsi problems were most apparent in his English pronunciation. A short follow-up interview was then conducted to gauge the learner's awareness of his own pronunciation problems. Both the initial interview and follow-up interview confirmed that the learner was aware of his problems distinguishing /w/ and /v/, /Θ/ and /ð/ and /t/ and adding /Ɛ/ to words that begin with /s/.

A focused diagnostic passage was then taken from Prator & Robinette (1957) and modified with special attention to 1) the learner's known vocabulary level and 2) L1 interference issues

listed above. This paragraph was then graded and revised until over 95% of the words fell within the Nation (2001) K1 and K2 words list. The remaining 5% of words from the Academic Words List (AWL) and off-list words were verbally confirmed with the learner prior to the focused diagnostic. The purpose of the above modifications was to minimize potential pronunciation issues caused by unfamiliar vocabulary, and better assess the treatment effect on pronunciation.

Following the needs analysis, several other instruments were used during the treatment to for both learning and assessment purposes. The University of Iowa Phonetics website (Phonetics: the sounds of American English, 2014) shows an animated Sammy Diagram of articulator movement during sound production and also includes videos of how the mouth looks from the outside during pronunciation of specific sounds. It is an interactive, visual guide to the pronunciation of phonemes of American English. This website was used to direct attention to the specific physical differences in the pronunciation of certain trouble sounds.

A list of words was generated and populated with items which were 1) used to elicit pronunciation of target sounds and 2) read aloud during listening distinction activities. A sentence list was also generated for the same purposes as the word list, but at the suprasegmental level.

A gap-fill activity worksheet intended to facilitate a dialogic interaction demanding the use of the target sounds. This sheet was used to encourage Hamid to produce and listen for the distinction between trouble sounds.

A wine menu was created specifically for the purpose of the roleplay between a waiter and a customer. It was intended to encourage Hamid to produce the distinction between /w/ and /ʍ/.

A speech prompt consisting of a list of sentence starters loosely organized by theme was introduced to facilitate an extended monologue on his life in the UK. It was intended to encourage Hamid to produce words beginning with /s/ (e.g. station) and /ɛs/ (e.g. essay). Examples of all materials are available on request. Hamid's interactions with each of the above materials were recorded, transcribed, and analyzed.

Procedure

Data collection

As the learner was located in Scotland and the researcher in Japan, face-to-face meetings

were impossible. Instead, lessons were conducted over the internet using a free video-chat protocol. Each lesson was recorded using a screen-capture program, and the video and audio were further analyzed using these recordings. All lesson materials were presented to the learner digitally. The learner engaged with the materials using a computer and sent results to the researchers through a shared document through a free file-sharing service.

Overview of sessions

A total of six sessions were conducted in this study. Two sessions focused on gathering information on learner background and performing a diagnostic of pronunciation problems. As a result of the general diagnostic and the diagnostic paragraph analysis, and given the project time limitation and the learner's proficiency level and needs, two pronunciation problems were selected for the study focus: substitution of /v/ for /w/, and vowel /ɛ/ insertion before initial /s/ sounds. In selecting these problems the researcher considered several factors. The learner was only able to participate in the study for four weeks after the diagnostic in week two. Due to the time limitation, it was concluded that emphasizing only one or two of the most persistent pronunciation errors was a reasonable goal for improvement. Second, pronunciation errors which cause low intelligibility and comprehensibility and affect learner confidence were considered, as these are what Jenkins (2001) suggest are the best to focus on. Vowel insertion adds an extra syllable to a word and makes a speaker less comprehensible and intelligible. The substitution of /v/ for /w/ does not impact comprehensibility or intelligibility in a drastically negative way but has a negative association in the society in which the learner lived and thus had a negative impact on learner confidence. Finally, Hamid's specific needs were taken into consideration. He was living in an English-speaking environment and used English to communicate with people daily. He was concerned with his ability both to integrate with and be treated as an intellectual equal by these people. Hamid was keenly aware of his typical pronunciation errors and he wanted to improve his pronunciation of /v/ and /w/ and eliminate initial vowel insertion.

Following diagnostic analysis, four lessons were conducted in four sessions, with two lessons focussed on the distinction between /v/ and /w/, and two on the insertion of /Ɛ/ before words beginning with /s/ sounds. To make the sessions easy for Hamid to follow, a similar structure was employed in each lesson. The first two lessons shared a similar structure, as did the second two lessons. All four lessons were organized based on the 5-stage sequence for pronunciation activities proposed by Celce-Murcia et. al. (2010) discussed above.

Table 1 is an overview of sessions with Hamid. Included for reference are: date of session, list of tasks for the session, materials necessarry for the tasks, and the purpose and objectives of each task.

Description of each session

In the first session, on July 8, Hamid was given a general diagnostic interview and vocabulary test. In the second session, on July 17, Hamid recorded the diagnostic paragraph. Background noise necessitated 4 different recordings. These unfortunate circumstances may have affected the data gathered.

The third session, on July 28, was the first of two lessons focused on the /v/ and /w/ sounds. This session began by accessing the University of Iowa website and studying and mimicking the target sounds. The second stage of the lesson was controlled practice of the target sounds using the word and sentence lists. Hamid had some trouble with the sentence list which may have been a consequence of the irregular rythm of the sentences and possible unknown vocabulary. The final stage of the third session also used the word and sentence list, this time for a listening discrimination activity in which the researcher read one of a pair of words or sentences, and Hamid was asked to identify correctly which of the pair was read.

The fourth session, conducted on July 29, followed an identical structure to session 3, but focused on the /s/ and /ɛs/ sounds. There were slight connection problems during this session, but neither the researcher nor Hamid felt they negatively affected the outcome of the lesson. The fifth session once again focused on /w/ and /v/ sounds. In the first stage of this lesson, Hamid was asked to describe and analyze the movements of his own mouth as he pronounced the target sounds on the word and sentence lists. In the second stage, guided practice of the target sounds was conducted using a gap fill activity which required Hamid to both produce and distinguish the target sounds. The final stage of the lesson was communicative practice of the target sounds in the form of a role play.

The sixth and final session was a lesson focused on the /s/ and /ɛs/ sounds. The session began with a review of the articulator movements necessary to produce the target sounds. Then, a gap fill activity similar to the one used in the previous session, modified to include the target sounds, was used for both productive and receptive practice. In the communicative practice stage, Hamid was given speech prompts to which encouraged production of the target sounds while focusing on natural, generative speech. The session finished with a final reading of the

Table 1

Overview of sessions

Sessions	Task	Materials	Purpose	Objectives
1. July 8, 2014	General Diagnostic *5 min* Vocabulary test *10 min*		To determine what areas the learner has trouble with in terms of pronunciation and current known vocabulary level	
2. July 17, 2014	Diagnostic paragraph reading *2 min*	Focused Diagnostic Passage	To further assess and confirm what specific pronunciation areas the learner needs to work with and decide the focus for the project	
3. July 28, 2014 Lesson 1	Description and analysis of sounds *7 min* Controlled Practice *5 min* Listening Discrimination *3 min*	University of Iowa Phonetics Website World List Sentence list World List Sentence list	To raise consciousness how to pronounce the sounds correctly To encourage the learner to develop self-monitoring methods for learning strategies To make the learner aware of these sounds and how they are different by providing receptive input	The student will be able to (AWBAST) understand how to English sounds/w/ and /v/ are produced. SWBAT pronounce English words with the consonant /w/ and /v/ accurately. SWBAT discriminate between the sound of the English consonant /w/ and /v/ when listening.
4. July 29, 2014 Lesson 2	Description and analysis of sounds *7 min* Controlled Practice *5 min* 	University of Iowa Phonetics Website Word List Sentence list World List	To raise consciousness of how to pronounce the sounds correctly To encourage the leamer to develop self-monitoring methods for learning strategies To make the leamer aware of these sounds and how they are different by providing receptive input	SWBAT understand how the English sounds /s/ and ɛ s/ are produced. SWBAT understand the difference of pronunciation between the English world with initial / ɛ and /s/. SWBAT pronounce English words with initial /s/ and / ɛ s/ and accurately. SWBAT discriminate between English words with

	Listening Discrimination *3 min*	Sentence list		initial / ɛ s/ and /s/ when listening.
5. July 31, 2014 Lesson 3	Description and analysis *5 min* Guided Practice - Gapfill Activity *8 min* Communicative Practice - Roleplay *7 min*	Word List Sentence list Gapfill Activity Wine Menu	To prime consciousness of target sounds To provide the learner the change to produce the practiced to produce the practiced sounds correctly To observe and confirm if the learner produce the practiced sounds correctly	SWBAT pronounce English words with the consonant /w/ and /v/ accurately. SWBAT understand and produce the target sounds in an activity. SWBAT use target sounds to give a suggestion.
6. August 1, 2014 Lesson 4	Description and analysis *5 min* Guided Practice - Gapfill Activity *7 min* Communicative Practice - Free speech *8 min* Final Diagnostic *2 min*	Review Gapfill activity Speech Prompt Focused Diagnostic Passage	To prime consciousness of target sounds To provide the learner the change to produce the practiced to produce the practiced sounds correctly To observe and confirm if the learner produce the practiced sounds correctly To assess what effect sessions had on the learner's ability to produce target sounds	SWBAT pronounce English words with initial /s/ and /ɛs/ and accurately. SWBAT understand and produce the target sounds in an activity. SWBAT produce target sounds in free speech.

Results

Table 2 summarizes the results from all diagnostics. Table 2 summarizes the results of each session.

Table 2

Accuracy of production of target phonemes in diagnostics

	/w/ (produced/total)	/v/ (produced/total)	/s/ (produced/total)	/ɛs/ (produced/total)
General diagnostic	2/6	8/8	11/16	0/0
Initial diagnostic	5/11	5/5	6/11	0/0
Final diagnostic	11/11	5/5	9/11	0/0

Table 3

Accuracy of production of target phonemes in each session across all activities

	/w/ (correct/attempts)	/v/ (correct/attempts)	/s/ (correct/attempts)	/ɛs/ (correct/attempts)
Session 1	69/78	34/36	8/12	0/0
Session 2	0/1	0/0	24/26	29/31
Session 3	110/124	65/68	14/15	0/0
Session 4	31/62	19/19	104/107	25/25

Data from each diagnostic and session has been broken down into the total number of instances of /w/, /v/, /s/ and /ɛs/ and the number of times each was correctly produced. There is a notable improvement in production of /w/ and /s/ from the initial to the final diagnostic.

The following tables contain data from individual activities in each lesson.

Table 4

Accuracy of target phonemes in lesson one by activity

Task		Sound	Correct
Self-monitoring practice (production)	Word list	/w/	15/15
		/v/	20/20
	Sentence list	/w/	42/48
		/v/	5/7
Listening distinction (receptive)	Word list	/w/	8/10
		/v/	2/3
	Sentence list	/w/	4/5
		/v/	6/6

All activities in lesson 1 had explicit instruction. There is a high level of accuracy in both productive and receptive instances of problem sounds.

Table 5

Accuracy of target phonemes in lesson two by activity

Task		Sound	Correct
Self-Monitoring practice (production)	Word list	/s/	8/8
		/ɛs/	9/10
	Sentence list	/s/	7/7
		/ɛs/	11/11
Listening distinction (receptive)	Word list	/s/	4/5
		/ɛs/	5/6
	Sentence list	/s/	5/6
		/ɛs/	4/4

All activities in this lession contained explicit instruction. There is a high level of accuracy in distinction of problem sounds in both productive and receptive instances.

Table 6

Accuracy with target phonemes in lesson three by activity

Task		Sound	Correct
Self-monitoring practice (productive)	Word list	/w/	15/15
		/v/	18/19
	Sentence list	/w/	20/22
		/v/	3/3
Gap fill activity	Productive	/w/	31/36
		/v/	12/13
	Receptive	/w/	4/8
		/v/	
Roleplay	Productive	/w/	40/43
		/v/	28/29

The first activity in lesson four used explicit instruction and resulted in high productive accuracy. The second two activities contained less explicit instruction also resulted in high productive accuracy. Receptive accuracy, however, was lower for /w/ sounds in the second activity.

Table 7

Accuracy of production of target phonemes in lesson four by activity

Task		Sound	Correct
Self monitoring practice (productive)	Word list	/s/	11/11
		/ɛs/	15/16
	Sentence list	/s/	4/4
		/ɛs/	7/7
Gap fill activity	Productive	/s/	6/6
		/ɛs/	12/13
	Receptive	/s/	6/6
		/ɛs/	8/9
Free speech	Productive	/s/	37/44
		/ɛs/	0/0
	Productive	/w/	18/43
		/v/	19/19

The first activity in this lesson contained explicit instruction and there was a high level of accuracy of problem sounds. The second activity contained less explicit instruction, but still yielded high accuracy in production of problem sounds. The final activity had no explicit instruction, as it was intended to encourage Hamid to focus on meaning over form.

From the above results, the following conclusions were drawn:

1) Raising of learner consciousness regarding L1 interference in a short time is possible.

2) Consciousness of the substitution of /v/ for /w/ was most improved in form-focused activities, not in implicit activities.

3) Consciousness of the addition of /ɛ/ to initial /s/ seems most improved in form-focused activities, not implicit activities.

4) Explicit activities are more effective than implicit activities for raising learner consciousness of fossilized L1 interference in a short time.

After the conclusion of all sessions, Hamid completed a survey designed to measure enjoyment and perceptions of effectiveness. The results of the survey are reported in Table 8. In the survey, Hamid asked to rank the five activities conducted in learning sessions on a scale from 5 (most enjoyed) to 1 (least enjoyed), and then each activity was also measured using a

Likert Scale measuring from 5 (Very fun) to 1 (Not fun). The same measures were also used to measure the effectiveness of each activity.

Table 8

Results of enjoyment and perception of effectiveness survey

Activity	Enjoyment Rank	Enjoyment Scale	Effectiveness Rank	Effectiveness Scale
Explaining sounds	3	5	5	5
Practicing sounds	1	5	4	5
Gap fill	5	5	3	5
Role play	4	5	1	5
Free speech	2	5	2	5

Note. Enjoyment and effectiveness scale from 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest)

According to the survey, Hamid enjoyed all activities equally and though all activities were equally effective for his learning goals. These results should be taken with a grain of salt as the maximum enjoyment and effectiveness score was given to all activities. It is possible that the explanation for the enjoyment scale response was influenced by Hamid's cultural background. In his native country, Iran, teachers are highly revered. Consequently, Hamid may have been hestitant to give a less than perfect rating on a survey which was not annonymous and which he knew would eventually be reported in this study.

Enjoyment ranking reveals that the gap fill was most enjoyable for Hamid. This is interesting because Hamid's performance on this activity was the least fluent, often asking for repeats and repeating himself. Perhaps the process of working towards success gave him a strong feeling of progress throughout the activity, and thus was the most positive learning experience. The least fun activity for Hamid was the practicing sounds activity where he read each of the words and sentences from the Word and Sentence List. This systematic, focus on form activity was likely quite dry for him in comparison to the more meaning focused activities. In terms of Hamid's perception of activity effectiveness, Hamid ranked explaining sounds activity highest and the roleplay activity was the least effective. While Hamid ranked the gap fill activity the highest among all the activities in terms of enjoyment, he ranked it third for effectiveness, behind explaining and practicing sounds. The effectiveness ranking is a descending scale from focus on form activities to meaning focused activities. It would seem that for teaching pronunciation, activities through which Hamid could receive explicit, timely feedback on his correctness were perceived as the most effective. When later asked, Hamid said

that he ranked activities interms of how much he enjoyed them as pronunciation focussed, that is form focused, lessons.

Discussion

Despite the short span of the study, Hamid showed a significant reduction in L1 influence in his English pronunciation of several different sounds. Hamid's high motivation and form-focused pronunciation teaching are two factors likely responsible for these results. Hamid had a high level of intrinsic motivation to improve his pronunciation. As an expatriate member of the L2 community, he had a strong desire to integrate into his new environment. Hamid made no substitution of /v/ for /w/ during the final diagnostic. Furthermore, he mispronounced words with initial /s/ sounds only twice in the final diagnostic. During teaching sessions, Hamid could fully understand how articulators move to pronounce the target sounds and make sure how to pronounce accurately by self-monitoring the movement of the articulators using a mirror. This explicit pronunciation teaching was deemed to be effective for raising his awarness of how to produce the sounds.

Hamid's tendency to substitute /v/ for /w/ seemed more amenable to change than insertion of /ɛ/ before a word with initial /s/. In the final diagnostic, he showed great improvement in accuracy of /v/ and /w/ production, but he made less progress with the insertion of /ɛ/ before initial /s/. This may be a result of the visibility of articulation. When the instructor or Sammy diagram showed pronunciation of /w/ and /v/ sounds, Hamid could observe the difference in the movement in the articulators (teeth on lips etc.). On the other hand, it is difficult to see the difference between the speaker's mouth movements when producing /s/ and /ɛs/.

Hamid showed a tendency to make more mistakes in meaning-focused, implicit activities such as roleplay and free speech. In in form focused activities with explicit instruction, Hamid's pronunciation errors were greatly decreased. This might be because the learner performed informal activities paying more attention to meaning rather than form. According to Major (1987) it can be difficult for L2 speakers to suppress interference processes in casual speech because they pay less attention to form.

Hamid made more mistakes in the free speech activity than in the roleplay. For the roleplay, Hamid received written instructions and examples of target sounds, so the spelling of words was available to him. According to Dickerson (1990), providing spelling is, in general, more useful than providing phonological symbols or guidance alone (as cited in Nation & Newton, 2009). Having written assistance could have led to fewer mistakes in the roleplay than the less guided

free talk activity.

The greatest limitation of this study was time. This study was conducted in only four weeks. Pronunciation may be considered difficult to be improved in short time. However, this study shows that segmental problems in pronunciation can be improved greatly with high learner motivation and an explicit pronunciation teaching. For further research, it would be meaningful to see whether the other problematic sounds in English for L1 Farsi speakers can also be improved using this methodology. Further research could examine whether this methodology is effective for treating not only segmental productions issues, but suprasegmental problems as well, under similar conditions. In addition, it would be useful to look for the most effective activities for specific instances of problem sounds and activities that promote transfer of pronunciation improvement from explicit form focused activities to implicit meaning focused activities.

Notes

(1) *Data for this study were collected and managed according to the ethical and legal standards of the TESOL Quarterly Research Guidelines. Informed consent to gather, analyze, and present the data anonymously was obtained using the TESOL Quarterly Release Form for Adults.*

References

Avery, P., & Ehrlich, S. (Eds.), (1992). *Teaching American English pronunciation*. New York: OUP.

Brown, H.D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (5th ed.). New York: Pearson.

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

Celce-Murcia, M., Brinton, D., & Goodwin, J. (1996). *Teaching pronunciation: A reference for teachers of English to speakers of other languages*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Couper, G. (2011). What makes pronunciation teaching work? Testing for the effect of two variables: Socially constructed metalanguage and critical listening. *Language Awareness, 20*, 159–182. doi:10.1080/09658416. 2011.570347.

Derwing, T., Munro, M., & Wiebe, G. (1998). Evidence in favor of a broad framework for pronunciation instruction. *Language Learning*, 48, 393–410. doi:10.1111/0023-8333.00047

Farhady, H., Jafarpoor, A., & Birjandi, O. (1994). *Testing language skills: From theory to practice*. Tehran: SAMT Publications.

Ghorbani, M.R. (2011). The impact of phonetic instruction on Iranian students' listening ability enhancement. *Asian EFL Journal*, 52, 24–34.

Jahangard, A. (2007). Evaluation of EFL materials taught at Iranian public high schools. *The Asian EFL Journal, 9*(2), 130–150.

Jenkins, J. (2001). *The phonology of English as an international language*. New York: Oxford.

Kennedy, S., Blanchet, J, & Trofimovich, P. (2014). Learner pronunciation, awareness, and instruction in French as a second language. *Foreign Language Annals, 47*(1), 79–96.

Major, R. (1987). A model for interlanguage phonology. In G. Ioup & S. Weinberger (Eds.),

Interlanguage phonology, (pp. 101–123) New York: Newbury House.

Nation, I.S.P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington.

Nation, I.S.P., & Newton, J. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL listening and speaking*. New York: Routledge

Nation, P. & Beglar, D.(2007). A Vocabulary Size Test. *The Language Teacher*, *31*(7), 9–13.

Peter, A., & Susan, E. (1992). *Teaching American English pronunciation by principles*. Oxford: Oxford

Prator, C., & Robinett B. (1957). *Manual of American English pronunciation*. Boston: Thompson Learning.

University of Iowa. (2001–2013). Phonetics: The Sounds of American English. Retrieved from http://www.uiowa.edu/~acadtech/phonetics/english/frameset-ad3.html

Vandergrift, L., & Goh, C. (2012). *Teaching and learning second language listening: Meta- cognition in action*. New York: Routledge.

母語干渉の意識を高めるための発音指導
――明示的・暗示的な言語活動の検証――

ローランド・ロバート・J. S.

抄　録

本研究では，ペルシャ語を母語とする学習者の，英語の発音における母語干渉への明示的及び暗示的な指導法が，学習者の発音矯正にどのように影響を及ぼすかを検証する。本研究では，一般的なペルシャ語の発音が英語の発音習得に干渉を及ぼしているということを学習者が意識するように，4 週間の指導法が提案された。授業中や事後テストのデータ分析の結果，本研究の指導法により学習者が短期間でも，とくに明示的な発音指導を通して，英語の発音への母語干渉を改善することが期待できることが示された。

キーワード：英語の発音，母語干渉，明示的指導法，暗示的指導法，フォーカス・オン・フォーム