

# The Effects of Communicative Pronunciation Instruction on Suprasegmental Performance in an EFL Context

Nasrin Shah Mohammad Nazari  
Islamic Azad University Isfahan, Khorasgan Branch, Isfahan, Iran

Atefeh Sadat Mirsaeedi  
Islamic Azad University Isfahan, Khorasgan Branch, Isfahan, Iran

**Abstract**—This study investigated the effects of communicative suprasegmental instruction on Iranian EFL learners' pronunciation performance. To this end, 24 pre-intermediate EFL learners were randomly assigned to two groups: the experimental group receiving communicative pronunciation instruction in which after receiving conventional explicit instruction students were given communicative tasks to practice learned features, and the control group receiving only conventional explicit exercise-based instruction. The learners' pronunciations were assessed in controlled read-aloud and communicative picture-description/picture-driven contexts in terms of two suprasegmental features (i.e. compound words stress and interrogative intonation). The results of the study revealed that the explicit exercise-based instruction was significantly effective in controlled contexts but modestly effective in communicative picture-description and picture-driven tasks. On the contrary, communicative pronunciation instruction was not only significantly effective in the controlled context but also in communicative tasks. This finding reveals that communicative suprasegmental instruction is more effective than conventional explicit instruction in both controlled and communicative language production contexts. In the end, some pedagogical implications of the findings are also discussed.

**Index Terms**—communicative pronunciation instruction, explicit exercise-based instruction, controlled contexts, communicative contexts

## I. INTRODUCTION

In the last thirty years, the role of pronunciation in English as a second (ESL) and as a foreign (EFL) language learning and teaching has been a topic of debate among practitioners of the field (Celce-Murcia, Brinton, and Goodwin, 2010). Although there have been disagreements about to what degree this skill should gain attention in communicative language teaching (CLT) syllabuses, it is generally acknowledged that it needs to be included in the methodology of every ESL/EFL course since wrong pronunciations might easily lead to communication breakdowns (Derwing & Munro, 2005).

Accordingly, there is now a general consensus among applied linguistics on the integral role of pronunciation in successful ESL/EFL communication (Hansen Edwards & Zampini, 2008), especially on the role of instruction in improving L2 learners' pronunciation performance, because the difference between learners' L1 pronunciation system and the L2's pronunciation patterns makes pronunciation of segmental and supra-segmental features difficult (Kissling, 2013). A body of recent research into the role of pronunciation instruction shows that explicit exercise-based instruction (that is, traditional consciousness raising listen-and-repeat activities) could still be effective in helping learners improve their segmental and suprasegmental pronunciation performance (e.g. Kissling, 2013; Reis & Hazan, 2013; Saito, 2015).

Nevertheless, it seems that researchers and instructors in the field of ESL/EFL pronunciation have particularly focused on traditional ways of teaching pronunciation through simple listen-and-repeat exercises at the expense of presenting pronunciation features in more communicative activities. As asserted by Celce-Murcia et al. (2010), pronunciation instruction needs to start with explicit instruction but it must be reinforced by communicative activities and practices, rather than simple listen-and-repeat exercises and drills so that learners have the opportunity to practice and observe segmental and suprasegmental features in real communicative settings. Despite such a pressing need to bring pronunciation instruction in line with tenets of CLT approach, most of the recent research in L2 pronunciation instruction has focused on traditional explicit instructions, especially on segmental rather than on suprasegmental features in ESL contexts, rather than on suprasegmental features in EFL contexts. Therefore, the following study is an attempt to put the limelight on comparing communicative and traditional explicit instruction on teaching Iranian EFL learners the suprasegmental aspects of English language.

## II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A look at the recent research into the role of instruction in helping ESL/EFL learners improve their pronunciation performance reveals that most studies have focused on traditional explicit exercise-based instructions. As an example, in one of the earliest studies in the turn of the new century, Couper (2003) investigated the effectiveness of explicit pronunciation instruction in improving the phonological performance of ESL learners in New Zealand at segmental and suprasegmental level. He found that conventional explicit instruction with exercises and drills were not only effective for segmental features but also effective for suprasegmental features.

Focusing on the production and phonemic accuracy of problematic English sounds, Chan (2010) investigated the pronunciation performance of different problematic consonants by forty Cantonese ESL university students in various read-aloud tasks, including lexical pronunciation, minimal-pair pronunciation, and passage pronunciation. The results of her study in general proved previous findings on the most problematic English sounds for Cantonese learners of English. Moreover, she found some productive strategies these learners employed in order to produce the required sounds in English. In conclusion, she put emphasis on the role pronunciation training at university level especially based on localized research on problematic sounds for particular learners.

Saito and Lyster (2012) focused on the role of form-focused pronunciation instruction with and without the presence of feedback. Through a 4-hour instruction, Japanese learners of English received instruction on the pronunciation of the problematic phoneme /r/ in meaningful discourse. The results of their study showed that the feedback group significantly improved their pronunciation of this problematic phoneme after intervention both in the read-aloud task and picture description. However, the control group and the group without feedback could not improve significantly.

In an informative study, Kissling (2013) compared the effects of explicit phonetic instruction with implicit instruction to 95 English learners of Spanish as a foreign language. She focused on problematic consonants for these groups of students. Learners' pronunciations of target phones were measured in the pretest, posttest, and delayed posttest through a read-aloud test. It was interesting to find that both groups gained from either explicit or implicit instruction showing that it seems that input, practice, and feedback are important than the mere type of instruction.

Finally, drawing on the role of recasts as an effective way to provide learners with phonological feedback, Saito (2014) investigated the acquisition of word-initial /r/ by Japanese learners of English. First, he found that raters' perceptions were related mostly to the third formant values of the phoneme /r/ rather than the second formant. He also found that it was only the experimental group receiving explicit instruction and recast that could improve the pronunciation of this phoneme in the third formant. He further concluded that the amount of feedback in the form of recasts and repairs together with the onset pronunciation proficiency of the learners affect the overall pronunciation development of the learners.

Overall, the results of these studies reveal that conventional explicit instruction of segmental (and in some instances suprasegmental) features have proved effective in improving ESL learners' pronunciation performances. Nevertheless, to the researchers' knowledge, no study has tried to compare such effectiveness with more communicative approaches to teaching suprasegmental features in an EFL (e.g. Iranian context) setting in which instructional treatments in CLT classrooms are of crucial importance due to lack of sufficient out-of-class exposure to the language. Thus, the following study tries to compare communicative instruction of most problematic suprasegmental features of English language (i.e. word compound stress patterns and interrogative intonations) with conventional explicit exercise-based instruction in helping Iranian EFL learners improve their pronunciation performances in controlled read-aloud activities and communicative tasks.

### III. METHOD

#### A. *The Participants of the Study*

The participants of this study consisted of 24 Iranian adult learners studying English as a foreign language at an intermediate level in a language institute in Tehran. The participants were males and females (14 males and 10 females) ranging from 20 years old to 28 years old. These 24 participants were selected from two pre-intermediate classrooms (12 students in each class) which consisted of 15 learners each. Three students from each classroom were removed from data analysis procedure because they either were mostly absent in the treatment sessions or in the posttest sessions. Therefore, in the end, 12 students in each classroom (one class as the control group receiving explicit instruction and one class as the experimental group receiving communicative instruction) were qualified as the final participants of the study whose scores in the pretest and posttest were analyzed and compared. The reason why pre-intermediate learners were selected were two-fold: (a) they were the researcher's own students which helped the researcher to have a better understanding of their proficiency level and pronunciation abilities and (b) they were neither too basic in terms of language proficiency so that they could deal with the tasks of the study nor too proficient to have advanced command on English pronunciation system.

#### B. *The Instruments of the Study*

In tandem with the communicative pronunciation teaching framework of the study, two types of tasks (i.e. testing activities) to measure learners' pronunciation performances in the pretest and posttest were designed: (a) a read-aloud task in which learners were required to read eight sentences for compound word stress and eight sentences for interrogative intonation patterns, (b) two picture description tasks for compound word stress pattern and one picture-

driven question making task for interrogative intonation patterns (see Appendix 2 and 3 for both tasks, respectively). It should be noted that the same types of tasks were employed in the pretest and posttest so as to keep the production setting and task effect similar in both testing situations.

In the same vein, two types of pronunciation instructional materials were designed to be presented to learners in each group from these resources: (a) the exercise-based materials from *Pronouncing American English* (2012) for the control and experimental group, and (b) communicative tasks adopted from Celce-Murcia et al. (2010) only for the experimental group (see Appendix 4 for the sample of communicative activities and tasks).

### C. The Communicative Framework of the Study

In order to present the experimental group of the study with communicative pronunciation instruction of relative suprasegmental features, Celce-Murcia et al.'s (2010) teaching framework was employed (see Table 1).

TABLE 1.  
THE COMMUNICATIVE PRONUNCIATION TEACHING FRAMEWORK BY CELCE-MURCIA ET AL. (2010)

Steps	Activities
1	<b>Description and Analysis</b> —oral and written illustrations of how the feature is produced and when it occurs within spoken discourse.
2	<b>Listening Discrimination</b> —focused listening practices with feedback on learners' ability to correctly discriminate the feature.
3	<b>Controlled Practice</b> —oral reading of minimal-pair sentences, short dialogues, etc., with special attention paid to the highlighted feature in order to raise learner consciousness
4	<b>Guided Practice</b> —structured communication exercises, such as information-gap activities, cued dialogues, and cued strip stories, that makes the learner to be monitored for the specified feature as he/she engages in controlled communication.
5	<b>Communicative Practice</b> —less structured, fluency-building activities (e.g. role-play, problem solving, interviews) that require the learner to attend to both form and content of utterances.

As shown in the table, in this framework the instruction starts with explicit teaching of pronunciation features and then moves to communicative activities and tasks. The control group, however, received the explicit instruction plus listening discrimination and controlled practices and drills (i.e. only the first three steps in the framework).

### D. Scoring Procedure and Data Analysis

In order to assign scores to learners' pronunciation of supra-segmental features, their performances in each pretest and posttest task were recorded by high-quality voice recording software. Then their performances were scored by an English native speaker to see if the feature is observed. The final score assigned to each participant in each feature was the sum of their performance in that feature. For instance, learner 1 in the control group read four sentences loaded with the noun + noun feature and four sentences loaded with adjective + noun feature. If he/she could pronounce one sentence correctly in each set, he/she was assigned the score of 1 for each set (out of total score of 4), if he/she could pronounce two sentences correctly in the first set and three sentences correctly for the latter set, he/she was assigned 2 and 3 for each set respectively. The same scoring procedure was also employed for the picture-description and picture-driven tasks. In the end, each learner in each group ended up with interval scores for their performance in the pretest and posttest.

To begin with, the normality of the data scores were tested by Shapiro-Wilk test of normality. Since the data were not normality distributed (see Appendix 1), the non-parametric statistical tests were employed. As for the homogeneity of the two groups in terms of their lack of required command on the two supra-segmental features of the study—apart from the fact that all the students were qualified and reported to be pre-intermediate by the standard testing procedure of the language institute—learners' pronunciations in the controlled and spontaneous tasks in the pretest were compared together with the non-parametric Mann-Whitney U test.

After the treatment of the study was finished for each feature, the same posttest was administered to both groups. The learners' pronunciations in the posttest were scored based on the same procedure as went above. Then, the acquired scores were compared by Mann-Whitney U for between-group variations and by Wilcoxon Signed-Rank test for within group variations. The aforementioned tests were run by SPSS software version 22.

### E. Procedure of the Study

At the beginning of the term, after receiving the green light from the head of the Institute, one of the researchers, as the teacher of the classes) introduced the overall plan for an extra pronunciation instruction to her learners in two classes to see if they were interested in allocating 30 minutes of their time after their usual class time runs out, every other session. The researcher explained that the overall instruction takes 4 hours (that is, four extra 30-minute sessions for compound word stress instruction and four extra 30-minute sessions for question intonation instruction). Since the feedback by learners was positive, the researcher administered the pretest of the study before the official time of the second session. The learners' pronunciations were voice recorded by a sophisticated voice recording software by a laptop computer.

As went above, four 30-minute extra sessions were devoted to teaching compound word stress patterns in which noun + noun constructions, wherein the first word takes the stress (e.g. bus stop, telephone booth, wedding party, etc.) and adjective + noun constructions, wherein the noun takes the stress (e.g. blue car, pretty house, big stadium, etc.)

were presented to learners of the control group through traditional conventional exercise-based instruction (i.e. the first three phases of the instructional framework) and to learners of the experimental group through the communicative framework (i.e. the five stages of the instructional framework). At the end of the fourth session, the posttest of the study was administered to both groups.

As for the English interrogative intonation pattern, the instruction started the next session after the posttest of compound word stress pattern. In this phase of the instruction, the focus was on Wh-word questions' intonation with falling intonations (e.g. where do you play basketball?) and Yes/No questions' intonation with rising intonations (e.g. Is he your English teacher?). Similarly, the instruction consisted of four 30-minut extra sessions for both groups. At the end of the fourth session, the posttest for this feature was administered.

In the end, the recording data of the two features were coded and then checked by an English native speaker to assign scores to each pronunciation task by the learners. When the scores were tabulated, the data were ready for the statistical analysis to see degrees of improvement in both groups of the study.

#### IV. RESULTS

To test the homogeneity of the experimental and control groups, their pretest scores were compared in read-aloud and picture description tasks for all suprasegmental features of the study by Mann-Whitney U test. First, the results of Mann-Whitney U test in read-aloud context showed that there were no significant differences (i.e.  $P$ -values  $\geq .05$ ) between the groups in compound words stress patterns (noun+noun structures:  $Z = -.604$ ,  $P = .546$ ; adj.+noun structures:  $Z = .000$ ,  $P = 1.000$ ) and in interrogative intonation patterns (Wh-questions:  $Z = .000$ ,  $P = 1.000$ ; Yes/No-questions:  $Z = -.492$ ,  $P = .623$ ). Likewise, there were no significant differences (i.e.  $P$ -values  $\geq .05$ ) in picture-description context in compound words stress patterns (noun+noun structures:  $Z = -.604$ ,  $P = .546$ ; adj.+noun structures:  $Z = .000$ ,  $P = 1.000$ ) and in interrogative intonation patterns (Wh-questions:  $Z = .000$ ,  $P = 1.000$ ; Yes/No-questions:  $Z = -.604$ ,  $P = .546$ ). Therefore, it could be concluded that both experimental and control groups were homogenous before the onset of the treatment in terms of their lack of command on the pronunciation features of the study.

To gauge between-group significant improvements (i.e. pretest/posttest significant differences), Wilcoxon Signed-rank test was employed for each group of the study. As for the control group, results revealed that the control group significantly improved (i.e.  $P$ -values  $\leq .05$ ) in their read-aloud tasks not only in terms of compound words stress patterns (noun+noun structures:  $Z = -3.108$ ,  $P = .002$ ; adj.+noun structures:  $Z = -3.002$ ,  $P = .003$ ) but also in terms of interrogative intonation patterns (Wh-questions:  $Z = -3.066$ ,  $P = .002$ ; Yes/No-questions:  $Z = -3.169$ ,  $P = .002$ ). These results show that explicit pronunciation instruction with mere exercises and drills were effective in read-aloud tasks. In picture-description tasks, however, there were no significant differences in compound words stress patterns (noun+noun structures:  $Z = -1.890$ ,  $P = .059$ ; adj.+noun structures:  $Z = -2.070$ ,  $P = .058$ ) and in Yes/No-questions intonation ( $Z = -1.933$ ,  $P = .053$ ), with significant difference in only Wh-questions ( $Z = -2.236$ ,  $P = .025$ ). These results show that, unlike in read-aloud tasks, the explicit exercise-based instruction were not comparatively effective in spontaneous picture-description contexts (that is, learners only significantly improved in one feature out of all four features).

The same statistical test was run for within-group significant differences in the experiment groups' performance. As with the control group, the statistical results revealed that the experimental group also improved significantly in read-aloud tasks regarding compound words stress patterns (noun+noun structures:  $Z = -3.108$ ,  $P = .002$ ; adj.+noun structures:  $Z = -3.133$ ,  $P = .002$ ) as well as interrogative intonation patterns (Wh-questions:  $Z = -3.017$ ,  $P = .003$ ; Yes/No-questions:  $Z = -3.145$ ,  $P = .002$ ). Nevertheless, unlike the control group, the experimental group significantly improved in the spontaneous picture-description tasks in compound words stress patterns (noun+noun structures:  $Z = -2.919$ ,  $P = .004$ ; adj.+noun structures:  $Z = -2.919$ ,  $P = .004$ ) and in interrogative intonation patterns (Wh-questions:  $Z = -2.889$ ,  $P = .004$ ; Yes/No-questions:  $Z = -3.035$ ,  $P = .002$ ). These findings show that the communicative pronunciation instruction were not only considerably effective in read-aloud tasks but also in picture-description tasks, whereas the explicit exercise-based instruction were mostly effective in read-aloud tasks.

Finally, the posttest scores of both groups were also compared together for any possible significant between-group differences by Mann-Whitney U test. As far as read-aloud tasks were concerned, there were no significant differences between the two groups in both pronunciation features: compound words stress patterns (noun+noun structures:  $Z = -1.116$ ,  $P = .264$ ; adj.+noun structures:  $Z = -1.899$ ,  $P = .058$ ) and interrogative intonation patterns (Wh-questions:  $Z = -.915$ ,  $P = .360$ ; Yes/No-questions:  $Z = -.096$ ,  $P = .924$ ). These results show that both groups improved more or less similarly in controlled read-aloud contexts. Yet, there were significant differences between the two groups in picture-description tasks in one of the compound words stress patterns (i.e. noun+noun structures:  $Z = -2.946$ ,  $P = .003$ ; not in adj.+noun structures:  $Z = -.761$ ,  $P = .078$ ) and all two interrogative intonation patterns (Wh-questions:  $Z = -2.830$ ,  $P = .005$ ; Yes/No-questions:  $Z = -2.635$ ,  $P = .008$ ). These findings reveal that the experimental group outperformed the control group exclusively in picture-description tasks in most of the relative pronunciation features of the study (i.e. stress patterns in noun+noun compound words and interrogative intonations).

Overall, the results showed that both types of instruction (i.e. communicative pronunciation instruction and explicit exercise-based instruction) were equally effective in helping Iranian EFL learners learn and pronounce correctly the suprasegmental features of compound words stress patterns and interrogative intonation patterns in controlled read-

aloud contexts. Nonetheless, the communicative pronunciation instruction was significantly more effective than the explicit exercise-based instruction in spontaneous picture-description contexts.

## V. DISCUSSION

The overall findings of the study showed that although explicit exercise-based pronunciation instruction helped learners to improve their pronunciation performances in supra-segmental features of compound word stress and question intonation patterns in simple read-aloud activities (wherein learners were only to read aloud sentences containing the target features of the study), this type of instruction, as compared with communicative pronunciation instruction, could not prove very effective in spontaneous picture description tasks in which learners had to spontaneously describe pictures to their partners. On the contrary, the communicative pronunciation instruction not only proved effective in controlled read-aloud tasks but also in spontaneous picture description tasks.

As stated by Celce-Murcia et al. (2010), despite the existing overindulgence in employing communicative approaches toward teaching different aspects and skills of the language, it seems that pronunciation is still presented in the form of exercises rather than communicative activities (i.e. tasks). According to Ellis (2003), tasks are activities which focus on the meaning-based language use while exercises are activities that mainly work on form-focused language use. Such a fine distinction clearly reflects the two types of instructional treatments the participants of this study received. Focusing on two supra-segmental features of compound words stress placement and interrogative intonation patterns in English, the control group only received pronunciation instruction in the form of explicit exercises in a way that learners were first presented with deductive explanations of the English rules regarding the correct pronunciation of the features (i.e. awareness raising), then they were presented with listen and repeat exercises and drills. On the contrary, the experimental group of the study not only received the awareness raising explanations but also practiced the learned features in both exercises and meaning-focus communicative tasks. It seems that the frequent meaning-focused practice of target features in the form of communicative tasks could make learners perform better in communicative activities in which the focus should also be on the meaning and message as well while paying attention to the form.

The benefits of explicit exercise-based phonetic instruction, however, could not be neglected (Fullana, 2006; Venkatagiri & Levis, 2007). Kissling (2013) mentions that both types of explicit and implicit phonetic instruction could be helpful to learners. Nonetheless, based on her findings, it seems that explicit instruction is more useful than implicit instruction in segmental instructions. The results of her study revealed that explicit instruction through phonetic exercises positively impacts the learners' performances in read-aloud activities. This finding is in line with the current research's findings as the control group improved significantly in read-aloud activities in terms of supra-segmental features. Nevertheless, as her measurement rubrics were only mechanical read-aloud activities, the results of the current study could add up to her findings by proving that explicit exercise-based instruction could not be fruitful in spontaneous communicative activities.

It should be noted that, based on the results of the study, the explicit exercise-based instruction had also modest positive effects on learners' correct observance of some supra-segmental features of the study (i.e. adj+noun compound stress patterns and yes/no question intonation patterns) which might be due to the fact that some phonological features are more prone to different types of instruction than others (Chung, 2008). Nonetheless, comparatively, as the results of between-group differences revealed, the communicative pronunciation instruction was significantly more effective than explicit exercise-based instruction.

One of the central variables which crucially affects the outcomes of any task-based instruction is the nature of the tasks themselves. Ellis (2003) categorizes tasks into two types: (a) unfocused tasks, and (b) focused tasks. Whereas the former is a true example of a strong version of communicative language teaching in which task include different target features at the same time like real-time language use, the latter more pedagogic one includes only a particular linguistic feature which is being practiced indirectly through communicative tasks. According to Ellis (2003), there is a psycholinguistic advantage behind communicative focused tasks (i.e. the ones employed in this study for phonological features) that makes them a better option for pedagogical purposes.

Therefore, based on the findings of this study in which one group of learners received communicative focused tasks, it could be claimed that focused tasks could help learners move from controlled processes towards automatic ones (see also Anderson, 2000). According to Ellis (2003), while automatic processes involve the involuntary activation of certain nodes in memory each time a specific input is present, controlled processes need attentional control and awareness towards the input. This process is also reflected in the way declarative knowledge turns into procedural knowledge (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010). Based on this idea, a focused task could actually prepare learners to practice an already learned feature in communicative real-time activities so that they can reflect this knowledge in real communicative situations.

The superior performance of the experimental group in this study who received pronunciation instruction through communicative focused tasks as well as awareness-raising exercises proves that practicing supra-segmental features through communicative activities not only helped learners perform well in controlled activities which require only controlled processes to be dealt with, but also made them perform well in the picture description tasks which required an online automatic process. As a matter of fact, communicative pronunciation instruction prepared learners to have a

more accurate supra-segmental performance (that is, paying attention to the formal aspect of language) while they focus was on the meaning (that is, paying attention to the communicative purpose of the activity).

## VI. CONCLUSION & PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

This study was an attempt to bring the limelight to the role of communicative pronunciation instruction on Iranian EFL learners' suprasegmental performance. Drawing on the proposed Celce-Murcia et al.'s (2010) framework, it was investigated whether the combination of explicit instruction and communicative tasks, in comparison with traditional exercise-based explicit instruction, would improve learners' performance in the controlled read-aloud and spontaneous picture-description activities. Although recent research has proven the effectiveness of explicit exercise-based instruction in helping learners acquire pronunciation features of the L2 (e.g. Kissling, 2013; Reis & Hazan, 2013; Saito, 2015), it is not still clear if the combination of explicit instruction with communicative tasks could be as much effective, especially in communicative tasks at suprasegmental levels.

The results revealed that communicative instruction of suprasegmental features is considerably more effective in improving EFL learners' pronunciation performances in spontaneous contexts in which learners have to focus on the interaction and messages communicated, rather than solely on the form of language. On the contrary, the traditional conventional explicit instruction with exercises and drills proves to be effective mostly in simple controlled read-aloud activities in which the learners could focus on the form, irrespective of the communicative meanings of the sentences.

In line with these findings, some theoretical, as well as practical L2 pronunciation implications, could be drawn. On the theoretical side, it shows that communicative activities (e.g. tasks) could help learners derive automatic processes out of controlled ones (Ellis, 2003). Indeed, it is proved that there is a psychological rationale behind focused tasks because if these types of communicative activities follow explicit exercise-based activities, which help learners develop controlled processes, they could help learners automatize the overtly learned features and observe formal features of language (such as pronunciation features employed in this study) while their focus is also on the message and the meaning.

On the practical side, the results of this study clearly put the limelight on the need to reevaluate the role of pronunciation in today's communicative syllabuses and the way L2 instructors deal with this sub-skill of language in their classroom. The ineffectiveness of exercise-based activities and instruction in improving learners' performances in communicative activities on the one hand, and the effectiveness of communicative pronunciation instruction in these activities on the other, shows that not only do English syllabus designers and mainstream material developers should focus more on the inclusion of communicative activities for pronunciation instruction, but also L2 teachers should try to employ more communicative tasks in their L2 classes so that learners could practice pronunciation features in communicative meaning-orientated activities. By so doing, they could perform much better in out-of-classroom real-life settings.

### APPENDIX 1. THE RESULTS OF SHAPIRO-WILK TEST OF NORMALITY IN THE PRETESTS FOR BOTH GROUPS IN CONTROLLED READ-ALoud AND SPONTANEOUS PICTURE-DESCRIPTION CONTEXTS

Feature/Group	Read-aloud tasks			Picture-description tasks		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
noun + noun/control	.465	12	.000	.465	12	.000
noun + noun/experimental	.327	12	.000	.327	12	.000
adj + noun/control	.465	12	.000	.465	12	.000
adj + noun/experimental	.465	12	.000	.465	12	.000
Wh-Q/control	.592	12	.000	.592	12	.000
Wh-Q/experimental	.592	12	.000	.592	12	.000
Yes/No-Q/control	.465	12	.000	.465	12	.000
Yes/No-Q/experimental	.552	12	.000	.552	12	.000

### APPENDIX 2. THE READ-ALoud TASK

Please read the following sentences clearly as your voice is being recorded:

1. There is a child in the bus station.
  2. I have a green house in the yard.
  3. I want to buy a new book.
  4. There is a nice car outside.
  5. I cleaned my fingernails.
  6. There are four kids in the house.
  7. He is buying a hard drive for his computer.
  8. She is an English teacher from England.
1. Do you speak English?

2. Can you play football?
3. Are they new teachers?
4. Does he know the game?
5. What are you doing?
6. Where is the nearest carwash?
7. When is she here?
8. Why do you study English

APPENDIX 3. THE PICTURE-DESCRIPTION AND PICTURE-DRIVEN TASKS

1. Try to describe the following picture in whatever way you like. You have one minute to think. You must use the words under the picture in your description.



Picture 1:  
Bus stop    people    traffic sign



Picture 2:  
Red car    fast    happy man

2. Look at the picture. Try to ask your partner different questions based on the picture with the given question-words. You have 30 seconds to think for each question.



1. Where .....
2. Does .....
3. Can .....
4. What .....
5. Is .....
6. Why .....

APPENDIX 4. A SAMPLE OF A COMMUNICATIVE FOCUSED TASK ON COMPOUND WORD STRESS PATTERNS ADOPTED FROM CELCE MURCIA ET AL. (2010).

Pre-task: Look at the list of objects that Mary should buy this month. Choose some of them and tell your partner that where you can buy each of them. Next, talk about the last time you bought them.

Example: *I can buy a dishwasher at a furniture store. The last time I bought it was last year.*

- hairbrush    notepad    screwdriver    a beautiful hat    sunglasses  
 a black umbrella    dishwasher    a mobile phone    a digital camera    notebook

**Task:** Look at the list of the objects below. With your partner, decide where you can buy each item. Later, write the name of the objects in the right column.

Shop Till You Drop				
Furniture Store	Hardware Store	Drug Store	Grocery Store	Stationary Store

Items:

Sunglasses	Beach towel	Beach ball
Ice cream	Notebook	Paintbrush
Notepad	Paper clips	Wastebasket
Toothbrush	Screwdriver	Hairbrush
Toilet paper	Footstool	Armchair

**Post-task:** Select one item and tell your classmates where you can buy them.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Anderson, J. (2000). *Learning and memory: An integrated approach*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- [2] Celce-Murcia, M., Brinton, D.M., Goodwin, J.M., & Griner, J.M. (2010). *Teaching Pronunciation: A reference for teachers of English to speakers of other languages*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- [3] Chan, A. (2010). Advanced Cantonese ESL learners' production of English speech sounds: Problems and strategies. *System* 38, 316-328.
- [4] Chung, W. L. (2008). *The effectiveness of explicit, implicit, and noticing instruction: Mandarin speakers' perceptions and production of English sentence stress*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Alliant International University, San Francisco, CA.
- [5] Couper, G. (2003). The value of an explicit pronunciation syllabus in ESOL teaching. *Prospect*, 18, 111-130.
- [6] Derwing, T. M., & Munro, M. J. (2005). *Second language accent and pronunciation teaching: A research-based approach*. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39, 379-397.
- [7] Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language teaching and learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [8] Fullana, N. (2006). The development of English perception and production skills: Starting age and exposure effects. In Muñoz, C. (Ed.). *The age and rate of foreign language learning* (pp. 41-64). Clevedon: Cromwell Press.
- [9] Kissling, E. M. (2013). Teaching pronunciation: is explicit phonetics instruction beneficial for FL learners? *The Modern Language Journal*, 97, 720-744.
- [10] Orion, G. F. (2012). *Pronouncing American English: Sounds, stress, and intonation*. Boston: Heinle.
- [11] Reis, J., & Hazan, V. (2011). Speechchant: a vowel notation system to teach English pronunciation. *ELT Journal*, 66, 156-165.
- [12] Saito, K. (2014). Experienced teachers' perspectives on priorities for improved intelligible pronunciation: The case of Japanese learners of English. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 250-277.
- [13] Saito, K. (2015). Experience effects on the development of late second language learners' oral proficiency. *Language Learning*, 65, 1-32.
- [14] Saito, K. & Lyster, R. (2012). Effects of form-focused instruction and corrective feedback on L2 Pronunciation development of /ɪ/ by Japanese learners of English. *Language Learning*, 62, 595-633.
- [15] Venkatagiri, H. & Levis, M. (2007). Phonological Awareness and Speech Comprehensibility: An Exploratory Study. *Language Awareness*, 16, 124-139.
- [16] Widdowson, H. (1978). *Teaching language as communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**Nasrin Shah Mohammad Nazari** was born in Iran, Isfahan in 1986. Nazari achieved her M.A. degree in teaching English as a foreign language from azad university of Khorasgan in Isfahan in 2016 and her B.A. degree in English translation from Kashan state university in 2009.

She currently works as an instructor in Gooyesh language school, Isfahan, Iran.

**Atefeh Sadat Mirsaeeidi** achieved her Ph.D. degree in general linguistics from university of Isfahan in 2011, her M.A. degree in general linguistics from university of Isfahan in 2008 and her B.A. degree in English literature from university of Isfahan in 2004.

She currently holds the position of Assistant Professor in the faculty of Foreign Languages at Khorasgan Azad University. She also worked as Instructor in Khoy, Shahreza and Spahan University from 2007 to 2009. Some of her publications include 'An Acoustic Investigation of Phonological Process of Vowel-to-consonant Assimiation In Persian', 'Semantic ambiguity in some of Wh-Questions in Persian', 'I can Hear You with My Eyes'.