

REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
ÇAĞ UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE

**THE EFFECT OF LISTENING TO SPOKEN READING EXERCISES ON
PRONUNCIATION IN ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSES
FOR STATE SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS**

THESIS BY

Davut TAKAN

SUPERVISOR

Assist. Prof. Dr. Erol KAHRAMAN

MASTERS OF ARTS

MERSİN, June 2014

REPUBLIC OF TURKEY

ÇAĞ UNIVERSITY

DIRECTORSHIP OF THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

We **certify** that thesis under the title of “**THE EFFECT OF LISTENING TO SPOKEN READING EXERCISES ON PRONUNCIATION IN ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSES FOR STATE SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS**” is satisfactory for the award of the degree of **Master of Arts** in the **Department of English Language Teaching**.



Supervisor-head of Examining Committee: Assist. Prof. Dr. Erol KAHRAMAN



Member of Examining Committee: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şehnaz ŞAHİNKARAKAŞ



Member of Examining Committee: Assist. Prof. Kim Raymond HUMISTON

I certify that this thesis conforms to formal standards of the Institute of Social Sciences.

13/06/2014

Assist. Prof. Dr. Murat KOÇ

Director of Institute of Social Sciences



Note: The uncited usage of reports, charts, figures and photographs in this thesis, whether original or quoted for mother sources is subject to the law of Works of Arts and Thought.No:5846.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Conducting this study, especially in such a limited time, was a great challenge for me. In doing all the studies, several people supported and inspired me. I was assisted by a number of tolerant, generous, helpful and kind people to whom I am grateful and indebted.

First of all, I would like to send my thanks to my committee members Assist. Prof. Dr. Erol KAHRAMAN, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şehnaz ŞAHİNKARAKAŞ, Assist. Prof. Kim Raymond HUMISTON for their time and accepting to be in the jury.

I would also like to thank to my supervisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Erol KAHRAMAN for his never-ending contributions and academic guidance during the process of writing this thesis.

I am indebted to my brother Ahmet TAKAN for his help and suggestions while conducting this study.

I would also like to offer my deep gratitude to my mother and father Atiye and Sami TAKAN for their endless love and care.

My sincere thanks are due to my colleagues and friends for their help; to Ümit CONTUK, Şükran YILMAZ, Cumali KARCI, Sitera DEĞİRMEN and Aslı BİLLOR.

I would also like to thank my best friend Yiğit Can ONAN for his endless care and encouragements during the study.

I would also like to thank to all of my students who participated in this study Atışalanı Anatolian Secondary School.

13.06.2014

Davut TAKAN

ÖZET

İNGİLİZCE’NİN YABANCI DİL OLARAK ÖĞRETİLDİĞİ DEVLET LİSELERİNDE SESLİ OKUMA ETKİNLİKLERİNİ DİNLEMENİN GENEL LİSE ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN İNGİLİZCE TELAFFUZLARINA ETKİSİ

Davut TAKAN

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı

Tez Danışmanı: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Erol KAHRAMAN

Haziran 2014, 64 Sayfa

Bu çalışma, ilk olarak İngilizcenin yabancı dil olarak öğretiminde telaffuz, dinleme ve sesli okuma hakkında kısa bilgi vermektedir. Aynı zamanda, bu terimler arasındaki ilişki ve İngilizce kelimelerin telaffuzunda yaşanan güçlüklerin olası kaynakları konularında bilgi verilmiştir.

Çalışmanın amacı, Türkiye’de bulunan liselerde yapılan İngilizce kelimelerin telaffuz hatası türlerini ve sebeplerini ortaya çıkarmaktır. Ayrıca, dinleme ve sesli okuma çalışmalarının İngilizce telaffuzu üzerindeki olası etkilerinin de ortaya çıkarılması amaçlanmıştır. Çalışmada sesbirim(phoneme) üzerinde durulmuş olupsesbirimsel değişkeler (allophones), parçalar üstü özellikler (suprasegmentals) ve diğer yönler genelde dikkate alınmamıştır.

Bu çalışma, Atışılanı Anadolu Lisesi’nde okuyan 15’i erkek ve 15’i kız olmak üzere toplam 30 öğrenciye uygulanmıştır. Katılımcılar 10. sınıf öğrencileridir ve yaşları 15 ile 17 arasında değişmektedir. Ders kitabı olarak Milli Eğitim Bakanlığının yürürlüğe koyduğu YesYou Can A1.2 kitabı kullanılmaktadır.

Veriler ders kitabının 3., 4. ve 5. ünitelerinde yer alan 5 farklı okuma metninden seçilen 32 kelime ile toplanmıştır. Her bir okuma çalışması için öğrencilerin sesleri kaydedilmiştir. Bu ses kayıtları araştırmacı ve üç İngilizce öğretmeni çalışma arkadaşı tarafından incelenmiştir. Yanlış telaffuz edilen kelimeler birlikte çalışılarak

tartışılmış ve kararlar verilmiştir. Öğrencilerin telaffuzları üzerindeki etkiyi ortaya çıkarması için, yanlış telaffuz edilen kelimelerin yer aldığı altı adet farklı dinleme etkinliği uygulanmıştır. Bu etkinlikler dinleme ve sesli okuma teknikleri kullanılarak uygulanmıştır. Bu etkinlikler tamamlandıktan sonra, katılımcılar ders kitabında bulunan okuma metinlerini tekrar okumuşlar ve kaydedilen gelişme bu ses kayıtları yardımıyla gözlemlenmiştir.

Çalışma sonuçlarının analizi, dinleme ve sesli okuma çalışmaları sırasında bütün öğrencilerin kelimelerin tamamını doğru okuyabilmelerine rağmen, öğrencilerin yarısından fazlasının etkinlikler yapılmadan önce yanlış okudukları çoğu kelimeleri bu etkinlikler yapıldıktan sonra doğru okuyabildiklerini ortaya çıkarmıştır. Çalışma sonuçlarından, dinleme ve sesli okuma etkinliklerinin öğrencilerin telaffuzları üzerinde olumlu bir etki yarattığı açıkça gözlenmiştir. Ayrıca, çalışma sonuçlarından öğrencilerin yanlış telaffuzlarının türleri ve sebepleri de belirlenmiş ve bunların öğrencilerin çoğunda benzerlik gösterdiği sonucuna varılmıştır.

Sonuç olarak, bu çalışmanın Türkiye'deki İngilizce öğretiminin, özellikle de İngilizce telaffuz eğitimi hususunda gelecekteki çalışmalarına yol gösterip katkıda bulunması, öğrencilerin sesletim yanlışlıklarının kaynaklarını bulabilme ve bu yanlışları düzeltme konusunda öğretmenlere yardımcı olması umulmaktadır.

Anahtar sözcükler: Telaffuz/Sesletim, Hata, Sesbirim, Parçasal, Sesbirimsel Değişken, Parçaüstü, Dinleme, Sesli Okuma.

ABSTRACT

THE EFFECT OF LISTENING TO SPOKEN READING EXERCISES ON PRONUNCIATION IN ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSES FOR STATE SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS

Davut TAKAN

Master of Arts, English Language Teaching Department

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Erol KAHRAMAN

June 2014, 64 pages

This study first gives the brief summary of pronunciation, reading aloud and listening in Teaching English as a Second Language. It clarifies the interrelation between them and describes potential sources of difficulties in pronunciation of English.

The aim of the study was to find out the error types and the reasons of pronunciation errors of English in secondary schools of Turkey. The potential effect of listening and reading aloud activities on pronunciation of English was also aimed to reveal by this study. The study focused on the errors that originating from the phonemes while allophones, suprasegmentals and other aspects were generally ignored.

The study was carried out at Atısalanı Anatolian High school with a total of 30 participants, 15 of whom are males and 15 females. They were 10th grade students and their ages were between 15 and 17. They used Yes You Can A1.2 as textbook constituted by the Ministry of National Education.

The data was collected with 5 different reading texts chosen from 3 units of the book with a total of 32 words to be examined. Voices of 30 students were recorded for each activity. The sound recordings were also examined by the three teachers of English who were the researcher's colleagues. Mispronounced words were discussed and they were determined mutually. Six listening activities containing the mispronounced words were put into practice to reveal the effect of these activities on

pronunciation of the students. Listening and reading aloud techniques were used during these practices. After these activities, the participants performed the reading texts again and their developments were observed with the help of the recorded performances.

The analysis of the results revealed that more than half of the participants could pronounce most of the words that they had mispronounced before the listening activities although all of the participants could pronounce the words correctly during the repeat after and reading aloud activities. The positive effect of listening and reading aloud activities on pronunciation was evident from the results. The results also revealed the types and reasons of the errors of pronunciation in most of the words as the errors were similar for most of the participants.

In conclusion, it is expected that this study will contribute as a guide to further studies of English language especially in the matter of English pronunciation teaching in Turkey and will help English teachers to determine the source of the pronunciation errors and to fix them.

Key words : Pronunciation, Error, Phoneme, Segmental, Allophones, Suprasegmental, Listening, Reading Aloud.

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘friend’	17
Table 2. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘badminton’	17
Table 3. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘swimming’	18
Table 4. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘love’	19
Table 5. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘classical’	20
Table 6. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘music’	20
Table 7. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘hate’	21
Table 8. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘about’	21
Table 9. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘romantic’	22
Table 10. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘got’	22
Table 11. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘brown’	23
Table 12. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘colour’	23
Table 13. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘kind’	24
Table 14. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘well’	24
Table 15. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘job’	25
Table 16. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘work’	25
Table 17. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘travel’	26
Table 18. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘breakfast’	26
Table 19. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘lunch’	27
Table 20. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘word’	27
Table 21. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘fun’	28
Table 22. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘summer’	28
Table 23. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘volunteer’	29
Table 24. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘country’	29

Table 25. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘feeding’	30
Table 26. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘with’	30
Table 27. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘camera’	31
Table 28. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘here’	31
Table 29. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘wearing’	32
Table 30. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘snowing’	32
Table 31. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘freezing’	33
Table 32. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘outside’	33
Table 33. Error distributions for pronunciation of the problematic words.....	34

TABLE OF CONTENTS

COVER PAGE.....	I
APPROVAL PAGE.....	II
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	III
ÖZET.....	IV
ABSTRACT	VI
LIST OF TABLES.....	VIII
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	X

CHAPTER 1

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. Background to the Study.....	1
1.2. The Aim of the Study.....	3
1.3. Research Questions.....	3
1.4. Limitations of the Study.....	3

CHAPTER 2

2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	5
2.1. Phonetics and Phonology.....	5
2.2. Transfer & Interlingual Error.....	6
2.3. Pronunciation and Listening.....	6
2.4. Studies in the World.....	10
2.5. Studies in Turkey.....	11

CHAPTER 3

3. METHODOLOGY.....	13
3.1. Data Collection Tools and Materials	13
3.2. Participants of the Research.....	13
3.3. Research Design.....	14

CHAPTER 4

4. DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS.....	16
4.1. The results of the sound recordings.....	16
4.2. Analysis and Interpretation of the Results.....	34
4.2.1. Analysis and Interpretation of the Results of the First Sound Recordings.....	34
4.2.2. Analysis and Interpretation of the Results of the Second Sound Recordings.....	36

CHAPTER 5

5. CONCLUSION.....	38
5.1. Discussion.....	38
5.2. Conclusions.....	39
5.3. Implications.....	40
5.4. Recommendations for Further Studies.....	41

6. REFERENCES.....	43
6.1. WEB REFERENCES.....	47
7. APPENDICES.....	48
7.1. Appendix 1: Reading Text 1.	48
7.2. Appendix 2: Reading Text 2.....	48
7.3. Appendix 3: Reading Text 3.....	48
7.4. Appendix 4: Reading Text 4.....	49
7.5. Appendix 5: Reading Text 5.....	49
7.6. Appendix 6: Listening and reading aloud activity 1.....	49
7.7. Appendix 7: Listening and reading aloud activity 2.....	49
7.8. Appendix 8: Listening and reading aloud activity 3.....	50
7.9. Appendix 9: Listening and reading aloud activity 4.....	51
7.10. Appendix 10: Listening and reading aloud activity 5.....	51
7.11. Appendix 11: Listening and reading aloud activity 6.....	52

CHAPTER 1

1. INTRODUCTION

Since people are social in community, language plays an important role in our lives because it enables us to communicate with each other. People use language in order to express what they mean to others and to understand what the others mean. In order to manage these, the language needs to be pronounced properly, the sounds need to be produced according to its phonological basis.

It was stated by Littlewood (1992) that if we utter an improper word it may create a new utterance which leads to new meaning. If it continues then misunderstanding or miscommunication will not be avoided.

When considered that English is native language of nearly 450 million people and second language of many others all over the world, the role of correct pronunciation in communication is very important especially for the nonnative speakers to be able to understand and express themselves. As there are limited studies conducted in Turkey, the studies in the field of pronunciation should have priorities and such studies are essential for a better learning and teaching.

1.1. Background of the study

According to Hismanoğlu (2009) since sounds play an important role in communication, foreign language teachers must attribute proper importance to teaching pronunciation in their classes. However, this significant part of teaching has been neglected by many language teachers in Turkey because of many combined reasons. One of these reasons is about the program itself. "Pronunciation is not incorporated directly into their programs or into the textbooks" (Hismanoğlu, 2009, p. 43). Another reason may be that the teachers may think the students can develop their pronunciation thanks to other activities included in the program without any direct focus on pronunciation. Third reason may be that the teachers, especially non-

native ones, don't have enough competence to teach the elements of pronunciation in target language. Another reason may be that the teachers don't use the target language properly or don't give the students the chance to hear the words that they may have difficulty in pronouncing correctly.

As an important problem that we encounter in our classes, pronunciation deficiency has been aimed to solve by different techniques and methods. There are different activities or techniques that may solve the problem. However, the question is whether we chose the correct one appropriate for our students. Teaching English alphabet and Phonetics is important and a must. Although these points are emphasized, teachers are often unsuccessful to make the students to pronounce in a fluent and correct way. As a result, there should be some other solutions to be applied. In this study, my aim is to investigate how effective are listening and on developing pronunciation. There isn't much study on the effect of on pronunciation.

As pronunciations of the words are mostly related with listening and speaking, students should be provided with the correct pronunciation of the words as much as possible. Activities in the classrooms are important chances for the students to hear the pronunciation of the words when it is provided in a correct way.

In Turkey, foreign language learning has always been important. The first foreign language has always placed in the education systems. Türker (2010) stated that preparation of new language books and programs and making them take place in the programs of the education faculties, employment of teachers, the students having option to select a second language during primary and secondary education are indicators to this. Additionally starting from the educational year in 2001 -2002, the second foreign language courses have become compulsory at Anatolian Teacher High Schools and starting from 2004-2005 in Anatolian High Schools, Anatolian Fine Arts High Schools and Science High Schools.

The National Ministry of Education also cares for teaching pronunciation at schools. Especially after the 'Fatih Project', the smart boards can be used effectively while teaching pronunciation. There is also a website of the Ministry called 'eba' containing a great many materials including visuals, oudios and videos. The support

of the Ministry for pronunciation teaching can be better understood by the following quotation. ‘‘Pronunciation teaching may be done by the teacher by recording the speeches of the teacher and the students and listening them in class or by watching television programs in the target language’’ (M.E.B. 2004:7-8).

1.2. The Aim of the Study

The aim of the study is to find out the common pronunciation errors and the sources of pronunciation errors of general high school students in Turkey. The potential effect of listening and reading aloud activities on pronunciation of English is also aimed to reveal by this study. The study focuses on the errors that originating from the phonemes while allophones, suprasegmentals and other aspects are generally ignored.

1.3. Research Questions

Research Question 1: What are the common pronunciation mistakes of general high school students in Turkey?

Research Question 2: What is the effect of listening and reading aloud activities on general high school students’pronunciation of English language?

1.4. Limitations of the Study

One of the limitations of the study was that the data was collected from a limited number of participants. Considering that the participants of the study were a class of Atışalanı Secondary School and there were 30 students in the class, the number of the participants is limited. Moreover, the study was carried out with only 10th grade students. The 9th or upper grades of students didn’t participate in the study. It was another limitation of the study.

The next limitation was the data collection tools itself and the word list of limited 32 words. During the recordings and while listening the voice recordings, some technical problems are possible to be encountered.

Another restriction of the study is that segmentals are focused in this study. The suprasegmentals such as intonation and stress were ignored.

Finally, the restriction of time is important. As 10th grades have two classes of English a week, the study was carried out in extra classes most of the time.

CHAPTER 2

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter studies that were carried out in the field of pronunciation and listening both in Turkey and in the world were reviewed briefly. Besides a some review of the studies that have been conducted worldwide and in Turkey is given.

2.1. Phonetics and Phonology

In his study John J. Ohala (1990) states that as a discipline, phonology is traditionally conceived of as the study of a logical and functional structure and behavior of speech sounds. Phonetics, on the other hand as a discipline is the study of how speech sounds are produced and perceived.

Roach (2009) states that phonology searches how phonemes function in language and the relationships among the different phonemes, in other words, the abstract side of the sounds of language. It is also defined by Ladefoged (1982) as the smallest segments of sounds that can be distinguished by their contrast within words are called phonemes. However, Phonetics investigates the articulation, description and classification of speech sounds by vocal organs while phonology deals with the functional aspect of those sounds in communication (Vardar, 1988).

Claire-A. Forel & Genoveva Puskás (2005) state that Phonetics is concerned with how sounds are produced transmitted and perceived. Phonology is concerned with how sounds function in relation to each other in a language. In other words, phonetics is about sounds of language, phonology about sound systems of language.

As phonetics and phonology both deal with sounds, and as English spelling and English pronunciation are two very different things, it is important that you keep in mind that we are not interested in letters here, but in sounds (Claire-A. Forel & Genoveva Puskás, 2005).

In his study, Crystal (2003) suggested that phonology is a branch of linguistics and it studies the sound systems of language. Pronunciation takes the most

important role represented in phonetic transcription. When words are mispronounced, communication will fail and the listener may not understand the main points.

2.2. Transfer & Interlingual Error

Various terms such as ‘interlanguage error’, ‘transfer’ and ‘interference’ also stand for interlingual errors. As Richards and Sampson (1985) state; “Sentences in the target language may exhibit interference from the mother tongue” (p.5). The language learner is always under the influence of the features of his/her native language. Namely, the learner’s native language will interfere with the learner’s production of the target language and the learner’s utterances in the target language will carry some features of his/her native language. Most simply, interlingual errors occur due the learner's application of his/her native language rules to the target language.

Especially at the early stages of foreign language learning, this interference is higher. Brown (1987) points out to emphasize the importance of these early stages and he states that “The beginning stages of learning a second language are characterized by a good deal of interlingual transfer from the native language, or interference. In these early stages, before the system of the second language is familiar, the native language is the only linguistic system in experience upon which the learner can draw” (p. 177).

2.3. Pronunciation and Listening

Pronunciation teaching is a significant part of language teaching. “As an important problem that we encounter in our classes, pronunciation deficiency has been aimed to solve by different techniques and methods” (John van Loon, 2002). Pronunciation teaching is a significant part of language teaching. As sounds play an important role in communication in English, foreign language teacher must be aware of the importance of pronunciation and must apply suitable activities to develop pronunciation. However, this significant part of teaching has been neglected by many

language teachers because of many combined reasons. One of these reasons is about the program itself. "Pronunciation is not incorporated directly into their programs or into the textbooks"(Hismanoğlu, 2009, p. 43). Another reason may be that the teachers may think the students can develop their pronunciation thanks to other activities included in the program without any direct focus on pronunciation. Third reason may be that the teachers, especially non-native ones, don't have enough competence to teach the elements of pronunciation in target language. Another reason may be that the teachers don't use the target language properly or don't give the students the chance to hear the words that they may have difficulty in pronouncing correctly.

In their study, Murat Hismanoglu and Sibel Hismanoglu (2010) aim at finding out the preferred pronunciation teaching techniques by the teachers. It is aimed to find out whether the teachers choose traditional or modern pronunciation teaching techniques. The teachers (participants) who teach English at university preparatory school are asked to determine three techniques that they use most. Further, the study investigates whether there is a relation between taking a pronunciation course at university education and choosing the techniques. As a result of the study, it was found out that most of the teachers prefer traditional methods. They don't use modern techniques such as video, audio or computer based teaching techniques. It is also revealed that there is no correlation between taking pronunciation lessons at university and choosing the teaching pronunciation techniques.

However, in another study which is also a survey study like the first article and conducted in Canada, the authors, (Judith Breitzkreutz, Tracey M. Derwing, and Marian J Rossiter, 2001) aim at finding to what extent the teachers use pronunciation teaching in their classes. The teachers' attitudes to teaching pronunciation is also aimed to find out in the study it is found out that teachers generally don't use computer based programs or audio – visual activities . This result resembles the outcome of the first article. Judith Breitzkreutz, Tracey M. Derwing and Marian J. Rossiter (2001) believe that the pronunciation should be taught integrated into communicative contexts. He states the need of the curriculum and materials to reach

the target unlike in the first article. “It is evident from this study that there is a continuing need for curriculum and materials developers to incorporate pronunciation instruction into communicative contexts” (Judith Breitkreutz, Tracey M. Derwing, and Marian J Rossiter, 2001).

In the study of John van Loon (2002) however, describes the pronunciation teaching in classes in a different perspective. “Teaching clear pronunciation as a language skill can be frustrating” (John van Loon, 2002). He believes that teaching pronunciation should be integrated into grammar. Then, the author suggests a technique about stressing and pausing in the same way of a native speaker of English. He describes some techniques such as information gap activities. As a result of his experimental study, John van Loon (2002) states that “There are different activities or techniques that may solve the problem. Dramatic improvement in pronunciation may be quickly achieved by showing learners how stress and pause are related to parts of speech and sentence structure.” In the study, he also emphasizes the awareness of pronunciation and grammar.

In a follow-up study conducted by Jennifer A. Foote, Amy K. Holtby, and Tracey M. Derwing (2010) aims to find out current pronunciation teaching practices and then compare the results with the results of the previous study. The base of the study is Breitkrutz, Derwing and Rossiter’s (2001) survey study. They conducted a survey to determine the nature and extent of pronunciation instruction in English as a second language classroom in Canada 10 years ago. For this study, “we also asked for background information about the instructors, formal education and teaching experience” (Jennifer A. Foote, Amy K. Holtby, and Tracey M. Derwing, 2010). As a result of the study, it is found out that the number of the pronunciation courses offered in ESL programs increased and also more training opportunities are available today. However, the teachers still are not happy with this. Jennifer A. Foote, Amy K. Holtby, and Tracey M. Derwing (2010) state that “Teachers’ beliefs about pronunciation instruction remained largely the same with a similar focus on segmentals and suprasegmentals.” However, according to study, there is a slight difference in how teachers approached these two aspects of pronunciation. Ten years

ago, teachers reported emphasizing both aspects in the class, whereas today there seems to be a slightly greater focus on segmentals.

Seidlhofer (2001) states that pronunciation includes both production and perception of the sounds of a particular language in order to understand and interpret the meaning. We can say that pronunciation involves the production and perception of segmental sounds along with suprasegmental (prosodic) features, such as stress, intonation and rhythm (Seidlhofer, 2001; Setter & Jenkins, 2005).

As Seidlhofer (2001) and Setter and Jenkins (2005) stated, pronunciation often happens at a subconscious level; therefore, it is difficult to control. This leads the authors to conclude that pronunciation is a very difficult and challenging aspect of second language learning and teaching.

As a conclusion of the studies, authors found different results according to their purpose, method and participants. However, most of them stressed the need for more attention to pronunciation teaching both from the points of teachers and curriculum. “How instructors approach pronunciation instruction in the classroom varies extensively.” (Jennifer A. Foote, Amy K. Holtby, and Tracey M. Derwing, 2010). “Most of the instructors of our acquaintance have not had any specific training of pronunciation; neither have they had much in the way of linguistic training in phonetics and phonology” (Judith Breitzkreutz, Tracey M. Derwing, and Marian J Rossiter, 2001). “Many teachers and educators have recognized that some L2 students need direct assistance with pronunciation: for the last two decades, considerable numbers of people have come out of communicative classrooms who, despite large vocabularies and good comprehension skills, have difficulty making themselves understood.” (Judith Breitzkreutz, Tracey M. Derwing, and Marian J Rossiter, 2001). “It is evident from this study that there is a continuing need for curriculum and materials developers to incorporate pronunciation instruction into communicative contexts” (Judith Breitzkreutz, Tracey M. Derwing, and Marian J Rossiter, 2001). “It should be stressed that the teachers should be motivated to make use of some computer-based pronunciation teaching programs that are available on the market. Moreover, language teachers are to be stimulated to use the Internet so as

to improve their pronunciation teaching skills and bring a variety to the language classroom'' (Murat Hismanoglu, Sibel Hismanoglu, 2010).

2.4. Studies in the World

There have been a great number of studies in the field of phonology or pronunciation all over the world but only some of the research and studies are mentioned.

In his study, Manuel Diaz-Campos (2004) searched the sounds of Spanish and English. He studied with 25 European exchange undergraduate students and his test contained 135 wordpairs. The participants were tested at three times: before and after an instruction period, and then after a three month stay-abroad term. He found that formal instruction period had a greater effect on the learners' perceptual phonological competence than the stay abroad term.

Mimatsu (2000) carried out her study with six female Japanese university students as participants for her research to investigate the pronunciation errors of English language. The most important one of those errors was the confusion of the sounds /l/ and /r/.

In their study, Truong, Strik, Cucchiarini and Neri (2004) focused on an acoustic-phonetic approach to automatic pronunciation error detection. They conducted the study with applying Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL) applications, Computer Assisted Pronunciation Training (CAPT) applications that make use of automatic speech recognition (ASR).

Sobkowiak and Ferlacka (2005) used twenty English words of four different phonetic difficulty levels as a data collection tool. They were read in carrier sentences by 38 Polish learners of English aged between 17 and 18. After an analysis, they also made a comparison between their data and the one collected in 2000 from 208 university students of EFL. Sobkowiak also studied on computer and machine assisted pronunciation teaching. He developed his own original Phonetic

Difficulty Index (PDI) over several years to reflect the pronunciation difficulties of the Polish learners of English.

Shudong, Higgins and Shima (2005) created a compact but effective internet-based support system for Japanese English learners to improve their English pronunciation. The system provided several interactive methods for users not only to learn pronunciation from the sample data of native speakers, but also to discover and evaluate their own specific pronunciation problems, and then improve their pronunciation with the help of the system.

In his study, Culhane (2003) studied the impact of a methodology for enhancing English as a second language pronunciation among Japanese learners through web-based listening and speaking activities.

2.5. Studies in Turkey

It seems that there isn't much interest in Turkey to explore the language learning problems in terms of pronunciation and phonology. Most of the researches take place at universities and are conducted on other skills of learning. Therefore, there is a great deal of work to be done before this study.

In the last two decades, Gurbuz (1988) studied on Turkish and German phonemes and produced a contrastive work of phonetics and phonology. Senel (1997) explained the contributions of phonetics to language teaching in state schools of Turkey. Demirezen (1986) gave definitions of phonemic analysis and phonology of English. His aim was to supply a need-filling gap on phonological theory which is mostly considered abstract or incomprehensible by students. Koksal (1990) gave the definitions of some approaches, methods and techniques in teaching English pronunciation to Turkish learners. In his study, Kaya (1989) focused on the difficulties of pronunciation in learning foreign languages. Akalın (1995) carried out her study on the basis of the contributions of the linguistics to language teaching, and she gave the definitions of partly phonetics, phonology and English sound system.

Kacmaz (1996) also analysed errors of English pronunciation of Turkish learners. Yıldızcelik (1996) studied the effect of foreign accent on comprehension.

In his study, Gultekin (2002) studied the errors in suprasegmental features such as stress, rhythm, and intonation of English pronunciation. He recorded 20 first year university students' voices while they were speaking spontaneously on certain topics. These speech samples were listened by 4 British and 6 American English teachers and by this way a pronunciation problem inventory was prepared by them. The results of the study showed problems of suprasegmental features such as stress rhythm, and intonation are found to be problematic for Turkish students.

Altınır (2008) investigated English learners' beliefs about the acquisition of the phonetic component of English. Her aim was to examine the differences in phonetic awareness, beliefs, and attitudes between learners of English. The participants were asked to complete a number of questionnaires, including a background questionnaire and a specific questionnaire on awareness, beliefs and attitudes.

In the study of Cekiç (2007), the effects of Computer Assisted Pronunciation Teaching (CAPT) on the improvement of listening comprehension of pre-intermediate preparatory class students at universities was investigated. As participants, he had three groups of pre-intermediate students as segmental, suprasegmental and control groups, which were each composed of 13 students. A pre-test was administered to all the three groups. After 6 consecutive weeks of CAPT, the results of post-test were in favor of suprasegmental group and segmental group. The differences between the experimental groups' pretests and post-tests results were statistically significant for the suprasegmental and segmental groups, but not significant for the control group. However, the differences between the post-tests results of the all the three groups were not significantly high because of some certain limitations such as the period of the study, the number of the students, and the lab's technological and physical inadequacy.

CHAPTER 3

3. METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, the design of the study is presented. It also gives information about the description of setting and participants, instruments used for the study, data collection method.

3.1. Data Collection Tools and Materials

Five reading texts (Appendix 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5) chosen from the textbook (Yes You Can A1.2) printed by the Ministry of Education and compulsory in General and Vocational high schools throughout Turkey. The reading texts were chosen from the 3rd, 4th and 5th units of the textbook. Then a list of 32 English words (Appendix 6) that were mispronounced by the participants was chosen from these reading activities. 9th grade students use *Impulse*, 10th grades use *Yes You Can A1.2*, 11th and 12th grades use upper levels of the book. The textbook also has a workbook and CD materials. The reason to take the book as criteria was that it was the compulsory course book of the school and all of the students had the book. Another reason was that the study requires the book to be studied during the research.

3.2. Participants of the Research

Thirty students of Atışalanı Anatolian High School participated in the study. Class 10-C was chosen for the study as their general success in English lesson and their general success in other lessons was higher than the other 10th grade classes in the school.

The students had three hours English classes a week in 9th class and they had two hours English classes a week in 10th grade and the upper grades. All of the

participants were learning English as a second language. English was their first foreign language. Their level of English was between beginner and elementary. The range of age was between 15 and 17.

As the school became Anatolian High school in 2013, only 9th classes were Anatolian classes. That is, 10th and upper grades were General High School classes.

3.3. Research Design

Reading texts (Appendix 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5) and a word list (Appendix 6) consisted of 32 words which are chosen from the reading texts are used to obtain data. A laptop computer with headphones and sound recordings also used to obtain spoken data.

The data was collected through the following tasks: First, the participants read the reading texts one by one from top to down into the microphone of the headphone and their voices were recorded using a computer recording program, Ashampoo Music Studio 4.

Then the recordings were examined by the researcher and three other colleagues of the researcher together. The mispronounced words were chosen from the texts using the recordings of the students one by one. The obtained results were given in frequencies and percentages in tables drawn for each word. Taking the percentages and frequencies into consideration the data was interpreted and the types of errors were classified.

After that, the listening activities that have audios of a native speaker of English were found. These activities contained the words that the students mispronounced during their performance. The activities were prepared to be studied during the lessons. The activities were listened by all of the students in the class. Different activities were done with these recordings. The students practiced the audio at least three times for each activity and they had the chance to repeat the words that they had mispronounced before. They sometimes were asked to figure the words that

they had mispronounced before starting the activities. They were also asked to read the audio script aloud after completing the listening activities. The recordings were played again and again until all the students could pronounce all of the problematic words.

After four weeks of the activities, the students asked to read the reading texts that they read before. Their voices were recorded by the same way again and the recordings were examined by the same colleagues. With the same procedure, the data collection was completed after ten weeks. The words mispronounced before were observed and the results were noted down one by one. The tables of the errors were drawn for each word again and analyzed by the same way.

CHAPTER 4

4. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of the sound recordings and the data analysis of this study based on data analysis procedure mentioned in the previous chapter. First part of this chapter gives the results, and the second part presents the analysis of the findings of the sound recordings.

The written and spoken data was analyzed in terms of the sources of the errors. The tables of the pronunciation errors of each word were provided in the chapter. Comments and interpretations were made about error types. The collected data revealed that most of the errors were made because of the lack of knowledge about English speech sounds.

4.1. The Results of the Sound Recordings

When the tables are investigated, the correct pronunciation phonetics of each word and the mispronounced version of the word pronounced by the students are given. The students who pronounced the word correctly and mispronounced are also exits. The scores and rates of correct pronunciation and mispronunciation are also given. There are also brief interpretations of the tables below them.

Table 1. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘friend’

<i>Friend</i>	Correct Pronunciation /frend/		Mispronounced /friend-frent/	
	Before	After	Before	After
Number	5	17	25	13
Rate (%)	16,6	56,6	83,3	43,3

Table 1 indicates that before the listening activities, 5 students pronounced the word ‘friend’ correctly while 25 participants mispronounced. In most of the participants’ pronunciation, the problem was with the sound /ɪ/. Some of them also pronounced the /d/ consonant as /t/. Table 1 shows that after the activities, 17 of the participants pronounced the word correctly with a rate of 56,6% while 13 of them mispronounced.

Table 2. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘badminton’

<i>Badminton</i>	Correct Pronunciation /bædmɪntən /		Mispronounced /bedmɪntən-bʌdmɪntən/	
	Before	After	Before	After
Number	6	14	24	16
Rate (%)	20	56,6	80	43,3

As table 2 indicates, the error rate of the word ‘badminton’ was 80% before doing the activities. Only 6 of the participants could pronounce the word correctly while 24 pronounced it incorrectly. The problems were with the vowels /æ/ and /ə/. Some participants pronounced the first sound as /ʌ/ or /e/ and as /ɒ/ the second sound. Some of the participants mispronounced both of the sounds while some of them pronounced only one sound incorrectly. As table 2 shows, after the listening practices, 14 participants pronounced the word correctly while 16 couldn’t.

Table 3. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘swimming’

<i>Swimming</i>	Correct Pronunciation /swɪmɪŋ/		Mispronounced /swɪmɪŋk-swɪmɪŋ/	
	Before	After	Before	After
Number	14	20	16	10
Rate (%)	46,6	66,6	53,3	33,3

It is indicated in table 3 that the error rate of the word ‘swimming’ was low compared most of the other problematic words. Correct pronunciation rate was 46,6 % with a number of 14 while mispronunciation rate was 53,3 % before the listening and reading aloud activities done. Most common error was made while pronouncing the suffix /-ing/. The participants couldn’t pronounce the nasal correctly. Instead, they pronounced the sound as /nk/ or /k/. A few of the participants also pronounced double /m/. After the activities, a total of 20 participants pronounced the word in a correct way. Other 10 repeated the same error that they had made before the activities.

Table 4. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘love’

<i>Love</i>	Correct Pronunciation /lʌv/		Mispronounced /lɒv/	
	Before	After	Before	After
Number	14	24	16	6
Rate (%)	46,6	80,0	53,3	20,0

Table 4 shows that the correct pronunciation of this word was higher in comparison to the other words. The correct pronunciation rate was the same with the word ‘swimming’. However, not over 50% participants could pronounce the word correctly again. The participants who mispronounced the word made errors while pronouncing the sound /ʌ/. They pronounced as /ɒ/ instead. Some of the participants also added an /e/ vowel at the end of the word while reading. It is indicated in the table 4 that after the activities 24 participants pronounced the word correctly. It was observed that 8 participants corrected their pronunciation compared to their performance before the activities. The correct pronunciation rate increased from 46,6% to 80% after doing the listening and reading aloud activities.

Table 5. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘classical’

<i>Classical</i>	Correct Pronunciation /klæsɪkəl/		Mispronounced /klasɪkəl/	
	Before	After	Before	After
Number	8	14	22	16
Rate (%)	26,6	46,6	73,3	53,3

As the table 5 shows; before the listening activities, 8 participants pronounced the word ‘classical’ in a correct way while 22 others mispronounced. The participants who mispronounced the word had difficulty in pronouncing the sounds /æ/ and /ə/. They pronounced them as /a/ or /ʌ/. Some mispronounced both of the sounds while some mispronounced one of them. It can be seen from the table 5 that after the activities 14 students were successfully pronounced the word. Others repeated the same errors. However, the incorrect pronunciation rate decreased from 73,3% to 53,3% after the activities.

Table 6. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘music’

<i>Music</i>	Correct Pronunciation /mju:zɪk/		Mispronounced /mu:zɪk- mu:sɪk/	
	Before	After	Before	After
Number	1	15	29	15
Rate (%)	3,3	50,0	96,6	50,0

Table 6 indicates that the word ‘music’ was pronounced correctly by 1 participant. The rate of the correct pronunciation was low (3,3 %). The problem with the word was the sound /ju:/. Some of the participants also mispronounced the consonant /z/ as /s/. Table 6 shows that after the activities, 15 of the participants pronounced the word in a correct way. The correct pronunciation rate increased from 3,3% to 50%. However the other 15 participants couldn’t correct their errors.

Table 7. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘hate’

<i>Hate</i>	Correct Pronunciation /heit/		Mispronounced /hʌte/	
	Before	After	Before	After
Number	13	20	17	10
Rate (%)	43,3	66,6	56,6	33,3

Table 7 shows that 13 participants pronounced this word correctly before the activities. Most of the other 17 participants pronounced the word as ‘hʌte’. As the table 7 indicates, after the activities, 20 students pronounced the word correctly (66,6%). 7 of the 17 participants that had made errors corrected their errors after the listening activities.

Table 8. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘about’

<i>About</i>	Correct Pronunciation /əˈbaʊt/		Mispronounced /ʌbaʊt/	
	Before	After	Before	After
Number	7	12	23	18
Rate (%)	23,3	40,0	76,6	60,0

Table 8 shows that after the first recording, it was observed that 23 students mispronounced the word ‘about’ while 7 participants’ pronunciations were correct. The problematic sounds were /ə/ and /aʊ/ vowels. The participants sounded them as /ʌ/ and /bʊ/. Table 8 indicates that after the practices, 12 of the participants pronounced the word correctly.

Table 9. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘romantic’

<i>Romantic</i>	Correct Pronunciation <i>/rəʊ'mæntɪk/</i>		Mispronounced <i>/rɒmʌntɪk/</i>	
	Before	After	Before	After
Number	0	10	30	20
Rate (%)	0,0	33,3	100	66,6

As it is indicated in table 9, none of the participants pronounced the word ‘romantic’ correctly before the listening activities. The participants made errors while pronouncing the /əʊ/ and /ʌ/ sounds. Most of them mispronounced both of the vowels while a few of them mispronounced one of them. Table 9 reveals that after the activities, 10 participants pronounced the word correctly. The correct pronunciation rate increased from 0,0 % to 33,3%. The others (66,6%) still mispronounced the word.

Table 10. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘got’

<i>Got</i>	Correct Pronunciation <i>/gɒt/</i>		Mispronounced <i>/gɔʊt-gʌt/</i>	
	Before	After	Before	After
Number	7	12	23	18
Rate (%)	23,3	40,0	76,6	60,0

It is observed from the table 10 that the word ‘got’ was pronounced correctly by 7 participants during their performance before the activities. The mispronunciation rate was pretty high with 76,6%. The participants that mispronounced the word had difficulty in pronouncing the vowel /ɒ/. Most of them pronounced it as /ɔʊ/ and some pronounced as /ʌ/. Table 10 reveals that after the activities, 5 of the participants corrected their pronunciation of this word. The number of the students that pronounced correctly was 12; other 18 participants mispronounced it again.

Table 11. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘brown’

<i>Brown</i>	Correct Pronunciation /braʊn/		Mispronounced /bravn-brɔvn/	
	Before	After	Before	After
Number	17	20	13	10
Rate (%)	56,6	66,6	43,3	33,3

It is observed from the table 11 that before doing the listening activities, 13 of the participants pronounced ‘brown’ in a correct way while 17 mispronounced. The problem was with the /aʊ/ diphthong and the /v/ consonant. The participants that mispronounced the word added a /v/ after /a/ or /ɔ/. As the table 11 shows, after the activities 20 of the participants were observed to be successful while pronouncing the word. The correct pronunciation rate was 66,6% after the activities.

Table 12. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘colour’

<i>Colour</i>	Correct Pronunciation /ˈkʌlə - ər/		Mispronounced /kɒləɪr-kɒləʊr/	
	Before	After	Before	After
Number	15	23	15	7
Rate (%)	50,0	76,6	50,0	23,3

As it is indicated in the table 12, the word ‘colour/color’ was mispronounced by 15 participants before the activities. 50% was a high rate by comparison to most of the other words. The pronunciation errors were related to the vowels. The participants who mispronounced word, pronounced the /ʌ/ and /ə/ vowels as ‘kɒləɪr’ or ‘kɒləʊr’. Table 12 reveals that after the activities, 23 participants could pronounce the word correctly. The correct pronunciation rate increased from 50% to 76,6%.

Table 13. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘kind’

<i>Kind</i>	Correct Pronunciation /kaɪnd/		Mispronounced /kɪnd-kɪnt/	
	Before	After	Before	After
Number	13	20	17	10
Rate (%)	43,3	66,6	56,6	33,3

From the table 13 it is observed that the word ‘kind’ was pronounced correctly by 13 participants at the first performance. The other participants mispronounced the word by sounding it as ‘kɪnd’ or ‘kɪnt’. According to the results given in table 13, 20 of the participants pronounced the word correctly after the activities. The error rate of the word was 33,3% in the second performance of the participants.

Table 14. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘well’

<i>Well</i>	Correct Pronunciation /wel/		Mispronounced /wɪl-wɪll/	
	Before	After	Before	After
Number	15	26	15	4
Rate (%)	50,0	86,6	50,0	13,3

Table 14 shows that the word ‘well’ was pronounced correctly by 15 participants before the activities. The error rate was average. The problematic sound was the vowel /e/. The participants that made error pronounced it as /ɪ/. Some of the participants also pronounced a double /l/ at the end of the word. Table 14 indicates that after the activities, 26 of the participants pronounced the word correctly. The correct pronunciation rate was 86,6%.

Table 15. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘job’

<i>Job</i>	Correct Pronunciation /dʒɒb/		Mispronounced /dʒʌb- dʒʌp/	
	Before	After	Before	After
Number	12	19	18	11
Rate (%)	40,0	63,3	60,0	36,6

As it is showed in the table 15, the word ‘job’ was mispronounced by 18 participants while correctly pronounced by 12. The most remarkable problem was with the consonant /j/. 18 participants pronounced the sound /dʒ/ as /j/. English phonetics doesn’t contain the sound. Some of the students also pronounced the vowel /ɒ/ as /ʌ/. Table 15 indicates that after the activities, 7 more participants pronounced the word correctly except from the other 12 participants who had pronounced correctly before. 63,3% of the participants pronounced the word in a correct way after doing the activities.

Table 16. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘work’

<i>Work</i>	Correct Pronunciation /wɜ:k/		Mispronounced /wɒk-wɔrk/	
	Before	After	Before	After
Number	10	22	20	8
Rate (%)	33,3	73,3	66,6	26,6

Table 16 shows that 10 of the participants pronounced the word ‘work’ correctly while 20 others couldn’t. The problematic sound was /ɜ:/. 20 of the participants pronounced it as /ɒ/ and some of them added an extra /r/ consonant after it. It is observed from the table 16 that 22 of the participants were successful while pronouncing the word after the activities. The correct pronunciation rate increased from 33,3% to 73,3%.

Table 17. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘travel’

<i>Travel</i>	Correct Pronunciation /trævəl/ /trʌvəl/		Mispronounced /trʌvəl-trevəl/	
	Before	After	Before	After
Number	14	24	16	6
Rate (%)	46,6	80,0	53,3	20,0

As it is given in the table 17, the correct pronunciation rate of the word ‘travel’ was 46,6% before doing the activities. 16 of the participants pronounced the word as ‘trʌvəl’ or ‘trevəl’. It can be observed from the table 17 that after the activities, 24 of the participants were successful. The correct pronunciation rate increased to 80%.

Table 18. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘breakfast’

<i>Breakfast</i>	Correct Pronunciation /brekfəst/ /brekfast/		Mispronounced /brekfast- brekfest/	
	Before	After	Before	After
Number	15	25	15	5
Rate (%)	50,0	83,3	50,0	16,6

Table 18 indicates clearly that the word ‘breakfast’ was pronounced correctly by the half of the participants while the other half mispronounced before the activities. The participants who mispronounced the word sounded the word as ‘brekfast’ or ‘brekfest’. Table 18 shows that the number of the participants that pronounced the word correctly after the activities was 25. The correct pronunciation rate increased from 50% to 83,3%.

Table 19. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘lunch’

<i>Lunch</i>	Correct Pronunciation /lʌntʃ/		Mispronounced /luntʃ/	
	Before	After	Before	After
Number	13	24	17	6
Rate (%)	43,3	80,0	56,6	20,0

As the table 19 shows, the word ‘lunch’ was pronounced correctly by 13 participants before doing the activities. The only problem with the mispronunciation was the sound /ʌ/. 17 of the participants pronounced it as /u/. All of the participants were successful while pronouncing the /tʃ/ sound. Table 19 indicates that after the activities, 24 of the participants pronounced it correctly. The correct pronunciation rate was 80% while the mispronunciation rate was 20%.

Table 20. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘word’

<i>Word</i>	Correct Pronunciation /wɜ:d/		Mispronounced /wɜ:rd-wɜrd/	
	Before	After	Before	After
Number	8	23	22	7
Rate (%)	26,6	76,6	73,3	23,3

It is showed in table 20 that the word ‘word’ was mispronounced by 22 participants while 8 of the participants were successful while pronouncing it. The problem with the word was the same with the word ‘work’. The participants that made error, pronounced it as ‘wɜ:rd’ or ‘wɜrd’. As showed in table 20, after the activities, the number of the participants that pronounced the word correctly increased from 8 to 23. The correct pronunciation rate was 76,6% after completing the listening activities.

Table 21. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘fun’

<i>Fun</i>	Correct Pronunciation /fʌn/		Mispronounced /fun/	
	Before	After	Before	After
Number	12	27	18	3
Rate (%)	40,0	90,0	60,0	10,0

Table 21 clearly indicates that 12 of the participants pronounced the word ‘fun’ correctly while 18 of them mispronounced before the activities. The problematic sound was again /ʌ/. 60% of the participants pronounced it as ‘fun’. From table 21, it was observed that 27 of the participants pronounced the word in a correct way after completing the activities. The correct pronunciation rate was 90%.

Table 22 .Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘summer’

<i>Summer</i>	Correct Pronunciation /sʌmər -ər/		Mispronounced /sumer-sʊmər/	
	Before	After	Before	After
Number	7	18	23	12
Rate (%)	23,3	60,0	76,6	40,0

Table 22 shows that before the listening activities, 7 students pronounced the word ‘summer’ correctly while 23 participants mispronounced. In most of the participants’ pronunciation, the problem was with the sound /ʌ/. Some of them also stressed the /r/ consonant that is at the end of the word. It is indicated in table 22 that after the activities, 18 of the participants pronounced the word correctly with a rate of 60% while 12 of them mispronounced.

Table 23. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘volunteer’

<i>Volunteer</i>	Correct Pronunciation /vɒlən'tiə/		Mispronounced /vɒlɒntɪr/	
	Before	After	Before	After
Number	2	11	28	19
Rate (%)	6,6	36,6	93,3	63,3

As table 23 reveals, the error rate of the word ‘badminton’ was 93,3% before doing the activities. Only 2 of the participants could pronounce the word correctly while 28 pronounced it incorrectly. The problems were with the vowel /ə/ and consonant /r/. Some participants pronounced the first sound as /ʊ/ or /u/ and stressed the consonant /r/. Some of the participants mispronounced both of the sounds while some of them pronounced only one sound incorrectly. It is observed from table 23 that after the activities, 11 of the participants pronounced the word correctly with a rate of 36,6%.

Table 24. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘country’

<i>Country</i>	Correct Pronunciation /kʌntri/		Mispronounced /kauntri-kɒntri/	
	Before	After	Before	After
Number	7	13	23	17
Rate (%)	23,3	43,3	76,6	56,6

Table 24 indicates that the error rate of the word ‘country’ was high compared most of the other problematic words. Correct pronunciation rate was 23,3% with a number of 7 while mispronunciation rate was 76,6% before the listening and reading aloud activities done. Most common error was made while pronouncing the /ʌ/ sound. The participants couldn’t pronounce the sound correctly. Instead, they pronounced the word as ‘kauntri’ or ‘kɒntri’. As table 24 shows, after the activities, a total of 13 participants pronounced the word in a correct way. Other 17 repeated the same error that they had made before the activities.

Table 25. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘feeding’

<i>Feeding</i>	Correct Pronunciation /fi:dɪŋ/		Mispronounced /fedɪŋ- fi:dɪnk/	
	Before	After	Before	After
Number	13	24	17	6
Rate (%)	43,3	80,0	56,6	20,0

As indicated in table 25, the correct pronunciation of this word was higher in comparison to the other words. However, not over 50% of the participants could pronounce the word correctly again. The participants who mispronounced the word made errors while pronouncing the sound ‘i:’ and the suffix ‘ing’. They pronounced the word as ‘fedɪŋ’ or ‘fi:dɪnk’. Table 25 reveals that after the activities 24 participants pronounced the word correctly. It was observed that 11 participants corrected their pronunciation compared to their performance before the activities. The correct pronunciation rate increased from 43,3% to 80% after doing the listening and reading aloud activities.

Table 26. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘with’

<i>With</i>	Correct Pronunciation /wɪð/		Mispronounced /wɪt/	
	Before	After	Before	After
Number	13	17	17	13
Rate (%)	43,3	56,6	56,6	43,3

Table 26 shows that before the listening activities, 13 participants pronounced the word ‘with’ in a correct way while 17 others mispronounced. The participants who mispronounced the word had difficulty in pronouncing the sound /ð/. They pronounced them as /t/. As indicated in table 26; after the activities, 17 students were successfully pronounced the word. Others repeated the same error. However, the incorrect pronunciation rate decreased from 43,3% to 56,6% after the activities.

Table 27. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘camera’

<i>Camera</i>	Correct Pronunciation <i>/kæməra/</i>		Mispronounced <i>/kʌməɾʌ/</i>	
	Before	After	Before	After
Number	5	15	25	15
Rate (%)	16,6	50,0	83,3	50,0

Table 27 shows that the word ‘camera’ was pronounced correctly by 5 participants. The rate of the correct pronunciation was low (16,6 %). The problem with the word was the sounds /æ/, /ə/ and /a/. The participants that made errors pronounced the word as ‘kʌməɾʌ’. It is showed in table 27 that after the activities, 15 of the participants pronounced the word in a correct way. The correct pronunciation rate increased from 16,6% to 50%. However the other 15 participants couldn’t correct their errors.

Table 28. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘here’

<i>Here</i>	Correct Pronunciation <i>/hɪə/</i>		Mispronounced <i>/here- hɪər/</i>	
	Before	After	Before	After
Number	10	20	20	10
Rate (%)	33,3	66,6	66,6	33,3

It can be seen from table 28 that 10 participants pronounced this word correctly before the activities. Most of the other 20 participants pronounced the word as ‘here’ or ‘hɪər’. Table 28 reveals that after the activities, 20 students pronounced the word correctly (66,6%). 10 of the 20 participants that had made errors corrected their errors after the listening activities.

Table 29. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘wearing’

<i>Here</i>	Correct Pronunciation <i>/hɪə/</i>		Mispronounced <i>/here- hɪər/</i>	
	Before	After	Before	After
Number	10	22	20	8
Rate (%)	33,3	73,3	66,6	26,6

It is showed in table 29 that after the first recording, it was observed that 20 students mispronounced the word ‘wearing’ while 10 participants’ pronunciations were correct. The problematic sounds were /e/ and /ɪŋ/. The participants sounded them as ‘wearink’. As it is indicated in table 29, 22 of the participants pronounced the word correctly after the practices.

Table 30. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘snowing’

<i>Snowing</i>	Correct Pronunciation <i>/snəʊɪŋ/</i>		Mispronounced <i>/snovɪŋ /</i>	
	Before	After	Before	After
Number	14	22	16	8
Rate (%)	33,3	73,3	66,6	26,6

Table 30 shows that 14 of the participants pronounced the word ‘snowing’ correctly before the listening activities. The participants made errors while pronouncing the /ɪŋ/ again. Most of them mispronounced the word as ‘snovink’. Table 30 indicated that after the activities, 21 participants pronounced the word correctly. The correct pronunciation rate increased from 46,6 % to 70% after the practices of listening. The others (30%) still mispronounced the word.

Table 31. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘freezing’

<i>Freezing</i>	Correct Pronunciation /fri:ziŋ/ /fri:ziŋ/		Mispronounced /fri:zɪnk- freziŋ /	
	Before	After	Before	After
Number	13	20	17	10
Rate (%)	33,3	66,6	56,6	33,3

As table 31 shows, the word ‘freezing’ was pronounced correctly by 13 participants during their performance before the activities. The mispronunciation rate was pretty average with 56,6%. The participants that mispronounced the word had difficulty in pronouncing the sounds /i: / and /iŋ/. Most of them pronounced it ‘fri:zɪnk’ or ‘freziŋ’. As it is given in table 31; after the activities, 7 of the participants corrected their pronunciation of this word. The number of the students that pronounced correctly was 20; other 10 participants mispronounced it again.

Table 32. Error distributions for pronunciation of the word ‘outside’

<i>Outside</i>	Correct Pronunciation /aʊt'saɪd/ /aʊt'saɪd/		Mispronounced /aʊt'saɪt- ʊt'saɪd/	
	Before	After	Before	After
Number	4	18	26	12
Rate (%)	13,3	60,0	86,6	40,0

Table 32 reveals that before doing the listening activities, 4 of the participants pronounced ‘outside’ in a correct way while 26 mispronounced. The problem was with the /aʊ/ vowels and the /d/ consonant. The participants that made errors mispronounced the word as ‘aʊt'saɪt’ or ‘ʊt'saɪd’. Table 32 indicates that after the activities 18 of the participants were observed to be successful while pronouncing the word. The correct pronunciation rate was 60% after the activities.

4.2. Analysis and Interpretation of the Results

Table 33. Error distributions for pronunciation of the problematic words

	Before the Activities		After the Activities		Increase	
	Correct Pronunciation Score	Incorrect Pronunciation Score	Correct Pronunciation Score	Incorrect Pronunciation Score	Score	Rate (%)
Friend	5	25	17	13	12	40,0
Badminton	6	24	14	16	8	26,6
Swimming	14	16	20	10	6	20,0
Love	14	16	24	6	10	33,3
Classical	8	22	14	16	6	20,0
Music	1	29	15	15	14	46,6
Hate	13	17	20	10	7	23,3
About	7	23	12	18	5	16,6
Romantic	0	30	10	20	10	33,3
Got	7	23	12	18	5	16,6
Brown	17	13	20	10	3	10,0
Color	15	15	23	7	8	26,6
Kind	13	17	20	10	7	23,3
Well	15	15	26	4	11	36,6
Job	12	18	19	11	7	23,3
Work	10	20	22	8	12	40,0
Travel	14	16	24	6	10	33,3
Breakfast	15	15	25	5	10	33,3
Lunch	13	17	24	6	11	36,6
Word	8	22	23	7	15	50,0
Fun	12	18	27	3	15	50,0
Summer	7	23	18	12	11	36,6
Volunteer	2	28	11	19	9	30,0
Country	7	23	13	17	6	20,0
Feeding	13	17	24	6	11	36,6
With	13	17	17	13	4	13,3
Camera	5	25	15	15	10	33,3
Here	10	20	20	10	10	33,3
Wearing	10	20	22	8	12	40,0
Snowing	14	16	21	9	7	23,3
Freezing	13	17	20	10	7	23,3
Outside	4	26	18	12	14	46,6

4.2.1. Analysis and Interpretation of the Results of the First Sound Recordings

As indicated in table 65, the error rates of the loan words were quite higher compared to most of the other words. None of the students pronounced the word 'romantic' correctly. 29 of the students mispronounced the word 'music' while 25 of

them mispronounced the word ‘camera’. The word ‘badminton’ was mispronounced by 24 students and the word ‘classical’ by 22 students. As the students already know the words because they exist in their mother tongue and they know the Turkish pronunciation of the words, the students were oriented to pronounce the words as in the Turkish language. The students pronounced the word as they were Turkish words intentionally or unintentionally. Mother tongue and background knowledge of the loan words were the origins of the errors in these words. Such errors may be accepted as inter-lingual mistakes that the students generally make. As it is seen from the Table 65, the words that have the highest error rates are loan words (romantic, music) with a rate of 100% and 96,6 %. It was the most remarkable detail considering the results of the sound recordings.

The error rates of the words that end with /-ing/ suffix was also remarkably higher. The word ‘wearing’ mispronounced by 20 of the participants and the word ‘snowing’ was mispronounced by 16 students. The words ‘swimming’ and ‘feeding’ were both mispronounced by 17 of the participants according to the sound recordings. The error rates of these words were slightly similar and the the number of the students that mispronounced shows the similarity. The /-ing/ syllables and /ŋ/ phoneme were also two of the most remarkable errors of the students. As the /g/ phoneme in Turkish is used in the first or middle syllables of the words and the words end with a /k/ instead of /g/, the students were tended to pronounce them as /k/.

The students did not have so much difficulty with /b, d, e, f, l, t/ phonemes. Those who mispronounced the words ‘friend, kind’ by sounding the final /d/ as /t/ made mistake because Turkish language has this feature to pronounce the final /b, c, d, g/ phonemes as /p, ç, t, k/ in many words. The word ‘friend’ was mispronounced by 25 participants (83,3%) while the word ‘kind’ mispronounced by 17 of the participants (56,6). However, the most remarkable errors in these words were the /ie/ and /i/ phonemes.

The /æ/ phoneme was also a remarkable error that the students made while pronouncing the words that contain that sound. These were the words ‘badminton, classical, romantic, travel, and camera’. As there is a little difference between the

Turkish /e/ phoneme and the English /æ/ phoneme, they mispronounced it. The English /æ/ is pronounced a little open and it led the students to mispronounce the /e/ phonemes.

Some of the participants pronounced the /w/ phoneme as /v/ because it doesn't exist in Turkish language. The errors of the participants while pronouncing the words 'well, work, word, with, wear' were simply observed.

The results of the study have also shown that the students had difficulties in the pronunciation of /ð, θ, ŋ, w/ consonants, /ɜ:, ə, ɔ:, ɒ, æ, ʌ/ vowels and /əʊ, aʊ, ɪə, oʊ/ diphthongs.

The /d, r, t/ consonants in English is slightly different from those in Turkish. These were allophones and the mispronunciations of these sounds were neglected while examining the sound recordings.

4.2.2. Analysis and Interpretation of the Results of the Second Sound Recordings

After the activities, it was found out that the correct pronunciation rate increased in all the problematic words. It was also observed that the participants who had pronounced the word correctly before the activities, achieved to pronounce them after the activities again. The number of the students that corrected their pronunciation of a word varies. Only 3 students corrected their pronunciation of a certain word while 15 of the participants corrected the pronunciation of another word.

The highest increase of correct pronunciation observed in the words was 'word' and 'fun'. 15 of the participants corrected their errors after doing the activities. It means 50% of the participants learned the pronunciation of these words and they performed them correctly. There were also 8 more students that pronounced 'word' and the score of the correct pronunciation increased to 23. The mispronunciation rate was 73,3% before the activities while it was 23,3% after the activities.

The increase rate of some other words were observed as following; the words 'music' and 'outside' were corrected by 14 participants with a rate of 46,6%, 'friend, work' and 'wearing' by 12 participantas and the words 'well, lunch, summer and feeding' were corrected by 11 participants.

As it was stated before, the correct pronunciation rate of all the words increased after the listening activities. However, the increase rates in some words were remarkably lower than the others. These words were; 'brown' with an increase rate of 10%, the word 'with' with a rate of 13,3%, the words 'about and got' with a rate of 16,6% and the words 'classical, swimming, country' with a rate of 20%.

CHAPTER 5

5. CONCLUSION

In this study, the reasons of English pronunciation errors were focused on. Types of pronunciation mistakes, problematic sounds and their sources and nature were discussed. The effect of the listening, and repeat after activities on pronunciation was also revealed. In this chapter, the discussion of the findings is given initially.

5.1. Discussion

The study focuses on the pronunciation errors. Types of pronunciation errors and problematic sounds and their sources of secondary school students were discussed. The effect of some reading aloud and listenings activities on their pronunciation of some words were also searched and discussed.

Learning the vocabulary and the grammar of English is important; however correct pronunciation of the words is needed for natural and understandable speeches. Knowing grammar and having good vocabulary knowledge doesn't mean having an understandable and natural communication.

Each and every language has different pronunciation and the same letter can be pronounced in different ways depending on the language and the letter that are combined with. The best way to acquire the correct pronunciation is to hear the words spoken by a native speaker of the language. The nature of the pronunciation and the mimics can be learned best with this way. It means that the English language teachers need to have a native like pronunciation or impose the students to the activities pronounced by the native speakers.

Normally the learners are expected to progress further in pronunciation along their learning and to make fewer and fewer errors. However, some errors will

probably never disappear entirely. Such errors are described as fossilized errors which mean the permanent features of the learner's interlanguage. Once the fossilization occurs in learner's interlanguage it is helpless to exert any efforts to fix it. Therefore, the language instructors must make a distinction between 'stabilized' and 'fossilized' errors. After confirming stabilized error, the instructor should take needed measures to destabilize the errors.

It is seen that the results of the current study overlaps Türker's results in some aspects. Yet, general secondary school students made more mistakes than Anatolian secondary school students in number. This can be caused by the difference between numbers of the English classes and the exposure to English in these schools. Therefore, the emergence of difference in results considered normal.

5.2. Conclusions

Every language has different sound systems which have a phonological basis. The differences of these sound systems depend on the variation in speech organ positions or breath control while pronouncing the words. Teacher will not necessarily teach this theoretical knowledge to the students but the teacher must understand the physical aspects of production of the sounds. This knowledge will provide the teachers to identify and understand the physical reasons of inaccurate pronunciation in target language. If teachers understand how students use their tongue while producing the native language sound and what they should be do to reproduce the foreign language sound, teachers will be able to help students to correct their producing the sounds.

As a good number of errors were seen regarding Turkish students' pronunciation, it is necessary to find alternatives for them to improve their pronunciation. Nevertheless, traditional teaching methods are limited when it comes to the teaching of pronunciation. Moreover, another reason for an alternative is because of the Turkish teachers' limitations regarding the teaching of pronunciation. Although they have skills to a certain extent, they themselves need much time to

practice and speak the English sounds correctly. Besides this, when attempting to overcome their pronunciation errors. Students have several limitations more than that of the teachers’.

As a conclusion of the study, it can be accepted that listening and reading aloud activities spoken by a native speaker are useful alternatives to help the students to improve their pronunciation. In order to hear the nature of the phonemes and the production of the sounds, the activities need to be spoken by a native speaker. Repeating the sounds and the words or reading aloud them after the recordings is one of the useful ways of improving and correcting pronunciation.

There are also several pronunciation teaching materials: videos, recorded cassettes, CDs etc. One of the new methods and an important device for teaching English pronunciation is to use on-line programs. Some websites (web references) try to teach pronunciation with audiovisual exercises and some are developed to practice English phonemes. Using such devices and programs is quite useful to develop the pronunciation. Computer Assisted Language Learning and Computer Assisted Pronunciation Training have become important in recent years. These techniques of learning pronunciation need to be introduced to the students by the teachers and they must be encouraged to use them. There are a lot of web pages and other computer programs for people interested in International Phonetic Alphabet symbols. Those who desire to learn the phonological basis of the words can also check their progress using them.

5.3. Implications

In the light of the findings of this study, the teachers of English need to be aware of the fact that the students accept the teachers as a model while pronouncing the words that they didn’t know before. This truth makes it important not to make pronunciation errors in the classes which means the teacher need to be good models for the students.

As concluded from both quantitative results; listening reading aloud and repeat after activities have a positive effect on the correct pronunciation of the words. Therefore, the course books need to contain more listening and pronunciation activities. The existing listening activities should not be skipped. When there is no activity aiming at developing the pronunciation of the students, teachers need to find appropriate listening activities.

In addition, since the study revealed that the students have a great difficulty in pronouncing the loan words, the curriculum can be revised to increase the number of the loan words existing in the course books. The same can also be done while determining and choosing the activities aimed to develop the students' pronunciation of English.

5.4. Recommendations for Further Studies

This study was carried out in a central county of İstanbul which is located in the European side of the city. It is possible to find out different results when similar studies carried out in different parts of Turkey. 30 students participated in the study. Much more detailed results can be collected if the number of the participants is increased. Therefore, it will be useful to replicate such studies in different parts of Turkey with different participants and different materials.

The study basically focuses on segmental errors of phonemes; therefore further studies focusing on suprasegmentals such as stress and intonation are essential for the contribution to the field of phonetics and phonology. Such studies can only make it possible to understand the nature of pronunciation errors of English and to develop methodologies to come up with a solution to these problems.

As it can be assumed that most of the students that make pronunciation mistakes accept their teachers as a model, therefore the teachers must be trained better at universities. If the teachers have better pronunciation and make fewer mistakes, it is certain that their students will do the same. It is surely beyond doubt

that it will be useful to use computer technology especially in listening, speaking and pronunciation lessons in faculties.

In conclusion, this study can be regarded as a rough sketch of the pronunciation errors of English in secondary schools of Turkey. The illustration of individual errors and the discussion of the results have not given and described in details. A number of detailed follow up research should be carried out in the future.

6. REFERENCES

- Abercombie, D. (1991) Teaching pronunciation. In A. Brown (Ed.), Teaching English pronunciation: A book of readings. (pp. 87-95). New York: Routledge.
- Akalm, S. (1995). The Contribution of Linguistics to Language Teaching (Unpublished MA Thesis) Ataturk University, Institute of Social Sciences, Erzurum.
- Altmer, S. (2008). The Attitudes of Preparatory Students in Abant İzzet Baysal University, Turkey and Sussex University, UK Towards Pronunciation Practice in English Courses (Unpublished MA Thesis) Abant İzzet Baysal University, Institute of Social Sciences, Bolu.
- Baker, A. and Goldstein, S. (1990). Pronunciation pairs: An introductory course for Students of English. Cambridge.
- Brown, A. (1992). A survey of attitudes and teaching practices related to pronunciation teaching. Perth: AMES WA.
- Celce-Murcia, M. and J. Goodwin (1991): "Teaching Pronunciation," In M. Celce-Murcia(ed), Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language, Boston, Heinle and Heinle Publishers.
- Celce-Murcia, M, D Brinton.,& J. Goodwin. (1996). Teaching pronunciation: A reference for teachers of English to speakers of other languages. Cambridge: Cambridge: University Press.
- Chela-Flores, B. (2001). Pronunciation and language teaching: An integrative approach. International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 39 (2), 85-102.

- Demirezen, M. (2008). 'The /a/ and /ʌ/ Phonemes as Fossilized Pronunciation Errors for Turkish English Language Teachers and Students: Undoing the Fossilized Pronunciation Error' *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies* Vol.4, No.2, October 2008 73-82.
- Diaz-Campos, M. (2004). 'Context of Learning in the Acquisition of Spanish Second Language Phonology' Cambridge University Press 249-273 Indiana University, Bloomington, U.S.A.
- Goodwin, J. (2001). Teaching pronunciation. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.) *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd ed.) (pp. 117-138). Boston: Heinle&Heinle.
- Grabe, W. (1991). Current developments in second language reading research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25/3, 375-406.
- Gültekin, M. (2002). *Türk Öğrencilerin Telaffuz Hataları: Parçalar Ustü Özellikler* Unpublished MA Thesis, Anadolu University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Eskisehir.
- Gürbüz, U. (1988). *Distinktive Merkmale der Segmentale Phoneme im Deutschen und im Türkischen* (Unpublished MA Thesis) Anadolu University, Institute of Social Sciences, Eskisehir.
- Hismanoglu, M and Hismanoglu, S. (2010). 'Language teachers' preferences of pronunciation teaching techniques: traditional or modern?' *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* 2 (2010) 983–989.
- Jenkins, J. (2004). Research in teaching pronunciation and intonation. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 109-125.

- Kaçmaz, T. (1993). An Analysis of the Pronunciation Problems of Turkish Learners of English (Unpublished MA Thesis) Bilkent University, Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara.
- Kaya, S. (1989). Yabancı Dil Öğrenimindeki Telaffuz Güçlükleri (Unpublished MA Thesis) Selcuk University, Institute of Social Sciences, Konya.
- Köksal, D. (1990). Teaching Pronunciation to the Turkish Learners of English: Approaches, Methods and Techniques (Unpublished MA Thesis) Gazi University, Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara.
- Leather, J. (1983). State of the art: Second language pronunciation learning and teaching, *Language Teaching*, 16, 198-219.
- Levis, J. M. (2005). Changing contexts and shifting paradigms in pronunciation “teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39(3), 369-377.
- Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Talim ve Terbiye Kurulu Başkanlığı. (2004). Orta Öğretim Kurumları Hazırlık Sınıfı İkinci Yabancı Dil İngilizce Dersi Öğretim Programı, Ankara.
- Morley, J. (1991). The pronunciation component in teaching English to speakers of other languages. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25(3), 481-520.
- Munro, Murray J. & Derwing, Tracey M. 1999. “Foreign accent, comprehensibility and intelligibility in the speech of second language learners”, *Language Learning* 49: Supplement 1, 285-310.
- Özgen, M. (2008). The use of authentic captioned video as listening comprehension material in the English language teaching. (Unpublished Master’s Thesis) Selcuk University, Konya.

- Park, H. K. (2004): "Applying Second Language Acquisition Theories to Teaching Interpretation to Undergraduate Students," Forum 2-1, p. 105-123.
- Pennington, M. C., & Richards, J. C. (1986). Pronunciation revisited. TESOL Quarterly, 20(2), 207-225.
- Schimdt, R.M. (2006). Teaching pronunciation in the high school German classroom: Impact on perceptual, spelling and decoding abilities. Unpublished Master Thesis. University of Calgary, Alberta, Germany.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2001). Pronunciation. In R. Carter & D. Nunan (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages* (pp. 56-65). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Senel, M. (1997). Contributions of Phonetics to Language Teaching (Unpublished MA Thesis) Hacettepe University, Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara.
- Shudong, W. , Higgins, M. and Shima, Y. (2005). 'Training English Pronunciation for Japanese Learners of English Online' The JALT CALL Journal (Vol.1.1) 39-47, Japan
- Singhal, M. (2001). "Reading proficiency, reading strategies, metacognitive awareness and L2 readers". The Reding Matrix. Vol. 1, No. 1.
- Yıldızçelik, S. (1996). The Effect of Foreign Accent on Comprehension: A Study on Comparative Turkish English Phonology as Reflected on the Pronunciation of Turkish Learners (Unpublished MA Thesis) ODTU (Middle East Technical University), Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara.

6.1.WEB REFERENCES

www.lingua.tsukuba.ac.jp/~ippan/JGL/2000/2000-Mimatsu.pdf
(accessed at 15.03.2014 : 21.15)

www.erudit.org/revue/meta/2006/v51/n2/013253ar.pdf
(accessed at: 06.02.2014 : 23.32)

<http://hoseok.kr/file.php?id=288>
(accessed at: 21.11.2013 : 19. 47)

<http://dspace.wul.waseda.ac.jp/dspace/bitstream/2065/12147/1/PACLIC14-15-22.pdf>
(accessed at: 22.04.2014 : 09.42)

<http://www.jlls.org/Issues/Volume%204/No.2/sbayraktaroglu.pdf>
(accessed at: 01.04.2014 : 18.39)

rle.ucpel.tche.br/php/edicoes/v5n1/G_rosane.pdf
(accessed at: 23.11.2013 : 23.19)

7. APPENDICES

7.1. Appendix 1: Reading text 1

Jessica is my best friend. Badminton and swimming are her favourite sports but she doesn't like football. She loves classical music but she hates rap. She is crazy about science fiction films but she doesn't like romantic films. She loves books. She is a real bookworm.

7.2. Appendix 2: Reading text 2

Angelina is tall and slim. She has got long brown hair. Her eyes are green. Her favorite color is black. Her nickname is Angie. She is kind and helpful. She has got six children. She is a good mother. She likes collecting knives. She can fly small planes but she can't cook. She is a good actress. Can she sing well? Ne she can't.

7.3. Appendix 3: Reading text 3

I like my job because I work at home. I don't travel to work. I am an artist and my daily routines are different. I get up at 10.00 and I go to the living room. This is my workshop. You see I have table in the middle of the room and there are three flower pots on the table. There is a big easel between the table and the window. The sofa is next to the table. I have breakfast and work in this room. Then I go out for lunch at 12.30. There is a nice restaurant near my house. I sometimes meet friends at this restaurant.

I come back home. First, I work until 5 o'clock. Then I cook for my children and wife. We have dinner together at about 7 o'clock in the kitchen and we talk about the day. After that, we play word games. The children watch TV and I start to work again. I put the new paintings in the balcony. Finally, I clean the brushes in the bathroom. I sometimes take a nap on the sofa in the living room. I go to the bedroom. I feel happy at the end of the day. I am lucky because my home is my office. Life is fun in my office.

7.4. Appendix 4: Reading text 4

I want to work for the white lions in South Africa this summer as a volunteer. White lions are in danger in this country and scientists do projects for them. I like feeding the baby lions and playing with them. I sometimes film the lions with my video camera. It's amazing. I stay with another volunteer at the bush camp. He comes from Korea. We work, cook together and share the same room. Great, isn't it?

7.5. Appendix 5: Reading text 5

Dear Jonathan

Greetings from SidiBouSeid, Tunisia. We are having a great time here. The sun is shining. I am wearing shorts and sandals at the moment. I am sitting at a café and drinking a cup of mint tea. Mint tea is a very popular drink here. My sister is shopping right now and I am waiting for her. What is the weather like in St. Petersburg? What are you doing at the moment?

Dear Alicia

Hi from St. Petersburg. It's very cold today. It is snowing and freezing outside. My twin brothers are making a big snowman and my cousins are throwing snowballs. They are wearing scarves and gloves. I am drinking a glass of tea now and watching them. See you in New York next month.

7.6. Appendix 6: Listening and reading aloud activity 1

My name's Penelope. I've got a brother. His name is Roberto. I love listening to pop music but he hates it. He likes classical music. I like reading adventure books but he likes history books. I love windsurfing but he doesn't like it. He likes swimming. I don't like romantic movies but he is crazy about them. I love horror films. We are so different but I love him very much. He is my best friend.

7.7. Appendix 7: Listening and reading aloud activity 2

Hi, I'm Jenny. There are different clubs in my school. I'm in the music club. I love singing and I can play the electric guitar. I've got curly blonde hair with brown eyes. I am energetic but a little bit crazy.

My best friend Tanita is in the poetry club. She loves writing poems. She can also write short stories. She has got long wavy hair and lovely green eyes. She is quiet and so romantic.

Jose, our Spanish friend, is in the sport club. He is very athletic. He is good at handball. He's on the school team. He can also play badminton well but he can't dance. He likes wearing bandanas. He has got short dark hair. His eyes are black. He's talkative and very kind. It's fun to be with him.

7.8. Appendix 8: Listening and reading aloud activity 3

Adriana: Do you like to work at home, Mr. Walker?

Mr Walker: Yes, sure. It's really fun. I don't take a bus or train to work. I have time for my job and housework.

Adriana: Cool. What time do you start your day?

Mr Walker: Very early. At half past nine or ten.

Adriana: Early? We start school at half past eight.

Mr Walker: Well, early for me. I go to bed very late. Sometimes at 2 a.m.

Adriana: Oh I see. Do you cook at home?

Mr Walker: Yes, I do. I always have breakfast at home and sometimes have lunch with my friends at a restaurant. I love cooking for my family. We always have dinner together.

Adriana: How nice! Do your children like drawing?

Mr Walker: Yes, they do. They draw nice pictures.

Adriana: Wow! Do you have an art gallery?

Mr Walker: Yes, I have a big open-air art gallery on the terrace.

Adriana: Oh, fantastic. Do you sell your paintings?

Mr Walker: Yes. I sell my paintings on the Internet.

Adriana: Your paintings are so beautiful. Thank you for your interview.

Mr Walker: You are welcome.

7.9. Appendix 9: Listening and reading aloud activity 4

Where do you usually go for summer holidays? Do you go to seaside or stay at home? Would you like to do something different this summer? Ok? Then listen to this. I want to talk about my best friend, Paula. Paula has different holidays every year. She doesn't go to seaside or stay at home. She goes to Kenya. Why does she go to Kenya? She volunteers for the children. Paula works at an orphanage in Kenya for two weeks every year. She helps the children with their school work and play games with them. She feeds the babies in the evenings. It's a nice place because there are young volunteers from different countries. Paula works hard but never gets bored. She meets new friends and she likes them very much. The group leaders are always friendly and helpful. They have good time together. She is very happy in Kenya. Would you like to go with her?

7.10. Appendix 10: Listening and reading aloud activity 5

Interviewer: My guest today comes from Denmark and is a photographer. He's travelled to almost every country in the world with his camera, and he's taken thousands of photographs of animals. Welcome to the programme, Anders.

Anders: Thank you. It's nice to be here.

Interviewer: You have travelled so many places. You haven't been to every country in the world, but have you been to every continent?

Anders: No, I have never been to Antarctica. I like warm places.

Interviewer: Now you have taken photographs of a lot of animals, but what are your favourite animals?

Anders: Oh, my favourite animals are spiders.

Interviewer: Ugh, spiders?

Anders: Well, yes. A lot of people don't like them. They think that spiders are scary, but in fact they are very beautiful. They are also very easy to photograph, because they don't move a lot.

7.11. Appendix 11: Listening and reading aloud activity 6

I'm Betty. I am in Quebec, Canada now. The weather is freezing cold. My friends and I are here for the festival. Everything is fantastic here. It's freezing cold outside but we are having fun. Kevin is skiing but John is snow rafting. William is building ice sculptures. Look at Dan and Henry. They are racing with their canoes on the iced river. Oh my God? Julia is playing volleyball on the snow but she isn't wearing thick clothes. She is wearing a swimsuit because all the people wear their swimsuits in this festival. Me? Of course I am recording my friends but now Bill is taking my photo.