

Chapter 2

PRONUNCIATION UNDER SCRUTINY: FLICKING THROUGH THE PAGES OF TEACHING METHODOLOGIES

İbrahim Halil TOPAL¹

INTRODUCTION

Throughout history, various languages have dominated diverse domains, such as education and commerce. This has constituted the need to learn foreign languages for international communication. As such, language teaching itself is also viewed as ancient as the history of humans. Earlier attempts at language teaching can be observed in grammar schools where Latin grammar was taught between the 16th -18th centuries (Richards & Rodgers, 2001) because it was attached to a higher status and considered to develop intellectual skills. In the 17th and 18th centuries, the colonization of the British Empire paved the way for the dissemination of English. This has become more manifest, particularly with the Americanization movement that helped the English language spread globally (Gonçalves et al., 2018) thanks to the cultural, political, and economic rise of the United States. In addition, globalization has expedited the expansion of English as the predominant language and made it the global lingua franca (Smokotin et al., 2014). However, it is almost impossible to speak of any sound language teaching methods until the early 20th century (Richards & Rodgers, 2014).

English language teaching (ELT) is characterized as the practice and philosophy of English language learning and teaching to the advantage of non-native English speakers. To bolster the quality of language teaching, linguists and language specialists have established a hierarchical structure comprising approach, method, and technique (Richards & Rodgers, 2014) on which language teaching is conceptualized and organized. A method is an organizing framework for systematically demonstrating linguistic content congruent and grounded on the chosen approach. A method is systematic, while an approach is self-evident (Anthony, 1963). According to Anthony's hierarchical structure, a method is the

¹ Lecturer, Gazi Üniversitesi, ibrahimtopal@gazi.edu.tr, ORCID iD: 0000-0003-4220-3706

level at which decisions as to which language skills are taught are made (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Richards and Rodgers (2014) replaced ‘method’ with ‘design,’ described it as the degree of method analysis that includes the objectives, content selection and arrangement, teaching activities, and types, the responsibilities of students and teachers, and teaching materials. Based on the constituents of a language teaching method, it is, therefore, plausible to assert that varying degrees of attention are paid to each element across teaching methods. For instance, some methods prioritized the acquisition of general communication skills, whereas others emphasized the achievement of perfect pronunciation. Depending on such objectives, other elements of a method have also displayed variations (e.g., language content and roles of stakeholders).

The late 19th century bore witness to the birth of the initial method for language teaching (i.e., Grammar-Translation Method, GTM), followed successively by others. Various factors might be claimed to play a part in the adoption or desertion of these language teaching methods. To begin with, language teaching is influenced by changes in such fields as linguistics and psychology. Therefore, a shift in one of these fields might also signal repercussions on language teaching. For instance, the emanation of second language acquisition as a field has prompted the adoption of new insights into the nature of language learning thus methods (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Another factor could be the support a language teaching method receives that becomes decisive in its fall or rise, as might be observed in the case of the Common European Framework of Reference (Council of Europe, 2001) endorsed by the Council of Europe. A third factor might be practicality which determines a method’s destiny. Feasible and locally-adaptive methods are more easily supported than those without such qualities. Fourth, it would be hard for methods that require native speaker proficiency to find advocates because the majority of language teachers are non-native speakers of English (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Fifth, some methods possess the characteristics to serve as the basis for published materials. Hence, their adoption by publishing houses and educational representatives becomes easier. Last but not least, methods might be compatible or incompatible with language contexts worldwide as learning and teaching styles vary significantly from culture to culture (Tsui, 2009).

On the other hand, some concerns were voiced over the suitability of teaching methods in the post-methods era, described by scholars as a time wherein tailored teaching methods served no practical purposes due to their limited and specific scopes. Kumaravadivelu (1994) proposed ‘post-method condition’ (p. 28) as a term that signifies the pursuit of a method substitute rather than a reserve method,

instructor's independence and reasoned practicality. It must be noted here that there is no best method, and language teaching methods do not necessarily need to be entirely deserted. Instead, they might be (i) matched with teaching, (ii) adapted to local needs, or (iii) replaced by personal methods (Richards & Rodgers, 2014) to reap their benefits. For instance, novice teachers might have no experience in teaching practice and thus benefit from the structural guidance provided by teaching methods. Another profit is the opportunity teaching methods provide teachers to select different items in each, such as choosing a different focus from one. When a method does not match a teacher's beliefs, deemed significant for teaching practice, teachers might acquire new ones contrary to theirs (Borg, 2006). To put it differently, a method should be harmonious with teachers' cognition and adaptive to learners' needs (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). A second option to resort to instead of abandoning a method is to adapt or modify it to the teaching context. A third option is to develop a personal method by utilizing principle eclecticism, personal principles, practical knowledge, and theorizing practice (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). On balance, it is safe to say that language teaching methods are essential to enhance language teaching conditions, whether by implementing them the way they are or adapting them according to the needs of learners and language contexts.

Following the discussion on the adoption or desertion of methods, another point needs to be made here – the extent to which pronunciation is included in language teaching methods. Previous studies concentrated on different issues. Liu and Shi (2007) probed into specific teaching methods concerning their strengths and weaknesses. In another study, Chang and Goswami (2011) aimed to determine the factors impacting the implementation of communicative language teaching in the Taiwanese context. In the same year, Chang (2011) compared the effectiveness of GTM and communicative approach in teaching grammar and revealed the effectiveness of the first. Bao and Du (2015) investigated the efficacy of task-based language teaching in Chinese language teaching and found certain benefits, such as increased participation and speaking opportunities. In a study by Sasi et al. (2020), the Silent Way was found effective in teaching Japanese sounds to Taiwanese learners. In a more recent study, Liu et al. (2021) explored the perceptions of Chinese teachers about task-based language teaching and revealed positive views. Despite manifold studies on language teaching methods, studies examining the place of pronunciation in teaching methods were scarce. Gilner (2008), for instance, reviewed the methods and techniques for teaching pronunciation with no particular attention to teaching methodologies. Ketabi and

Saeb (2015) examined the past and present of pronunciation teaching, concerning decades and some instructional dilemmas (e.g., nativeness vs. intelligibility). However, the present research looked into the position of pronunciation in 15 language teaching approaches and methods included in two proverbial books in the field by Larsen-Freeman and Anderson (2011) and Richards and Rodgers (2014). In this respect, the review is considered concise and to the point and differs from previous studies. It hopefully aimed to contribute theoretically to the relevant literature.

LANGUAGE TEACHING METHODS: DEFINITION, DEVELOPMENT AND SIGNIFICANCE

In the field of English language education, there are two main concepts regarding language teaching that have more followers: English as a foreign language (EFL) and English as a second language (ESL), whereby the first refers to English language teaching contexts where the target language is not shared by the residents of the home country, either as primary or official languages and the latter relates to English language teaching contexts where English serves as primary or official language in the home country. As Bentley (2021) narrates, the number of English language speakers amounts to a neighborhood of 1.5 billion, with EFL learners outnumbering ESL learners. English language teaching is viewed as the practice and philosophy of English language learning and teaching to the advantage of non-native English speakers.

Toward the late 19th and early 20th centuries, methods emerged to enhance the conditions of language teaching. Based on the studies of Latin and also known as the Prussian Method, the GTM appeared in the mid-19th century and continued to be utilized until the early 20th century (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). The late 19th and early 20th centuries witnessed opposition to the GTM as the need for oral communication arose in Europe. During this period, individual French and English language specialists, such as Marcel, Prendergast, and Gouin, proposed specific methods to reform language teaching. Gouin's series method was based on the belief that language learning was aided by using language to complete activities involving multiple connected tasks. (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Gouin's method emphasized the contextualized presentation of linguistic items and the utilization of gestures for meaning-making, which later laid the foundation of such methods as situational language teaching and total physical response.

From the late 19th century onward, linguists and language specialists led by

Frenchman Paul Passy, German Wilhelm Viëtor, and Englishman Henry Sweet commenced the Reform Movement in language teaching by rejuvenating the field of linguistics, establishing the field of phonetics, founding the International Phonetic Association and designing the International Phonetic Alphabet (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). All these reforms signified a fundamental shift in language teaching, moving the focus from grammar to speech processes. The reformers emphasized the spoken language over the written one, applying the findings of phonetics to language teaching and prioritizing listening skills over others. The efforts of such reformers set the stage for the emergence of natural methods, such as the Direct Method, which was introduced in France and Germany and also known as the Berlitz Method due to its implementation in commercialized language schools.

Teaching methods in the 20th century were introduced to improve language teaching, albeit with variations in their objectives, assumptions, and techniques. In the early- and mid-20th century, British linguists propounded the Oral Approach and its prospective manifestation Situational Language Teaching, leaving the Presentation-Practice-Production (PPP) lesson model as its heritage (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). The United States' entry into World War II created the need for military personnel to learn foreign languages in a short time, which gave birth to the Audio-Lingual Method (ALM) – also known as the Army Method and the Informant Method – that was based on intensive contact with the target language albeit without a well-developed methodological basis (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). In the 1960s, Gattegno (1963) proposed the Silent Way as a teaching method based on the premise that teachers should be silent and learners produce language as much as possible (Richards & Rodgers, 2014, p. 289). The 1960s and 1970s also witnessed the emergence of an approach to language teaching that came into being under the name Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) due to the changing needs and growing demand for communication. The CLT was characterized as an approach instead of a method by the British and American proponents because it was aimed at attaining communicative competence and developing four skills (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Total Physical Response (Asher, 1969) is another language teaching method designed to teach language via bodily (dynamic) activity activities by organizing utterance and movement. (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Based on Terrell's (1977) experiences, the Natural Approach emphasized input rather than practice, enhancing emotional readiness, focused attention before linguistic production, and the willingness to utilize various materials as input sources (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). In the late 1970s, Lozanov proposed

(1978) Suggestopedia that focuses the student on communication rather than lexical repetition and habit formation.

“Originated in mainstream education and emphasizing peer support and coaching” (Richards & Rodgers, 2014, p. 244), Cooperative Language Learning (CLL) is another method offered in language teaching settings. Next appeared Content-Based Instruction (CBI) and its like Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), both of which arose owing to the movement that endorses English as the medium of instruction (Graddol, 2006). Teaching in such methods is organized around the content/subject (i.e., History or Geography) taught via the target language. However, it must be noted that CBI and CLIL vary moderately in focus, albeit with similar features (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Despite being designed for teaching reading and writing for first-language learners, the Whole Language movement was also applied to second-language teaching settings. Unlike other methods that rely on forward design, three were based on the backward design, zeroing in on learning outcomes: “Competency-Based Language Teaching (CBLT), the standards movement, and the Common European Framework of Reference” (Richards & Rodgers, 2014, pp.150-151). The common ground of these methods/approaches is that they focus on the learning outcomes in designing language programs. Characterized as a method of language teaching in which learners are assigned everyday activities that encourage them to place more emphasis on meaningful interactions and use language for non-linguistic reasons in real life (Van den Branden, 2006), Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) is another popular teaching method drawing on the principles of CLT. Drawing on ‘the counseling metaphor to redefine the roles of the teacher (the counselor) and learners (the clients) in the language classroom’ (Richards & Rodgers, 2014, p. 303), Community Language Learning is another method proposed for language teaching in the early 1980s.

The 1990s observed the emanation of Text-Based Instruction (TBI) derived from a genre-based theory of learning and ‘the role that texts play in social contexts’ (Richards & Rodgers, 2014, p.200). The Lexical Approach (Lewis, 1993) is another approach to language teaching referring to one originating from the assumption that the key elements of language learning and interaction are not syntax, operations, conceptions, or any other unit of planning and instruction but vocabulary items, such as words and, in particular, multi-word blends (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). The diversity of language learners paved the way for the Multiple Intelligences (MI) approach (Gardner, 1983) to language teaching associated with a learner-centered theory that views human intelligence as comprising various

facets that need to be recognized and improved in education (Richards & Rodgers, 2014).

All in all, manifold language teaching approaches and methods were proposed in the 19th and 20th centuries. All these methods and approaches have some benefits and drawbacks concerning the opportunities they provide teachers with. To illustrate, teaching methods might be claimed to supply teachers with a ready guideline for teaching, especially for novice teachers. Teachers might benefit more from teaching methods by selecting the practical or desired parts. However, it must be noted that no teaching context should be constrained by any single approach or method that usually owns defined learner and teacher roles and certain assumptions about the teaching and learning processes (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Instead, any teaching method or approach should consider 'learner autonomy, learning strategies, learning styles, and the opportunities for learner-focused learning' (Richards & Rodgers, 2014, p. 341). As noted earlier, language teachers might adapt or modify teaching methods and approaches or develop personal ones.

ENGLISH PRONUNCIATION: DEFINITION, FEATURES AND SALIENCE

Sound and effective communication in the target language is viewed as the eventual goal to attain (Forsberg et al., 2019). Clear and intelligible pronunciation, among many other factors, is decisive for achieving this goal. Pronunciation is defined by Hornby et al. (1987) as "the way in which language is spoken; the way in which a word is pronounced; the way a person speaks the words of language" (p.497). It is oft used interchangeably with the accent, which means "the cumulative auditory effect of those features of pronunciation which identify where a person is from, regionally or socially." (Crystal, 2008, p.3). As the definition of pronunciation encapsulates, two concepts become prominent when it comes to pronunciation: segmentals and suprasegmentals, whereby the first refers to pronunciation features at the segmental level, such as phonemes and syllables, while the latter relates to pronunciation beyond the phonemic level that includes such characteristics as intonation, rhythm, and stress. It is, therefore, plausible to assert that both features of pronunciation are required for effective communication (Gordon, 2021).

Consonants and vowels constitute the segmental features of pronunciation (Richards, 2015). The English language has 44 sounds represented by 26 letters (21 consonants and five vowels) with multiple spellings. The number of phonemes,

particularly vowel phonemes, might indicate variations across the two major English varieties (i.e., American English and British English). Richards (2015) maintains that American English owns 15 vowels, whereas it is 20 in British English. No matter the exact number or the numerical variations, articulating these sounds requires neuromuscular flexibility (Yates, 2003), as pronunciation is extensively physical (Richards, 2015). Awareness of where these phonemes occur and how they are articulated can be associated with an individual's phonemic awareness, a subset of phonological awareness. Additionally, producing and using these phonemes accurately in relevant contexts may be related to an individual's phonemic/phonological competence. It, therefore, becomes plausible to claim that learners are expected to be phonologically aware and competent for effective communication since mispronunciation of consonants and vowels might result in communicative hurdles (Pennington & Rogerson-Revell, 2019; Richards, 2015).

Also referred to as prosodic features, suprasegmentals are such pronunciation features as stress, pitch, juncture, rhythm, and voice quality that occur beyond the phonemic level (Richards, 2015). Since English is a stress-timed language (Nespor et al., 2011), referring to the "one where the stresses fall at roughly regular intervals within an utterance (Crystal, 2008, p. 455), it might pose certain troubles for English learners with different linguistic backgrounds that have syllable-timed qualities, such as French and Spanish that tend to display "a particular type of rhythm" (Crystal, 2008, p. 469). Stress, pitch, and juncture comprise intonation altogether (Topal, 2017). Individually, each of these components has been proven to be significant for speech intelligibility and comprehensibility (Yenkimaleki & van Heuven, 2021). Characterized as the "an application of the general sense of this term in phonology, to refer to the perceived regularity of prominent units in speech" (Crystal, 2008, p. 417), rhythm is another salient prosodic feature for intelligibility as well (Levis, 2018).

Notwithstanding variations in research regarding the effectiveness of these features on intelligibility and comprehensibility, it goes without saying that both gain significance for clear and intelligible pronunciation, an essential element of effective communication (Pennington & Rogerson-Revell, 2019). All in all, it is safe to say that being both segmentally- and suprasegmentally- aware and competent is crucial for language learners and teachers concerning effective communication.

METHOD

This review grounded its findings on document analysis as one of the qualitative research methods. Document analysis, according to Bowen (2009), refers to the

systematic examination or assessment of printed and/or digital materials. The data collected through this method are interpreted to gain insights and develop practical knowledge (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). In this regard, two prominent books about language teaching approaches and methods by Larsen-Freeman and Anderson (2011) and Richards and Rodgers (2014) were examined concerning the degree of importance attached to pronunciation in the teaching methodologies.

FINDINGS

The GTM attaches almost no significance to pronunciation (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011; Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Target grammar is an essential part of the GTM; however, pronunciation is not included here, given its close relationship with grammar (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010). This connection occurs during the introduction of a new grammar topic, the success of which largely depends on accurate phonetic realization (Sicola & Darcy, 2015). The GTM also warrants the memorization of verb conjugations (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011), yet no attention is paid to the pronunciation here. For instance, the past verb endings take on different pronunciations, but this grammar-pronunciation relation is also ignored in the GTM. This method also neglects the relationship between vocabulary and pronunciation, although learning the target vocabulary is essential (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011). Word spellings are one of the first areas where teachers might be related to pronunciation because they might have the chance to work on orthography and pronunciation (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010). Notwithstanding the significance of orthography for intelligible pronunciation (Sicola & Darcy, 2015), the GTM disregards focusing on this link between vocabulary and pronunciation. Although statements are fundamental to language teaching and practice (Richards & Rodgers, 2014), word or sentence stress is also ignored in the GTM. However, word and sentence stress are salient prosodic features for intelligibility (Bøhn & Hansen, 2017).

Unlike the GTM, The Direct Method views the language as comprised primarily of speech, and therefore pronunciation is studied in the first place (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011), and correct pronunciation is emphasized (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Dictation is one of the techniques in this method, which is a great opportunity for teachers to provide learners with a proper pronunciation model of the target language. Therefore, teachers using this method must possess a good command of pronunciation as they present good role models for their students (Richards, 2015). The entire lesson is conducted in the target language –

a golden opportunity to provide learners with good pronunciation models. This method is also known as the Berlitz method because of its implementation in private schools, where native-speaking teachers were commonplace (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). The success of the Berlitz schools is attributed to learners with higher motivation due to generous payments and native-speaking teachers or teachers with native-like proficiency (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). However, such a requirement does not necessarily guarantee the achievement of learning outcomes – communication in the target language. A study by Levis et al. (2016) revealed similar comprehensibility ratings for both native and non-native teachers, albeit with learner preference for the native-speaking teacher. Also, having native-speaking teachers as the norm might be disadvantageous in such cases, where teachers might explain or clarify a pronunciation feature (or other skills) in the native language, as such an attitude was claimed to provide opportunities for teaching pronunciation features using a bilingual approach that hopefully increased learner awareness and motivation (Forman, 2007).

The Oral Approach and its manifestation, Situational Language Teaching (SLT), consider pronunciation crucial and urge the avoidance of errors (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Potential learner errors are expected to be skillfully handled by teachers regarding faulty pronunciation (Richards & Rodgers, 2014); however, teachers may fail to address all learners equally. Similar to Direct Method, SLT requires that teachers continuously use the target language, too. Learners might find this favorable for being constantly exposed to the target language pronunciation. A typical lesson plan includes practice in stress and intonation and consists of pronunciation and oral drills (Pittman, 1963; Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Given the salience of suprasegmentals, such as stress and intonation (McAndrews, 2019), this method might be claimed to be useful for teaching pronunciation. The drills are also significant in the SLT and thus can be practical for teaching segmentals. Using visuals, such as ‘wall charts, flashcards, pictures’ (Richards & Rodgers, 2014, p. 51), might be utilized for teaching suprasegmentals, such as intonation. The use of pronunciation drills to teach segmentals and visuals for teaching suprasegmentals were supported in previous studies (Burri & Baker, 2021).

The ALM considers the teacher as the model of the target language (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011), and teachers are expected to present good language models for pronunciation as well. As aforementioned, teachers serve as good language models for students (Richards & Rodgers, 2014) and thus have a critical role in this method. The ALM also allows teachers to make contrastive analyses

between the native and target languages to identify the potential problem areas for learners because the difficulties in learning a foreign language were associated with the differences between structural components (Richards & Rodgers, 2014), such as differences in phonological patterns between the native and target languages. This might be beneficial for presenting the pronunciation features of both languages to raise learner awareness. The ALM also views accurate pronunciation, the awareness of verbal representations in writing, and the ability to recreate these representations in writing (Brooks, 1964) as requisites, alongside the ultimate attainment of using language like a native speaker. Accurate pronunciation is associated with proficiency in speech, just as pronunciation teaching is related to fluency in speech (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). The language comprises primarily speech; therefore, recognition and production of speech sounds are required for language proficiency. Additionally, listening is extensively regarded as “training in aural discrimination of basic sound patterns” (Richards & Rodgers, 2014, p.66). Previous studies support this, indicating that explicit articulatory training contributes to improved aural abilities (Linebaugh & Roche, 2013; Zhang & Yuan, 2020). In addition to correct pronunciation, such suprasegmentals as stress, rhythm, and intonation are also emphasized in the ALM (Richards & Rodgers, 2014), which coincides with earlier studies in that these features are deemed significant for speech intelligibility and comprehension (Pennington & Rogerson-Revell, 2019; Yenkimaleki & van Heuven, 2021). Apart from these, technology plays a significant role in the ALM in the form of audiovisual materials which were proven to be effective for pronunciation teaching (Espinoza et al., 2021).

Introduced by Gattegno (1963), The Silent Way utilizes color-coded pronunciation charts called Fidel charts which supply learners with physical and visual materials to expedite recall. These charts have been designed for numerous languages and include L2 symbols for vowels and consonants (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). These target language symbols are color-coded; therefore, the sounds with multiple symbols are color-coded alike. The logic behind these charts is visual association. That is, learners associate sounds with colors. This way, they might be able to produce sounds and words by using the spellings when teachers point at certain sounds. Teachers are also role models here for the articulation of sounds. Pronunciation is fundamental to this method, given the learning material (i.e., Fidel charts) devised particularly for it.

The CLT views communicative competence (Hymes, 1972) as the goal of language teaching and aims to develop procedures for four-skills language teaching (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Communicative competence is a broad term

covering linguistic competence, which, in turn, contains phonological competence (Topal, 2019). In other words, language learners must be phonologically competent to develop their communicative competence. To help learners achieve communicative competence, a syllabus should include identifying several language aspects, including the necessary target language varieties (e.g., American English or British English) and the thresholds of verbal and written language that students have to achieve (Van Ek & Alexander, 1980). In this regard, it might be asserted that language learners need to be familiar with the English varieties, with the two most common and preferred ones being American English (AmE) and British English (BrE) by language learners and teachers (Rindal, 2014; He, 2017). Since the CLT urges the teaching of four skills integratedly, the relationship between pronunciation and the other language skills (e.g., listening, reading, writing, speaking, and vocabulary) might be mentioned here. Pronunciation might be linked to speaking because its incorrect use might result in misunderstanding and miscommunication (Pennington & Rogerson-Revell, 2019). The relationship between sounds and letters connects pronunciation to writing, specifically spelling (Sicola & Darcy, 2015). Speech perception involves the recognition of sounds (Poeppel, 2015) and therefore makes pronunciation an essential part of listening. It is also important to remember that pronunciation (e.g., vowels, consonants, word stress, and word ends) is another facet of vocabulary instruction (Ahmad, 2016), although it is usually associated with definitions and meanings. The close connection between spelling and pronunciation might boost and hinder native-like production during dictation (Sicola & Darcy, 2015). The knowledge of the phonetic alphabet will thus assist learners in achieving word articulation in reading texts to the extent that they are familiar with them. The CLT further promotes accuracy and fluency, which might be associated with pronunciation in such a way that the first one requires language learners to speak with accurate pronunciation, and the latter urges them to be familiar with and use such concepts as connected speech processes (e.g., linking, assimilation, etc.) in their speech.

Also known as the Comprehension Approach, the TPR prioritizes listening comprehension before oral production. It does not prioritize pronunciation, but pronunciation is necessary to understand the verbal commands from the teacher. Similarly, the Natural Approach also emphasizes comprehension before production. It, therefore, does not promote the teaching or learning of pronunciation in particular. However, clear and intelligible pronunciation is essential to provide learners with comprehensible input. In Suggestopedia, the place of pronunciation is not prioritized either. However, Bancroft (1972) acknowledges that the materials

are delivered with different tonalities and a mixture of audio and written messages or sketches. In this regard, it can be maintained that prosody is utilized to present the material, but no pronunciation instruction is given. No particular references to pronunciation were made in CLL, but Richards and Rodgers (2014) hold that it can be used to teach pronunciation. Pronunciation is not a primary concern in CBI and CLIL methods either, albeit the emphasis placed on developing oral communication skills (Coyle et al., 2010), which might be associated with pronunciation in that comprehensible and intelligible pronunciation is required for effective communication (Levis, 2018; Pennington & Rogerson-Revell, 2019).

Focusing on teaching reading and writing, the Whole Language approach emphasizes the teaching of phonics – the identification of letters and their conversion into sounds (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). This approach urges the awareness of sounds and the symbols representing them. More precisely, great significance is attached to phonological awareness.

Phonological awareness is primarily responsible for the ability to sound words out. The ability to use phonics and sound words out, in turn, is fundamentally accountable for developing context-free word-recognition ability, which in turn is primarily responsible for improving the ability to read and comprehend connected text (Richards & Rodgers, 2014, p.146).

The CBLT is an approach rather than a method and therefore does not directly emphasize pronunciation. However, intelligible pronunciation might be included in the learning outcomes as part of ‘oral competencies,’ and phonemic awareness and sound-spelling correspondences might be included under reading and writing competencies (Hagan, 1994, p.22). A typical example of the CBLT approach is the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR, Council of Europe, 2001) which provides some learning outcomes and descriptors according to proficiency levels. In this sense, the place of pronunciation at each level might be observed in CEFR. According to CEFR, language learners should possess phonetic skills, awareness, and abilities to achieve language proficiency (Topal, 2019). TBLT does not prioritize teaching pronunciation, but it might be considered significant since meaning is emphasized in this approach (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011). Written and spoken texts are significant in the TBI. However, the approach does not specify pronunciation teaching. Nevertheless, this skill might be included in the course objectives.

The Lexical Approach prioritizes the teaching of multi-word lexical chunks. It should be noted that pronunciation is also part of vocabulary teaching despite the

main emphasis on meanings and definitions (Ahmad, 2016). Elaboration is one of the memory-enhancing techniques that can be used in this approach (Boers & Lindstromberg, 2009; Richards & Rodgers, 2014). It might comprise pondering the pronunciation of a term and “the formation of visual and motoric images related to the term” (Boers & Lindstromberg, 2009, p.35), increasing the likelihood of being stored in long-term memory if more such dimensions are involved. Given the significance of corpora and concordancing in this approach, pronunciation might be included in the lessons under the framework of this approach through video pronunciation dictionaries such as YouGlish (<https://youglish.com/>). This exposes learners to the authentic use of the target lexical items. Last, Gardner’s (1983) MI theory, more precisely musical intelligence, might be associated with pronunciation. Strictly speaking, those with a high musical intelligence might be inclined toward such pronunciation features as rhythm and intonation (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). In this regard, language teachers might help raise learners’ awareness about their intelligence types and enable them to focus on their abilities.

DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

This research tackled the place of pronunciation in approaches and methods in language teaching. To this end, 15 teaching methods and approaches were examined with particular references to the books *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching* (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, 2014) and *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching* (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011) along with the studies conducted on these methods and approaches. The analysis revealed that pronunciation was placed significance to varying degrees that might be categorized into three: (i) little or no significance (e.g., GTM), (ii) secondary significance (e.g., the Silent Way), and (iii) no specific reference (e.g., CLT). To clarify these categories, the examination suggested that teaching methods/ approaches attached little or no importance to pronunciation or harbored pronunciation but did not give primary attention or did not mention it clearly, albeit with its inclusion in the objectives.

Pronunciation has been given different degrees of importance in teaching methodologies over time. For instance, GTM disregarded pronunciation, although pronunciation is connected with grammar and orthography (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010; Sicola & Darcy, 2015), and the verb endings in grammar are pronounced differently. The DM, SLT, and ALM viewed pronunciation as significant following the GTM. Accurate pronunciation was required in these methods. In the ALM, teachers have fundamental roles – serving as pronunciation models. In this respect,

they need to possess a good command of second language pronunciation. The Silent Way utilized Fidel charts that include symbols for second-language sounds. In this respect, pronunciation is essential in this method. No direct references were made in CLT, CLL, CBI, CLIL, and TBLT. However, its inclusion might vary according to local contexts and needs. The TPR does not endorse pronunciation in particular. However, it is necessary to understand the verbal commands. The Whole Language attaches importance to teaching phonics and phonological awareness. Additionally, the CBLT does not emphasize pronunciation teaching specifically. Nevertheless, pronunciation might be grouped into oral competency and phonemic awareness in reading competencies in CBLT. Similarly, the Lexical Approach downplays pronunciation. However, it might be taught while teaching lexical chunks, considering the relationship between vocabulary and pronunciation (Uchihara & Clenton, 2020). Last but not least, the musical intelligence in the MI theory might be associated with developing or learning rhythm and intonation as suprasegmental pronunciation features (Richards & Rodgers, 2014).

In fact, these variations in the importance of pronunciation by language teaching approaches and methods have maintained their position in the post-methods era. It must, however, be declared that its significance has been understood. The relevant current discussions revolve around such concepts as nativeness-intelligibility principles (Levis, 2005) and segmentals vs. suprasegmentals (Wang, 2022). Regardless of the teaching methods adopted, pronunciation must be paid careful attention across diverse teaching contexts, given its significance for effective communication (Levis, 2018; Pennington & Rogerson-Revell, 2019). Just like the inclusion or exclusion of pronunciation in teaching methodologies based on the changing needs, the attention given to pronunciation in modern-day classrooms might also vary due to similar reasons. However, this does not necessarily mean its total desertion in teaching practices. Teachers might organize the content and relevant teaching activities according to learners' needs and interests across diverse contexts.

The review concludes that pronunciation has been given importance at varying degrees in the examined language teaching approaches and methods. The theoretical changes, systemic endorsements, utility, teacher's linguistic competence, serving as a foundation for specific language curriculum components, and compatibility with native customs (Richards & Rodgers, 2014) might account for the rise and fall of teaching methods. The changing needs might, in general, rationalize this variation in the significance of pronunciation. The review is limited to examining 15 teaching approaches and methods in the two selected books.

No particular pronunciation teaching methods or techniques were surveyed in this review. Prospective research might consider the empirical examination of the relationship between pronunciation and language teaching methods and approaches across various teaching contexts.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, K. (2016). Integrating pronunciation with vocabulary skill. In T. Jones (Ed.), *Pronunciation in the classroom: The overlooked essential*, (pp. 1-16). Alexandria, VA: TESOL Press.
- Anthony, E. (1963). Approach, method and technique. *English Language Teaching*, 17, 63-67.
- Asher, J. (1969). The total physical response approach to second language learning. *Modern Language Journal* 53(1), 3-17. <https://doi.org/10.2307/322091>
- Bancroft, W. J. (1972). Foreign language teaching in Bulgaria. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 28(3), 9-13. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.28.3.9>
- Bao, R. & Du, X. (2015). Implementation of task-based language teaching in Chinese as a foreign language: Benefits and challenges. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 28(3), 291-310. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2015.1058392>
- Bentley, J. (2021). Report from TESOL 2014: 1.5 billion English speakers worldwide. *International TEFL Academy Blog*. Retrieved 1.2.2022, from <https://www.internationalteflacademy.com/blog/report-from-tesol-2-billion-english-learners-worldwide>
- Boers, F. & Lindstromberg, S. (2009). *Optimizing a lexical approach to instructed second language acquisition*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bøhn, H. & Hansen, T. (2017). Assessing pronunciation in an EFL context: Teachers' orientations towards nativeness and intelligibility. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 14(1), 54-68. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2016.1256407>
- Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education*. London: Continuum.
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27-40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>
- Brooks, N. (1964). *Language and language learning: Theory and practice* (2nd ed.). New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Burri, M. & Baker, A. (2021). 'I feel... slightly out of touch': A longitudinal study of teachers learning to teach English pronunciation over a six-year period. *Applied Linguistics*, 42(4), 791-809. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amab009>
- Celce-Murcia, M., Brinton, D. M. & Goodwin, J. M. (2010). *Teaching pronunciation hardback with audio CDs (2): A course book and reference guide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chang, M. & Goswami, J. S. (2011). Factors affecting the implementation of communicative language teaching in Taiwanese college English classes. *English Language Teaching*, 4(2), 3-12. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n2p3>
- Chang, S. C. (2011). A contrastive study of grammar translation method and communicative approach in teaching English grammar. *English Language Teaching*, 4(2), 13-24. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n2p13>

- Corbin, J. & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Council of Europe (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coyle, D., Hood, P. & Marsh, D. (2010). *Content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2011). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics* (6th ed.). Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Espinoza, M. G. T., Cárdenas, Y. I. C., Martínez, C. V. P. & Saavedra, F. I. B. (2021). The use of audiovisual materials to teach pronunciation in the ESL/EFL classroom: El uso de materiales audiovisuales para enseñar la pronunciación en el aula de ESL/EFL. *South Florida Journal of Development*, 2(5), 7345-7358. <https://doi.org/10.46932/sfjdv2n5-074>
- Forman, R. (2007). Bilingual teaching in the Thai EFL context: One teacher's practice. *TESOL in Context*, 16(2), 20-25.
- Forsberg, J., Mohr, S. & Jansen, S. (2019). "The goal is to enable students to communicate": Communicative competence and target varieties in TEFL practices in Sweden and Germany. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(1), 31-60. <https://doi.org/10.1515/eujal-2018-0006>
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gattegno, C. (1963). *Teaching for languages in schools: The silent way*. Reading, MA: Educational Explorers.
- Gilner, L. (2008). Pronunciation instruction: A review of methods and techniques. *Journal of School of Foreign Languages*, 35, 93-108.
- Gonçalves, B., Loureiro-Porto, L., Ramasco, J. J. & Sánchez, D. (2018). Mapping the Americanization of English in space and time. *PloS One*, 13(5), e0197741. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0197741>
- Gordon, J. (2021). Pronunciation and task-based instruction: Effects of a classroom intervention. *RELC Journal*, 52(1), 94-109. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688220986919>
- Graddol, D. (2006). *English Next*. British Council.
- Hagan, P. (1994). Competency-based curriculum: The NSW AMES experience. *Prospect* 9(2), 30-40.
- He, D. (2017). Perceptions of Chinese English and pedagogic implications for teaching English in China. In Z. Xu, D. He, & D. Deterding (Eds.), *Researching Chinese English: The state of the art* (pp. 127-140). Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-53110-6>
- Hornby, A. S., Cowie, A. P. & Gimson, A. C. (1987). *Oxford advanced learners' dictionary of current English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics*, (pp. 269-293). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Kelly, L. G. (1969). *25 centuries of language teaching*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Ketabi, S. & Saeb, F. (2015). Pronunciation teaching: Past and present. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 4(5), 182-189.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (1994). The postmethod condition: (E)merging strategies for second/foreign language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(1), 27-48. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587197>

- Larsen-Freeman, D. & Anderson, M. (2013). *Techniques and principles in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Levis, J. M. (2005). Changing contexts and shifting paradigms in pronunciation teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39(3), 369-377. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588485>
- Levis, J. M. (2018). *Intelligibility, oral communication, and the teaching of pronunciation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levis, J. M., Sonsaat, S., Link, S. & Barriuso, T. A. (2016). Native and nonnative teachers of L2 pronunciation: Effects on learner performance. *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(4), 894-931. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.272>
- Lewis, M. (1993). *The lexical approach*. Hove, England: Language Teaching Publications.
- Linebaugh, G. & Roche, T. (2013). Learning to hear by learning to speak: The effect of articulatory training on Arab learners' English phonemic discrimination. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 36(2), 146-159. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ara1.36.2.02lin>
- Linebaugh, G. & Roche, T. (2013). Learning to hear by learning to speak: The effect of articulatory training on Arab learners' English phonemic discrimination. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 36(2), 146-159. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ara1.36.2.02lin>
- Liu, Q. X. & Shi, J. F. (2007). An analysis of language teaching approaches and methods-- Effectiveness and weakness. *US-China Education Review*, 4(1), 69-71.
- Liu, Y., Mishan, F. & Chambers, A. (2021). Investigating EFL teachers' perceptions of task-based language teaching in higher education in China. *The Language Learning Journal*, 49(2), 131-146. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2018.1465110>
- Lozanov, G. (1978). *Suggestology and outlines of suggestopedy*. New York: Gordon and Breach.
- McAndrews, M. (2019). Short periods of instruction improve learners' phonological categories for L2 suprasegmental features. *System*, 82, 151-160. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.04.007>
- Nespor, M., Shukla, M. & Mehler, J. (2011). Stress-timed vs. syllable-timed languages. In M. van Oostendorp, C. J. Ewen, E. V. Hume, & K. Rice (Eds.), *The Blackwell companion to phonology: Volume II Suprasegmental and Prosodic Phonology* (pp.1-13). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Pennington, M. C. & Rogerson-Revell, P. (2019). *English pronunciation teaching and research: Contemporary perspectives*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pittman, C. (1963). *Teaching structural English*. Brisbane, Australia: Jacaranda Press.
- Poeppl, D. (2015). Speech perception. In A. W. Toga (Ed.), *Brain mapping: A comprehensive reference, three volume set* (pp. 429-434). Academic Press.
- Richards, J. C. (2015). *Key issues in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rindal, U. (2014). Questioning English standards: Learner attitudes and L2 choices in Norway. *Multilingua-Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 33(3-4), 313-334. <https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2014-0015>
- Sasi, A. S., Haga, T., & Chen, H. Y. (2020). Applying the silent way in teaching Japanese language to university students in Taiwan. *World Journal of Education*, 10(3), 160-169. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wje.v10n3p160>

- Sicola, L. & Darcy, I. (2015). Integrating pronunciation into the language classroom. In M. Reed & J. Levis (Eds.), *Handbook of English pronunciation* (pp. 467-483). New York: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Smokotin, V. M., Alekseyenko, A. S. & Petrova, G. I. (2014). The phenomenon of linguistic globalization: English as the global lingua Franca (EGLF). *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 154, 509-513. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.10.177>
- Terrell, T. D. (1977). A natural approach to the acquisition and learning of a language. *Modern Language Journal*, 61(7), 325-337. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1977.tb05147.x>
- Topal, I. H. (2017). An analysis of the intonation patterns of if-clauses in Turkish English majors [Master's thesis, Hacettepe University]. Hacettepe University Institutional Repository. <http://hdl.handle.net/11655/3319>
- Topal, I. H. (2019). CEFR-oriented probe into pronunciation: Implications for language learners and teachers. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 15(2), 420-436. <https://doi.org/10.17263/jlls.586087>
- Tsui, A. B. M. (2009). Teaching expertise: approaches, perspectives and characteristics. In A. Burns & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education* (pp.190-197). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Uchihara, T. & Clenton, J. (2020). Investigating the role of vocabulary size in second language speaking ability. *Language Teaching Research*, 24(4), 540-556. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818799371>
- Van den Branden, K. (2006). *Task -based language education: From theory to practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Ek, J., & Alexander, L. G. (1980). *Threshold level English*. New York: Pergamon.
- Wang, X. (2022). Segmental versus suprasegmental: Which one is more important to teach?. *RELC Journal*, 53(1), 194-202. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688220925926>
- Yates, K. W. (2003). *Teaching linguistic mimicry to improve second language pronunciation* (Master's thesis, University of North Texas). UNT Digital Library. <https://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc4164/m1/85/>
- Yenkimaleki, M. & van Heuven, V. J. (2021). Effects of attention to segmental vs. suprasegmental features on the speech intelligibility and comprehensibility of the EFL learners targeting the perception or production-focused practice. *System*, 100, 102557. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102557>
- Zhang, R. & Yuan, Z. M. (2020). Examining the effects of explicit pronunciation instruction on the development of L2 pronunciation. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 42(4), 905-918. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263120000121>