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Preface

Speaking English is something many of us can do. Most of the people in that group also consider themselves quite capable of communicating effectively in the language. However, it is proved that Dutch people regularly overestimate themselves when it comes to their abilities in the English language. The solution to this problem begins at the learning stage of the language, i.e. at school. Students need to be taught vocabulary, grammar, reading comprehension, writing skills, listening comprehension, and conversational skills. However, pronunciation is not touched upon as much as the other skills. When a student has reached a certain level of proficiency in a language I believe the time has come to pay attention to their pronunciation. It will only benefit the student, since his or her understandability and credibility amongst others will improve.

This research was conducted at the Philips van Horne sg in Weert, in class Mavo 3G. I would like to thank Loe Giesen, my internship supervisor and actual teacher of this class. I would also like to thank my supervisors, Frans Hermans (Fontys) and Tim Logister (Philips van Horne), for their feedback on my chapters and support throughout the process. Special thanks also go out towards Annelies Plugge for providing me with peer feedback during different stages of this research.

Of course I may not forget my research group: the 27 students of Mavo 3G who participated in the research with never-ending patience for all the recordings they had to participate in.
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Summary of the research

Teaching pronunciation seems to be one of the trickiest parts of teaching a language. How do we teach pronunciation? How can we correct students’ pronunciation if it is not correct? One method of doing this is using explicit phonological feedback, meaning correcting students on the spot and in an explicit manner so they know what part of their utterance is incorrect. The students in this research were first taught one pronunciation lesson, in which six elements of pronunciation were taught. After this lesson, they were given explicit phonological feedback during three weeks of lessons as necessary. After the research period, students were tested to see if their pronunciation has improved. The students’ pronunciation appears to have improved during the trial period of three weeks regarding these six selected phonemes.
1 Introduction

1.1 Explanation of terms used in this report

*Phonological awareness*: a combination of skills used in phonological tasks, e.g. blending sounds together, recombining sounds or judging whether two words have sounds in common (Anthony & Francis, 2005).

*Explicit phonological feedback*: in this research considered as a kind of feedback given to students while they speak, in the lesson and at the very moment they speak. The students’ pronunciation is corrected by this kind of feedback.

*MAVO*: VMBO TL, the highest level of VMBO education.

*Phonological interference*: the way the first language influences the second language.

*L1*: first language of a person, their mother tongue.

*L2*: second language of a person, a language they have learnt later in their life.

*EFL*: English as a Foreign Language

1.2 School context

This research will be conducted at the Philips van Horne sg in Weert, The Netherlands. The research group consists of 27 MAVO 3 students in class Mavo 3G.

1.3 Reason for the investigation

The main focus in English lessons in the Netherlands seems to be the skill of reading, perhaps because the final exam for the students in secondary school is a reading comprehension test. There is also room for listening and writing exercises. However, I believe students’ pronunciation is underdeveloped. Students are not always able to convey their message, simply because this is not practiced as much as e.g. reading skills. This can result in students not being able to perform at their highest possible level, which is a pity, since the goal of education is to make them do exactly that.

In the Lower General Secondary Education (LGSE), the final exam consists of a writing and a reading exercise. But even then the writing exercise only carries 13 out of 48 points (Correctievoorschrift VMBO-GL en TL 2014). In the higher levels, Havo and Vwo, the final exam consists of only a reading assignment (Engels in 2014).

In the Netherlands, students are supposed to have a specific ERK-level of language use when they leave secondary school. A table of these levels for Mavo can be found below in Figure 1.
We can see in Figure 1 that the level Mavo students should have is a mixture of A2 and B1. However, even level B2 is a part of the reading exam, therefore illustrating that it is the reading that has the main focus in the final examinations. For speaking, ‘gespreksvaardigheid’, we can see that it is merely required to have an A2 level, whereas the other subskills are all required to be higher as can be seen by the mixture with B1 and B2 level. Because of these requirements, the focus in lessons and certainly during exam preparation is naturally on reading.

Explicit instruction of pronunciation rules can aid in the improvement of phonological awareness, which then again aids in being understood (Derwin & Munro, 2005; Dekeyzer, 2003). Improving phonological awareness can also improve listening skills, such as recognising rhythm, word boundaries, and vocabulary (Harmer, 2007). Thus, by giving students explicit phonological feedback, the pronunciation itself improves, which results in a clearer message to be understood by the listener. Moreover, by focusing more on the pronunciation, the student will become more self-confident in speaking English (Patil, 2008).
1.4 Research goal and research questions

The goal of this research is to investigate whether the use of explicit phonological feedback in the lesson can help students’ pronunciation improve.

Main research question: “Can students’ pronunciation in Mavo 3G improve by giving them explicit phonological feedback during the lessons?”

Sub questions:
1. What is the top five of most mispronounced phonemes in Test 1?
2. Is there a difference in the number of times the phonemes selected in Test 1 are mispronounced in Test 2?
3. What is the top five of most mispronounced phonemes in Test 2?
4. Is there a difference in the number of times the phonemes selected in Test 2 are mispronounced in Test 3?

1.5 Relevance for school practice

The results of this research can help me as a teacher of English as a foreign language in the Netherlands to decide whether or not to use the explicit phonological feedback approach in my lessons. I can advise my colleagues at the Philips van Horne about whether or not to use this approach.

1.6 Relevance for professional development

As a professional, I am continuously looking for ways to improve my lessons and to unlock my students’ full potential. I believe there is not enough focus on speaking skills during the lessons, and I want to try to change this. My students should be stimulated to unlock their full potential in speaking so they can convey their message adequately and feel confident while speaking English.
2 Literature review

Finding literature

When starting to write this literature review, I started with approximately 23 research papers. Some proved to be more useful than others and there are a few research papers which helped me forward a great deal. During the process of selecting information, I found I could not use all the papers I found during my first search, and in the end I had about half left. All the research papers were found on the internet, alongside a number of e-books and literature used during my education. For some papers, I reached out to the authors via email in order to get a copy of their work, which they were most happy to give.

Literature review

This research focuses on improving EFL learners' pronunciation of English, thus looking for a way to make their L1 influence on L2 less strong. This will be done using the method of explicit phonological feedback, which means correcting learners' pronunciation as they speak. Large amounts of previous research can shed light on how a language, and specifically its pronunciation, is learnt.

2.1 Factors influencing the acquisition of language

Pronunciation of a language which sounds foreign, is mostly referred to as accented speech. An accent is everything that is different from a set standard in terms of pronunciation. The standard variety most often taught for English is Received Pronunciation (RP) or General American (GA). The strength of an accent is determined by a number of factors. Firstly, a learner’s L1, which influences the way they learn the L2 and the accent they have; secondly the age they began learning the L2, which will be discussed at a later point in this literature review; thirdly the use of L1 as well as L2 during learning; and fourthly their experience in L2, also including instruction received and actual time spent using L2 outside the classroom. Another important factor in learning the pronunciation of a language is the learner’s motivation for learning and improving his/her accent (Nabei, 2004; Derwing & Munro, 2005; Cunningham Florez, 1998; Moyer, 2007; Thomson & Derwing, 2014). Speaking with a foreign accent can have an advantage, since a native speaker can modify the input given if desirable. However, it can also reduce intelligibility and provoke stereotyping (Derwing & Munro, 2005).

2.1.1 The critical period

Lenneberg (1967) states that there is a critical period, roughly between two years of age and puberty, for the acquisition of language. The reason it is more difficult to acquire language after this period is a loss of neural plasticity in the brains. There is a bulk of evidence which suggests this critical period to be a fact, and thus proving an individual is less able to learn new sounds as he/she gets older. Phonology is said to be the most difficult skill to attain after at the end of the critical period (Moyer, 2007). Pronunciation is the only area of language learning that is influenced by a critical period, because of its neuromuscular basis. Thus, learners who start learning a language after the age of roughly 12 years, are never able to achieve native-like pronunciation (Scovel, 1969 and 1988).
Levis (2005) introduces the term ‘nativeness principle’ to refer to the fact that achieving a native-like pronunciation only appears to be possible before adulthood, i.e. the critical period. There is evidence that very few adult learners have actually been able to achieve a native-like pronunciation. Most currently produced materials are consistent with the nativeness principle, and materials used in learning English are mostly based on either GA or RP, while most native speakers do not pronounce their language according to these standard varieties; there is always some kind of accent. This causes learners to hold an inaccurate view of the L2 speaking community, thinking native speakers’ pronunciation is according to these standard varieties. This may cause them to encounter problems when they interact with native speakers in person.

Bongaerts (1999) conducted research on whether native speakers of English could distinguish between other native speakers of English and very proficient adult Dutch speakers of English in terms of accent. The so-called judges could indeed point out some differences between the two groups, however these were minimal. The conclusion drawn here is that using very strict criteria, there are a number of proficient learners who can pass themselves off as native speakers. However, this is not as obvious as we might think it is. A lot of research has been done to investigate whether age is a determining factor in language acquisition.

Looking back at Bongaerts’ (1999) research, we can conclude that the critical period might not be as big a factor in learning a language as it is claimed to be. This experiment is not in line with the claims made before, since the conclusion is that it is indeed possible to achieve a native-like pronunciation after the age of 12. The reason for this according to Klein (1995); Neufeld (1977, 1978) and Derwing & Munro (2005) is as follows: even though the neural plasticity decreases, there are no physical barriers for learning a new language and its pronunciation. There is a possibility of achieving a native-like accent even if exposure starts after the end of the critical period; if the learner is provided with a considerable amount of input and is motivated to achieve a native-like accent. Still, there is a significant advantage in early exposure. Exposure to a language at an early age does not only predict greater exposure or contact, with early exposure there is a more advantageous balance of exposure, which in its turn positively affects the improvement of pronunciation abilities (Moyer, 2007). This is supported by Bongaerts (1999), who argued that the main difference between younger and adult learners in terms of input is the amount of native input given, thus resulting in a better language production of younger learners in general and pronunciation in particular. The biological factor or the age factor is one of the key factors influencing pronunciation, however not the only one.

### 2.2 Pronunciation and credibility

There is also a large amount of evidence present suggesting a correlation between pronunciation and credibility. Credibility consists of two components: trustworthiness and believability (Nabei, 2014). Nabei (2014) investigated whether identical pieces of text, presented with or without an accent, resulted in different reactions from listeners. The research proved that unaccented speech earned a better evaluation than the accented speech samples, even if both pieces were presented by the same person, in other words, the native-like pronounced texts received far better evaluations than the non-native texts pronounced with accents. Whether or not the listener was native or non-native, or even a learner of English themselves, made no difference. Concluding, we can say that the heavier the accent, the lower the credibility. The native-like speakers were also thought to be more intelligent and confident.

It follows that non-native speakers of a language are likely to be judged as lacking credibility, moreover they are at risk of not being taken seriously as a confident person in their
knowledge or ability to make decisions. A non-native speaker may also fall victim to stereotyping, since native speakers feel anxious about the interaction and are afraid they might not understand the message (Morley, 1998). Additionally, samples of speech which are perceived as unintelligible are always heavily accented. However, a heavily accented sample is not by definition unintelligible (Derwing & Munro, 2005).

2.3 Pronunciation in the EFL classroom

Pronunciation research translates into the classroom via several language learning theories. These theories are designed to provide a model with which the language can be taught. Focus on pronunciation is most present in the reformed method and audiolingualism. These claim pronunciation should be taught explicitly. On the other side, there is the fluency first movement, stating learners should first attain fluency in the L2, after which grammatical and phonological accuracy are dealt with (Eisenstein Ebsworth, 1998). In addition, communicative language teaching and the cognitive movement even ignore pronunciation altogether (Levis, 2005). Finally, the intelligibility principle focuses on learners to be understandable, since communication can be effective even if accents are present. There is a noticeable amount of evidence against this principle (Nabei, 2014; Derwing & Munro, 2005; Morley, 1998), however it is still used a lot. Today, a widely used approach is communicative language teaching, which focuses on meaning rather than on form, causing pronunciation instruction to become less important, even though pronunciation is proven to improve through exposure (Thomson & Derwing, 2014).

The question we must ask ourselves is how we can embed all the evidence discussed before in our lessons. According to Morley (1998), we must be aware of the way we teach pronunciation. We must use a communicative-cognitive approach, which is more effective than an articulatory phonetics approach. Phonetic instruction is to consist of two parts: macro-focus and micro-focus. Macro-focus involves intonation, stress and rhythm; in short the ability to speak fluently, whereas micro-focus focuses on a phrase and word level, meaning vowel and consonant sounds. Furthermore, pronunciation practice should consist of three stages: imitation, communicative practice and independent practice, which means integrating the new knowledge.

A vast amount of research has been done to investigate the effects of pronunciation interventions in the classroom. Lee, Jang & Plonsky (2014) investigated different studies of pronunciation instruction and concluded that, quite obviously, long-term interventions result in larger effects than short-term interventions, moreover, interventions which use feedback produced better results than those without feedback. The use of technology is not yet proven to produce better effects than traditional teaching, there is even some evidence which suggests that the use of technology has the opposite effect. In short, learners who were corrected by instructional feedback improved their pronunciation and performed better than learners in control groups. Learners at all levels can improve by being given pronunciation instruction. However, not all elements of pronunciation are learnable. We can learn some aspects of intonation, like nuclear stress, however for example the intonation of sentence tags is not learnable (Levis, 2005).

In trying to improve learners’ pronunciation, teaching pronunciation will benefit their productions and can even lead to significant improvement since the differences between the learners’ own pronunciation and the correct pronunciation is pointed out. This way, learners are able to improve (Derwing & Munro, 2005; Thomson & Derwing, 2014). Thomson & Derwing (2014) also state explicit phonological instruction can improve learners' pronunciation.
In conclusion, teaching pronunciation is important for a number of reasons. Firstly, it improves learners’ intelligibility when speaking. This is important when interacting with others for the interaction to be successful. Secondly, having a clear pronunciation which is close to the standard pronunciation increases a speaker’s credibility towards others. Teaching pronunciation is a logical and necessary component of learning a language. The goal of this research is to investigate whether explicit phonological instruction can aid in improving learners’ pronunciation. Derwing and Munro (2005) and Thomson and Derwing (2014) proved that pronunciation teaching and in particular pronunciation instruction can aid in improving learners’ pronunciation. According to Thomson and Derwing (2014), “explicit instruction of phonological forms can have a significant impact” (p.14). Thus, we have now found an evidence-based approach to try to improve learners’ pronunciation.
3 Method

As said before, Derwing & Munro (2005) and Thomson & Derwing (2014) proved that teaching pronunciation is beneficial and that explicit instruction of phonological forms can have a significant impact.

3.1 Materials

Students in this trial were taught English as a foreign language using the explicit phonological feedback approach, meaning their pronunciation was corrected on the spot, during a period of three weeks. Students participated in three test moments to determine whether there was progress in their pronunciation. The tests consisted of a variety of speaking assignments.

The first test provides students with a choice: they can either interview each other or tell a story using guiding questions. The second test was taken twice. During the first try, students received another interview assignment, during the second try they were interviewed by their teacher about personal matters. For the third test moment, students were again invited to a conversation with the teacher. They received a short news text, after which a conversation followed about their personal opinions of these news items.

3.2 Subjects

The research group was a Mavo 3 class of 28 students. Of these 28 students, 11 are female and 17 are male. The average age is fifteen. The students in this class are at mixed levels of proficiency, which can also be seen in the recordings. One of the students went to international school abroad for a few years, and one student followed bilingual education for a few years. Most students speak Dutch as their first language at home, sometimes accompanied with a dialect of Dutch. One student’s first language is Polish, one student’s first language is Chinese, and one student also uses sign language at home.

One of the students participated in the first test moment, but this recording was ignored in this analysis and the rest of the research, since this student has an ill health and could not participate in neither the other test moments nor the intervention itself. The total number of students is therefore set at 27.

3.3 Development of materials

The speaking assignments for this research were developed using a mixture of self-developed materials and adaption of materials from others.

The tests consisted of a variety of speaking assignments. The first test can be found in Appendix 1. This was a speaking assignment which students carried out in duos. They either interviewed each other or they told a story using guiding questions. The story-writing assignment is adapted from http://www.teachthemenglish.com/2013/01/the-greatest-creative-writing-activity-ever/.

The second test was taken twice. Initially, students were to do another interview assignment, pretending they were an animal. However, in listening to these recordings, it became evident that students did not speak sufficiently. The one minute recording was mostly filled with laughter or answers consisting of two words. In terms of pronunciation, there was not much to analyse. The second test moment was retried and eventually the second test
consisted of the teacher interviewing the students about their first day at school, their hobbies, their families, i.e. subjects which would fit an A1/A2 level speaker, so students would not have trouble finding the right words. For these questions, see Appendix 2.

For the third test moment (Appendix 3), students were again invited to a conversation with the teacher. They received a short news text, in order to have something to talk about. The conversation then focused on the text and their opinion about the events described.

### 3.4 Procedure

The structure of this research was as follows: Test 1 – three weeks of regular teaching (control period) – Test 2 – three weeks of teaching with explicit phonological feedback – Test 3. The reason for having three test moments with the group is that the research group doubled as the control group, due to the absence of another control group. The first three weeks function as control period, whereas the second three weeks function as research period. The control period is designed to eliminate the chance that improving on the students’ part can be due to their language development in general.

All these tests resulted in a recording of the student speaking, resulting in three recordings from every student. All the recordings gathered were about one minute in length and were recorded using a smartphone. Students were then numbered according to their position in the alphabetical name list of this class.

As soon as the first recordings were collected, 10 students’ recordings were picked using their numbers via www.randomizer.org. Numbers 1 up to and including 27 were entered into the Randomizer. The site then generated 10 numbers, these were the students whose recordings were analysed. Since these recordings were picked at random, they are representative for this entire group.

The students in the research group participated in three test moments. The first test was taken, after which three weeks of regular teaching followed. The second test moment doubled as the end test of the first period and the start test of the second period, after which three weeks of teaching using explicit phonological feedback followed. The third and final test was taken after three weeks of teaching with phonological feedback and served as end test for the second period.

Speech samples in all three test moments were recorded by smartphones and transferred onto a computer, after which ten recordings were picked to be analysed. Every test moment answered one sub question. The sub questions were related as to how many mistakes students make in each test moment. Every test will answer one question.

### 3.5 Analysis of data

In order to answer the sub questions, the selected recordings were to be analysed in order to determine which mistakes the student made. The contents of these recordings were then transcribed to plain text and phonetic text, using the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA). The recording was then played numerous times to determine which phonemes were not pronounced in a Received Pronunciation (RP) manner. In this process, the matters of r-colouring, aspiration and intonation were left out, firstly because the focus of these recordings was to analyse the phonemes students use and secondly since some students (for example the student who went to international school) have a strong r-colouring in their speaking. It is unfair to expect these students to get rid of their r-colouring. Intonation and aspiration can be
learned at a later stage. In short, by only focusing on the phonemes and the way they are pronounced, all the students will be analysed in the same way.

The recording was then analysed and the phonemes which were mispronounced were marked. Using the marked phonemes, a top 5 for each student was created, however phonemes which were only mispronounced once were ignored in this top 5, sometimes resulting in a top 3. All 10 top 5’s were then transformed into one final top 5 by marking the occurrence of the phonemes and putting them in order of occurrence. In test 2 there were six phonemes, since two phonemes shared the fifth place. The same approach was used for recordings 1, 2, and 3.

For every student, a top 5 was made, if possible. For some students, there are two number ones or multiple number fives. More than two phonemes in the fifth place were ignored. Using the amount of occurrence of specific phonemes in these top fives, a final top six was constructed, which thus includes the phonemes students mispronounced most in the recordings per test.

In order to make it clear if and how much the students improved their pronunciation, the top 5 was then put into percentages. For example, if the æ sound was used 50 times and mispronounced 25 times, its percentage will be 50%. This way, all three test moments can be compared equally regardless of the frequency of the phonemes.
4 Results

4.1 What is the top five of most mispronounced phonemes in Test 1?

For this test moment, ten randomly selected students’ recordings were analysed. These were the students with numbers 1, 2, 9, 11, 14, 18, 19, 25, 27 and 28. Some students’ top fives had shared places, for example student 9 had 4 phonemes in the second place. These phonemes are added to the top 5’s seen below, and were also counted in by creating the final top five.

Table 1. Students’ top five in the first test moment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Personal top 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student 1</td>
<td>1. æ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. ə</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. ɔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. ei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 2</td>
<td>1. əʊ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. æ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. ɔ, ɔ, ə</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 9</td>
<td>1. əʊ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. æ, ə, θ, ɪə</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. ei, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. ɔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 11</td>
<td>1. æ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. ð, ə</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. ə, əʊ, ɔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 14</td>
<td>1. əʊ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. ɪə, ə, ð</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 18</td>
<td>1. ð</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. əʊ, ə</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. æ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 19</td>
<td>1. ð, æ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. ə</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. ɪə, ə, ɔ, ə, əʊ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 25</td>
<td>1. ʊ, əʊ, ð</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 27</td>
<td>1. ei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. ɔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. əʊ, u, ɪə</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 28</td>
<td>1. ð</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. ə</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. əʊ, u</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The final top five for test moment 1 was as follows (taking into account the number of occurrence of these phonemes in students’ individual top fives):

1. əʊ
2. ɒ
3. æ
4. ʊ
5. ɔ

This top five will be used to assess whether students improved their pronunciation during the control period.

Table 2 shows the occurrence of these phonemes alongside the number of times they were mispronounced, as well as the percentage of times these phonemes were mispronounced.

Table 2. Frequency table of the phonemes in Test 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phoneme</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
<th>Mispronounced</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>əʊ</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ɒ</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>æ</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʊ</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ɔ</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.1 Answering this research question

In short, we can see that there are five phonemes which are continuously mispronounced by the students. Students’ top fives resulted in one final top five in which the sounds: əʊ, ɒ, æ, ʊ, and ɔ can be found. These sounds will be used as a basis for the analysis of the second test recordings.
4.2 Is there a difference in the number of times the phonemes selected in Test 1 are mispronounced?

For this test moment, ten randomly selected students’ recordings were analysed. These were the students with numbers 8, 10, 11, 15, 16, 19, 20, 23, 25 and 26. These results serve two purposes: they are the end point for the period of regular teaching (the control period) and the onset of the period in which explicit phonological feedback was used.

These results were firstly analysed against the top 5 created in the first test moment, in order to determine whether the students made any progress during the control period.

For clarity, one can find Table 2 below.

Table 2. Frequency table of the phonemes in Test 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phoneme</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
<th>Mispronounced</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ð</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ð</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ð</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ð</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ð</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Making a frequency table for these phonemes in the same manner for Test 2 results in the following table:

Table 3. Frequency table of the phonemes in Test 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phoneme</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>Mispronounced</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ð</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ð</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ð</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ð</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ð</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Putting the two tables’ percentage column side to side, we see the following:

Table 4. Differences in score between test 1 and test 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phoneme</th>
<th>Test 1</th>
<th>Test 2</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ð</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>+ 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ð</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>+ 44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ð</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>+ 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ð</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>+ 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ð</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>+ 8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.1 Answering this research question

In this comparison, we find that students’ pronunciation has not improved. It even seems to have deteriorated, about which one can read more in chapter 5. The occurrence of mistakes in the selected phonemes has even increased, as can be seen in Table 4. During this period, students did not receive any teaching or feedback on their pronunciation.
4.3 What is the top five of most mispronounced phonemes in Test 2?

Secondly, these same recordings were used to create a new top 5, as a starting point for the second period of teaching, using the explicit phonological feedback. The personal top fives were created in the same way as before.

Table 5. Students’ top five in the second test moment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Personal top 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student 8</td>
<td>1. ð, æ&lt;br&gt;2. ʌ&lt;br&gt;3. z, ø&lt;br&gt;4. œu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 10</td>
<td>1. ð&lt;br&gt;2. ø&lt;br&gt;3. œu&lt;br&gt;4. ø&lt;br&gt;5. æi, z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 11</td>
<td>1. ð&lt;br&gt;2. ʌ&lt;br&gt;3. ø, æ&lt;br&gt;4. œ, z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 15</td>
<td>1. ð&lt;br&gt;2. æ&lt;br&gt;3. œu&lt;br&gt;4. ø&lt;br&gt;5. ð, ʌ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 16</td>
<td>1. æ&lt;br&gt;2. d&lt;br&gt;3. ø&lt;br&gt;4. z&lt;br&gt;5. æi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 19</td>
<td>1. ð&lt;br&gt;2. æ&lt;br&gt;3. ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 20</td>
<td>1. ð, æ&lt;br&gt;2. ʌ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 23</td>
<td>1. æ&lt;br&gt;2. ð&lt;br&gt;3. œu&lt;br&gt;4. œi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 25</td>
<td>1. ð&lt;br&gt;2. æ&lt;br&gt;3. œu&lt;br&gt;4. ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 26</td>
<td>1. ð&lt;br&gt;2. æ, œu, æ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The final top six for test moment 2 was as follows:

1. \( \delta \)
2. \( \varepsilon \)
3. \( \varnothing \)
4. \( \delta \)
5. \( \lambda \)
6. \( z \)

It was chosen to use a top six since both phonemes in the fifth and sixth place occurred equally often.

Table 6 shows the occurrence of these phonemes alongside the number of times they were mispronounced, as well as the percentage of times these phonemes were mispronounced.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phoneme</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
<th>Mispronounced</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \delta )</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \varepsilon )</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \varnothing )</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \delta )</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \lambda )</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( z )</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.1 Answering this research question

These results serve as a starting point for the pronunciation lesson students will be taught and these sounds will be used as a basis for the analysis of the third test recordings. The sounds which will be in focus are the following: \( \delta \), \( \varepsilon \), \( \varnothing \), \( \delta \), \( \lambda \), and \( z \).
4.4 Is there a difference in the number of times the phonemes selected in Test 2 are mispronounced?

For this test moment, ten randomly selected students’ recordings were analysed. These were the students with numbers 2, 5, 9, 13, 14, 20, 21, 23, 25 and 28. These recordings were analysed according to test 2’s top 6 in order to investigate whether or not students’ pronunciation had improved during the trial period.

For clarity, one can find Table 6 below.

Table 6. Frequency table of the phonemes in Test 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phoneme</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>Mispronounced</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ð</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>æ</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>æu</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ð</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>æ</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Making a frequency table for these phonemes in the same manner for Test 3 results in the following table:

Table 7. Frequency table of the phonemes in Test 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phoneme</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>Mispronounced</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ð</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>æ</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>æu</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ð</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>æ</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Putting the two tables’ percentage column side to side, we see the following:

Table 8. Differences between test 2 and test 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phoneme</th>
<th>Test 2</th>
<th>Test 3</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ð</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>-26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>æ</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>-66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>æu</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>-52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ð</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>-57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>æ</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.1 Answering this research question

In Table 8, one can see that the percentages of times phonemes were mispronounced, has decreased. The percentages vary from 26% to 94%, with the phoneme $z$ as the only one which remained consistent in both tests. We can see that during the trial period, students improved their pronunciation with regards to these phonemes. The percentage of error occurrence decreased, in some cases even drastically. Only the $z$’s occurrence remained the same.
5 Conclusion and discussion

5.1 Answers to the research questions

In this research, the question “Can students’ pronunciation in Mavo 3G improve by giving them explicit phonological feedback during the lessons?” was explored. The improvement was measured using three different tests in order to determine whether students made less mistakes after receiving explicit phonological feedback. In order to answer the main research question, four sub questions have been formulated. The answer to the first sub question resulted in the top five of most mispronounced phonemes in Test 1. The second sub question investigated whether students’ pronunciation with regards to these five phonemes had improved. The answer to the third sub question resulted in the top five of most mispronounced phonemes in Test 2. The fourth and last sub question investigated whether students’ pronunciation with regards to these six phonemes had improved.

Regarding the first sub question, results showed the following top five: \( \delta, \alpha, \chi, \eta, \) and \( \varepsilon. \) Whilst retaining regular teaching during the control period, results showed that students’ pronunciation had not improved. The occurrence of mistakes in the selected phonemes had increased, thus the pronunciation seems to have deteriorated. This might be due to the fact that the communicative approach, which is mostly used by regular teaching methods, does not pay attention to pronunciation (Thomson & Derwing, 2014). Another reason for this could be the different ways of testing, as can be seen later in this chapter.

With regards to the third sub question, the top five most mispronounced phonemes in Test 2 were: \( \delta, \alpha, \chi, \eta, \lambda, \) and \( \varepsilon. \) One can see multiple differences between the top fives. The main difference is the fact that there are different phonemes found. This might be due to the fact that the assignments used for Test 1 and Test 2 were not the same, which could have resulted in a different word choice during both tests. Secondly, the rankings of the phonemes differ. Although four of the phonemes occur in both top fives, they can be found in a different position. Again, this might be due to the fact that different assignments were used.

With regards to the difference of the number of times of mispronunciation between Test 2 and Test 3, results show that students improved their pronunciation of these phonemes. The percentage of error occurrence decreased, in some cases even drastically ranging from 26% to 94% decrease. Only the \( \varepsilon \)’s occurrence remained the same.

In conclusion, the answer to the research question “Can students’ pronunciation in Mavo 3G improve by giving them explicit phonological feedback during the lessons?” is “yes” based on this study. Students showed an improvement regarding their pronunciation as can be seen by the percentages of times these phonemes were mispronounced. However, there are some objections to this definite answer, as can be seen later in this chapter.

5.2 Interpretation and explanation of results related to the literature

Using the results collected in the three test moments we can conclude that the students whose recordings were analysed have improved their pronunciation after receiving explicit phonological instruction. This is in line with Derwing and Munro’s (2005) and Thomson and Derwing’s (2014) whom claimed that teaching pronunciation and giving explicit phonological feedback can improve learners’ pronunciation. In this light these results confirm the hypothesis.
There is no other research available as to whether explicit phonological feedback can help Dutch learners of English. However, as Lee, Jang & Plonsky (2014) stated, for an intervention to be successful there needs to be a considerable amount of time involved. When evaluating the results of this research, one can conclude that the given time span is long enough to achieve a significant effect.

### 5.3 Recommendations for school practice

By means of the results of this research teachers can consider using explicit phonological feedback in their lessons in order to improve students’ pronunciation. Schools can decide to conduct further research and to structure this approach more so it can be applied in the lessons by all teachers of English. Further research is required to prove that explicit phonological feedback can be applied to all levels of secondary education, however the results of this research already prove that explicit phonological feedback could have an effect on students’ pronunciation.

By using regular teaching methods which are mostly inspired by the communicative approach, students’ pronunciation does not improve. This might be a result of a focus on meaning rather than on pronunciation (Thomson & Derwing, 2014). If teachers used the explicit phonological feedback alongside the communicative language teaching approach, students’ pronunciation will improve which might even lead to a better understanding of the English language as described by Harmer (2007).

### 5.4 Possible invalidity

There are a few things to consider in this research. First of all, the research group was rather small since it only consisted of 27 students. They all had different backgrounds and though they are in the same class and school level, their level of proficiency is different, which is also likely to have influenced the results of this research. Considering this limited research group the results are only applicable to this group and cannot be generalised to other students. In order to make this research stronger, a bigger research group is necessary. Moreover, the research group doubled as the control group. This is not an ideal situation.

Secondly, the tests were not taken under exactly the same conditions. The first test consisted of students interviewing each other in couples with very little teacher involvement. Since this resulted in recordings with which an analysis could take place, the second test moment was set up approximately the same. However, since these second recordings were not of the same quality and length as those in test moment 1, a teacher-paced approach was chosen instead. During these recordings, which were individually recorded together with the teacher, there was more room to lengthen the audio files in order to gather enough sound data. This inevitably resulted in recordings of better quality, which could perhaps have influenced the results of sub question 2 in particular.

Thirdly, the tests existed of different tasks every time. This was done in order to reduce any kinds of learner-effects. However, by using three different tests it is probable that the results were influenced as the tests could have been of a different quality. The tests had a high level of freedom for students in terms of what they could talk about, so some phonemes have not been used at all. It would have been a better idea to use a short text in which phonemes occurred approximately equally often. This would make the results clearer and more
trustworthy. More importantly, the tests in this research were not used in any studies before requiring further research based on the validity of these measurements.

Lastly, the time period in this research, three weeks, was rather short. The results showed an effect, however different findings, or even stronger effect might be found by lengthening the test period.

5.5 Suggestions for future research

For future research, the limitations as mentioned above should be eliminated. Further research with regards to this topic should involve the following: a bigger research group, consistent and valid tests (preferably reading texts), and a separate research and control group. The focus of further research could also be more towards the influence of pronunciation on the understanding of the English language. I would suggest a school-wide research over a longer period of time, with clear tests and approaches in testing. If possible, a research over different levels of education and different schools in the area would be desirable.
Sources


Appendixes
Appendix 1: Test 1

Algemene instructie

- Deze opdrachten voer je uit in tweetallen
- Neem je opdracht op met je telefoon
- Spreek eerst duidelijk je naam en klas in op de opname
- Je spreekt voor ongeveer 1 minuut
- Je krijgt 2 opdrachten, kies er 1 uit
- Je mag moeilijke woorden opzoeken op je telefoon
- Iedereen is verantwoordelijk voor zijn eigen opname
- Na afloop zetten we alle opnamen op de docenten-pc
- Voor beide opdrachten hebben jullie 5 minuten voorbereidingstijd, maar er wordt niks uitgeschreven!

Optie 1
Jullie gaan elkaar interviewen. Jullie bedenken zelf de vragen in de 5 minuten voorbereidingstijd.
Dingen waarover het interview kan gaan: een onderwerp waarover je heel gepassioneerd bent, een bepaalde gebeurtenis in je leven, een beroemd persoon, etc. De vragen die jullie gaan gebruiken, mogen wel worden uitgeschreven.


Optie 2
Use the following questions to tell a story:
- How long have you been on the planet?
- Why did you go there?
- Describe the two people who are with you.
- Why is your spaceship damaged?
- When you decided to leave your ship, how far did you walk?
- What were you looking for?
- When did you realise that someone was following you?
- Describe the creature.
- While you were running away, you tripped and fell. What happened?
- What was the big surprise at the end of your story?

Jullie gaan over deze vragen een dialoog maken. Een van jullie stelt de vragen, de ander beantwoordt deze. Kruip echt in je rol en doe alsof je ook werkelijk op een vreemde planeet bent!
Vervolgens wissel je rollen. Je hebt dus beiden een verhaal verteld.
Appendix 2: Test 2

The teacher will ask the following questions, until the moment the recording is about one minute in length.

- What was your first day at school like?
- Can you tell me something about your family?
- What is your hobby? Please tell me something more about that.
Appendix 3: Materials for the pronunciation lesson

Lesson preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Klas</th>
<th>M3G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Datum</td>
<td>18-05-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uur/Tijd</td>
<td>11.50-12.40 – 13.10-14.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lesdoelen
1. Leerlingen luisteren kritisch naar de uitspraak van native RP en GA sprekers
2. Leerlingen luisteren kritisch naar de uitspraak van twee Nederlandse sprekers
3. Leerlingen kunnen het verschil benoemen tussen beide categorieën sprekers
4. Leerlingen kunnen de fonetische klanken &, æ, ø, õ, z, d zonder gebruik van terminologie uitleggen en toepassen in woordverband
5. Leerlingen kunnen een nieuwtекst voorzien met correcte uitspraak van de fonetische klanken &, æ, ø, õ, z, d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesplanning</th>
<th>Tijd</th>
<th>Wat?</th>
<th>Middelen</th>
<th>Werkvorm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introductie</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>1. Programma van vandaag, spelregels en uitleg introductie-opdracht</td>
<td>Bord</td>
<td>Klassikaal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>2. Leerlingen kijken filmje eenmaal</td>
<td>Filmpjes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>3. Leerlingen krijgen teksten</td>
<td>Handout</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>4. Leerlingen kijken filmje nogmaals, alleen RP en GA versie en letten</td>
<td>Bord</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>5. Vervolgens nogmaals Louis en Rob en letten op uitspraak onderstreepte woorden</td>
<td>Bord</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>6. Bespreken onderstreepte woorden en proberen deze juist uit te spreken</td>
<td>Bord</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>7. Uitleg klanken: &amp;, æ, ø, õ, z, d</td>
<td>Bord/ppt</td>
<td>Klassikaal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>8. Verbinden klanken aan woorden en laten horen met Cambridge Dictionary</td>
<td>Nieuwsartikelen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>9. Uitleg aanpak komende paar lessen: explicit phonological feedback</td>
<td>Smartphones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>10. Uitleg nieuws-opdracht, werkvorm, spelregels en eindproduct + follow-up klassikaal</td>
<td>Drietal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.30</td>
<td>13. Eindproduct inleveren</td>
<td>Recordings</td>
<td>Klassikaal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.35</td>
<td>14. Twee of drie recordings klassikaal beluisteren en doornemen op uitspraak van onderstreepte woorden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afsluiting</td>
<td>13.45</td>
<td>15. Korte recap theorie &amp; æ, ø, õ, z, d</td>
<td></td>
<td>Klassikaal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>16. Nabespreking proefwerk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Persoonlijk leerdoel
Duidelijke uitleg geven
Groepswerk begeleiden (ook regels stellen)
Students’ version of texts used in video

Students received these texts which were presented in the video. The underlined words are words using the phonemes which were to be discussed.

**BBC News:**

That’s right, in the, literally in the last minute or so we now have the name for the Princess of Cambridge. She is to be called Charlotte Elizabeth Diana. In the full statement that we’ve received from Kensington Palace it says that the Duke and Duchess of Cambridge are delighted to announce that they have named their daughter Charlotte Elizabeth Diana. The baby will be known as Her Royal Highness Princess Charlotte of Cambridge. So that is what we’ve been waiting for throughout the day.

**CNN:**

There’s been a lot of talk about the Americans using drones against people linked to Al-Qaida, American citizens. You look at a case like this, and Dorner, is this a case where you would think sometime soon that we would use drones against American citizens, a case like this, where he’s trying to kill people?

**Louis van Gaal 1:**

It’s the biggest club of the world. Within two days I know already how important Manchester United is and I have to adapt to this big club. It shall not be easy, but I do my utmost best and when you see my career you can see what I have won. And that I can say.

**Louis van Gaal 2:**

You never know, hé. I’ve said that already before, so, yeah, it’s always, you have to wait and see.

**Rob Geus:**

Ongelooflijk. You speak English? Speak any English? The food is cold. Look. Look. Forty degrees. The minimal degrees, seventy. But where can I see it? He’s out! Now, but he was out. Why? Why is he out? Why?

**Assignment news texts**

**Children 'more likely to confide in pets than siblings'**

Children who are facing adversity, such as illness or parents splitting up, are more likely to confide in their pet than brothers or sisters, according to research.

Matt Cassels at Cambridge University says far too little attention has been paid to the significant role of pets in young people’s emotions.

“They may feel that their pets are not judging them,” said Mr Cassels.

His research is based on a 10-year study of 100 families in the UK.

Mr Cassels, a postgraduate psychiatry researcher, says that the place of pets in the lives of young people has not been adequately recognised and the scale of its importance has been underestimated.

Family break-ups mean that in the United States children are more likely to live with a pet than their natural father, says the research.
Appendix 4: Test 3

Please pick one of the articles in this booklet.

1. Deutsche Bahn strike delays millions of passengers
2. 'Hitler's horse sculptures' found in black market probe
3. Jeremy Clarkson says Top Gear exit 'left a huge hole'

For every text, there are a few questions. Read through them. You will talk to your teacher about these texts using the questions, for about one minute. Some difficult words in the texts are explained at the bottom of the page.

Deutsche Bahn strike delays millions of passengers

• 20 May 2015

• From the section Business

The passenger rail strike affected commuters on Wednesday morning

Millions of commuters have been hit by delays in Germany after Deutsche Bahn's train drivers went on strike again.

Two in three long-distance trains and hundreds of commuter services have been cancelled from Wednesday morning.

GDL union leader Claus Weselsky has given no end date for the strike, but said it would "last a little longer" than the previous five-day stoppage.

The GDL has staged a series of strikes to call for a 5% pay rise for 20,000 drivers and a shorter working week.

This is the ninth strike in just 11 months and follows a five-day train strike earlier in May, which was the longest in Deutsche Bahn's 21-year history.

An estimated 5.5 million people travel daily by train in Germany.

Economists estimate that the strike earlier this month cost the German economy some €750m (£541m) in lost activity.
" Strikes hurt everyone and cost time and money," said Ulrich Weber, Deutsche Bahn's personnel chief.

Commuter = someone who regularly travels between work and home (= forestry)

Strike = to refuse to continue working because of an argument with an employer about working conditions, pay levels, or job losses (= staking)

GDL = Gewerkschaft Deutscher Lokomotivführer (GDL), trade union (= vakbond) for train personnel.

1. What do you think of strikes in general?
2. The strike has ended and the GDL got what it wanted, a 5% pay rise. How do you feel about governments giving in to people who strike?
3. How do you think the commuters think of this strike?
4. If you were unhappy in your job, would you consider a strike?
5. What do you think of the 75 million euros that the previous strike cost the government? Is it fair?

'Hitler's horse sculptures' found in black market probe

• 20 May 2015

• From the section Europe

The chancellery was badly damaged during World War Two and later destroyed

Two bronze horse statues that once stood in front of Adolf Hitler's chancellery are among several pieces of Nazi-era art found by German police.

Police said they recovered the pieces after staging a series of raids as part of a probe into black market art.

Eight people are being investigated.

The "Walking Horses", by Josef Thorak, were custom-made for the Berlin building, which was badly damaged in World War Two and later destroyed by Soviet forces.

The works were last seen at a Soviet barracks near Berlin in 1989, shortly before the fall of the Berlin wall.

German newspaper Bild reported that up until their disappearance, the statues had been painted gold, damaged by bullets, and played on by children.

Probe: an attempt to discover information by asking a lot of questions
Chancellery: a building or room where a chancellor works or lives, or the people who work in a chancellor's offices. Chancellor: a person in a position of the highest or high rank, especially in a government or university

Era: a period of time of which particular events or stages of development are typical

Staging raids: organizing a short sudden attack, usually by a small group of people

Barracks: a building or group of buildings where soldiers live

1. If you were the police officer in charge of this probe, what would you do with these statues?
2. How would you feel if they were to be put up again, somewhere in Berlin?
3. What do you think about other pieces of art connected to the Nazi regime? Should we lock them away, destroy them or make them available for the public to see?
4. Some of the artists who worked for Hitler were punished for their actions. What do you think about that?

Jeremy Clarkson says Top Gear exit 'left a huge hole'

• 12 minutes ago

• From the section Entertainment & Arts

Jeremy Clarkson was dropped by the BBC after a 'fracas' with a Top Gear producer

Jeremy Clarkson says that being dropped from Top Gear has "left a huge hole" in his life "that needs to be filled".

The broadcaster was speaking to BBC Radio 2's Chris Evans in his first interview since he lost his job, following a "fracas" with a producer. "It was my own silly fault, so I can hardly complain," he said.

Clarkson said he had taken phone calls about producing a driving show for another broadcaster but "I'd be a fool jump into something". "I have been at the BBC for 27 years. When you emerge after 27 years, you find the world is changed.

"When you learn how the world works you can start to work out what to do in it," he continued. "In the meantime I'm getting really good at tennis."

Clarkson was suspended, then dropped, by the BBC in March following a "fracas" with a producer at a hotel. Producer Oisin Tymon suffered swelling and a split lip in the assault by Clarkson on 4 March and visited a hospital for his injuries. Following an internal investigation, the BBC announced on 25 March Clarkson's contract on Top Gear would not be renewed.

At the time, a BBC spokesman said: "Jeremy's contract has not been renewed on Top Gear but he isn't banned from appearing on the BBC." More than a million fans signed a petition to reinstate the presenter, but BBC director general Tony Hall said "a line has been crossed" and "there cannot be one rule for one and one rule for another".
Fracas: a noisy argument or fight
Broadcaster: someone whose job is to speak on radio or television programmes
Emerge: to appear by coming out of something or out from behind something
Suspended: If someone is suspended from work, school, etc., they are temporarily not allowed to work, go to school, or take part in an activity because of having done something wrong (=schorsen)
Assault: a violent attack
Reinstate: to give someone back their previous job or position

1. What do you think of the show Top Gear?
2. Jeremy Clarkson fought with a producer. What do you think of the fact the producer had to go to hospital because Clarkson assaulted him?
3. What do you think of the BBC’s reaction? Is it right for an employee to strike a colleague? Should they be fired for this? Is it fair to say the same rules apply to anyone?
4. Imagine yourself working in one place for 27 years. What would you do if you were fired?
Appendix 5: PowerPoint presentation used at the AOSL-symposium 8-6-2015

**EXPLICIT PHONOLOGICAL FEEDBACK IN THE ESL CLASSROOM**

**DOES EXPLICIT FEEDBACK ON PRONUNCIATION HELP ESL STUDENTS IN IMPROVING THEIR PRONUNCIATION?**

Sharon van Lümic Engels
Philips van Horne sg
F.J.H. Hermans & T. Logister

---

**INHOUD**

- Aanleiding en praktijkrelevantie
- Hoofdvraag van het onderzoeksdeel (onderzoeksvragen)
  - Literatuur: het leren van een taal
  - Literatuur: uitspraak en geloofwaardigheid
  - Literatuur: uitspraak in de Engelse les
  - Explicit phonological feedback
  - Gebruikte onderzoeksmethoden/instrumenten
  - Opbrengsten voor de schoolpraktijk
  - Beantwoorden van de hoofdvraag
AANLEIDING EN PRAKTIJKRELEVANTIE

- Uitspraak is onvoldoende ontwikkeld
- Erk-niveaus
  - Expliciete instructie van uitspraak
    - Dervinger & Munro, 2005
    - Dekeyzer, 2008
- Eigen professionele ontwikkeling

| Subkerniveau | Spanje | Frankrijk | Engels | Nederland
|--------------|-------|-----------|--------|-----------
| Luidopvoering | 2     | 2         | 2      | 2         |
| Geprononcieerdheid | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Schrijfvaardigheid | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Constructietsiervragen lokaalvaardigheid (waar CITO na) | 2 | circa 50% | circa 25% | circa 40% |
| Constructietsiervragen lokaalvaardigheid (waar CITO na) | 2 | circa 50% | circa 25% | circa 40% |

HOOFDVRAAG VAN HET ONDERZOEKSDIEEL
(ONDERZOEKSVRAGEN)

Hoofdvraag: ‘Kan de uitspraak van leerlingen in klas Mavo 3G verbeteren door hen expliciete fonologische feedback te geven tijdens de lessen?’

Subvragen:
1. Hoeveel uitspraakfouten maken de leerlingen in het eerste testmoment en in welke categorieën horen deze fouten thuis?
2. Hoeveel uitspraakfouten maken de leerlingen in het tweede testmoment, na drie weken reguliere les, en in welke categorieën horen deze fouten thuis?
3. Hoeveel uitspraakfouten maken de leerlingen in het derde testmoment, na drie weken instructive, en in welke categorieën horen deze fouten thuis?
LITERATUUR: HET LEREN VAN EEN TAAL

- Factoren die het leren van een taal beïnvloeden
  - L1 (eerste taal)
  - Leeftijd
    - Gebruik van zowel L1 als L2 (tweede taal)
    - Ervaring in L2
    - Motivatie
  - Leeftijd: Critical Period
    - Nativeness principle
    - Bongaerts (1999)

LITERATUUR: UITSPRAAK EN GELOOFWAARDIGHEID

- Verschil in waardering van spraak met of zonder accent
  - Hoe zwaarder het accent, hoe lager de geloofwaardigheid
In trying to improve learners’ pronunciation, teaching pronunciation will benefit their productions and can even lead to significant improvement since the differences between the learners’ own pronunciation and the correct pronunciation is pointed out. This way, learners are able to improve (Derwing & Munro, 2005; Thomson & Derwing, 2014). Thomson & Derwing (2014) also state explicit phonological instruction can improve learners’ pronunciation.
GEBRUIKTE ONDERZOEKSMETHODEN/INSTRUMENTEN

- Drie tests
  - Interview
- Gesprek leraar-leerling
- Gesprek n.a.v. een gelezen nieuwsartikel
- Opnames van leerlingen
- Uitzoeken van fouten

OPBRENGSTEN VOOR DE SCHOOLPRAKTIJK

The final top 5 for test moment 1 was as follows:
1. ə
2. o
3. a
4. ɪ
5. ə

Control period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phoneme</th>
<th>Test 1</th>
<th>Test 2</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ə</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>+ 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>+ 19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ɪ</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>+ 38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ɔ</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>+ 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ə</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>+ 5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Differences in score between test 1 and test 2.

The final top 6 for test moment 2 was as follows:
1. ə
2. o
3. a
4. ɪ
5. ə
6. ɛ

Second test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phoneme</th>
<th>Test 2</th>
<th>Test 3</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ə</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>+ 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ɪ</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>+ 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ɔ</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>+ 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ə</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>+ 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ɛ</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Differences between test 2 and test 3.
The answer to the research question “can students’ pronunciation in mavo 3G improve by giving them explicit phonological feedback during the lessons?” seems to be “yes”, the students who were investigated have improved their pronunciation. The percentages of times these phonemes were mispronounced had decreased.

**CAN STUDENTS’ PRONUNCIATION IN MAVO 3G IMPROVE BY GIVING THEM EXPLICIT PHONOLOGICAL FEEDBACK DURING THE LESSONS?**
## Appendix 6: Feedback forms presentation
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Beoordelingsformulier Presentatie afstuderepraktijkonderzoek (APO)
4e jaars FLON-studenten

Titel presentatie
Door: Rümic (naam en studierichting student)
Naam afstuderegeleider FLON:

### In welke mate is tijdens de presentatie aandacht besteed aan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. niet</th>
<th>2. nauwelijs</th>
<th>3. redelijk</th>
<th>4. in ruime mate</th>
<th>5. in zeer ruime mate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inhoud van de presentatie</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. De aanleiding en praktijk/relevante het project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hoofdvraag van het onderzoek/steamel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Inhoud in context en theorie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. De gebruikte onderzoeksmethoden/instrumenten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Opbrengst(en) voor de (school)prikkel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vorm van de presentatie</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Logische opbouw en structuur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Binnen tijdsgrens (12 minuten)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Functioneel visuele ondersteuning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Uitnodigend interactief moment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Mondeling taalgebruik en houding presentator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Totaalscore (telt toegelende waarderingen per criterium op)
Maximaal te behalen punt = 50
(10 criteria x maximaal een score van 5 per criterium)

### Een TIP en een TOP

Het sterkste punt (top) van de presentatie vond ik:

*Veel duidelijke info.*

Voor een volgende presentatie zou ik de presentator de volgende tip willen geven:

*minder tekst op al paar punt.*
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Beoordelingsformulier Presentatie afstudeerpraktijkonderzoek (APO)
4e jaars FLOS-studenten

Titel presentatie: **Explicit phonological feedback in the ESL classroom**

Deur: Sharon von Haimich - Engels (naam en studierichting student)

Naam afstudeerbegeleider FLOS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In welke mate is tijdens de presentatie aandacht</th>
<th>1 niet</th>
<th>2 nauwelijks</th>
<th>3 redelijk</th>
<th>4 in ruime mate</th>
<th>5 in zeer ruime mate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inhoud van de presentatie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. De aanleiding en praktijkrelevantie het project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hoofdvraag van het onderzoek/(deel)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Inbedding in context en theorie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. De gebruikte onderzoeks- methoden/instrumenten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Opbrengsten voor de (school)praktijk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vorm van de presentatie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Logische opbouw en structuur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Binnen tijdsbalk (12 minuten)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Functionaliteit visuele ondersteuning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Uitnodigend interactief moment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Mondeling taalgebruik en houding presentator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totaalscore** (tel toegekende waarderingen per criterium op)

Maximaal te behalen punten = 50
(10 criteria x maximaal een score van 5 per criterium)

**Een TIP en een TOP**

Het sterkste punt (top) van de presentatie vond ik:

*Duidelijke uitleg wat ze precies gedaan had*

Voor een volgende presentatie zou ik de presentator de volgende tip willen geven:
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Beoordelingsformulier Presentatie afstudeerpraktijkonderzoek (APO)
4e jaars FLOS-studenten

Titel presentatie

Door: (naam en studierichting student)

Naam afstudeerbegeleider FLOS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In welke mate is tijdens de presentatie aandacht besteed aan:</th>
<th>1 niet</th>
<th>2 nauwelijks</th>
<th>3 redelijk</th>
<th>4 in reusse mate</th>
<th>5 in zeer reusse mate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inhoud van de presentatie</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. De aanleiding en praktijkrelevantie het project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hoofdvraag van het onderzoek (deel)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Inbedding in context en theorie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. De gebruikte onderzoeksmethoden/instrumenten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Opbrengst(en) voor de (school)praktijk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vorm van de presentatie</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Logische opbouw en structuur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Binnen tijdsgrens (12 minuten)</td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Functionaliteit visuele ondersteuning</td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Uitnodigend interactief moment</td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Mondeling taalgebruik en houding presentator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(x)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totaalscore (tel toegekende waarderingen per criterium op)**
Maximaal te behalen punten = 50
(10 criteria x maximaal een score van 5 per criterium)

40

Een TIP en een TOP

Het sterkste punt (top) van de presentatie vond ik:

In **houding**

Voor een volgende presentatie zou ik de presentator de volgende tip willen geven:

Voorwaard: **zorg/voorzichtig en uitgebreid voorliggend**

1 e
Appendix 7: Personal reflection of how this research helped my professional development

This research has been valuable to me in more than one way. First of all, my goal as stated in Chapter 1, has been reached. I have more insight in how explicit phonological feedback can help students in improving their pronunciation, from previous literature and research as well as my own research group.

I will continue to use the explicit phonological feedback approach in my lessons, but in a more general way and also in lower proficiency levels I will correct general mistakes. I have learnt that this approach is useful and I will continue to look for ways to develop this further and use it in my lessons.

Moreover, the process of researching developed my skills as a researcher and helped me to gain more insight in what makes a good research and how I can construct this research. I can use these skills for further research connected to education or work.
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Fontys Lerarenopleiding Sittard
T.a.v. Bedrijfsbureau Fontys Lerarenopleiding Sittard
e-mail: trim-flos@fontys.nl

Swalmen, 20-6-2015

Betreft: verklaring non-plagiaat

Hierbij verklar ik niet ongeoorloofd passages (zonder bronvermelding volgens de APA regels) te hebben overgenomen uit andermans werk. Bijgevoegd is het Ephorus rapport.

Met vriendelijke groet,

Sharon von Lülich, 2179944

Burgemeester Tobbenstraat 15
6071 GG Swalmen
06-12432084
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Betreft: verklaring publicatie op scriptiebank AOSL

Hierbij verklaar ik akkoord te gaan met de publicatie van mijn APO-rapport, getiteld *Explicit Phonological Feedback in the EFL Classroom* via de AOSL/Fontys-scriptiebank

Met vriendelijke groet,

Sharon von Lümic, 2179944
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