

University of Pardubice

Faculty of Arts and Philosophy

Approaches to Teaching English Pronunciation

Bachelor Thesis

2023

Veronika Kiacová

Univerzita Pardubice
Fakulta filozofická
Akademický rok: 2021/2022

ZADÁNÍ BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE

(projektu, uměleckého díla, uměleckého výkonu)

Jméno a příjmení: **Veronika Kiacová**
Osobní číslo: **H20020**
Studijní program: **B0231A090018 Anglický jazyk**
Specializace: **Anglický jazyk pro vzdělávání**
Téma práce: **Přístupy vyučujících k výuce výslovnosti v hodinách angličtiny**
Téma práce anglicky: **Approaches to teaching English pronunciation**
Zadávací katedra: **Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky**

Zásady pro vypracování

Studentka se v této bakalářské práci zabývá problematikou výuky výslovnosti ve výuce angličtiny z pohledu vyučujících na středních školách. V úvodu teoretické části vymezí terminologii spojenou s přístupy k výuce výslovnosti angličtiny. Představí relevantní didaktické postupy výuky anglické výslovnosti pro studenty středních škol. V praktické části studentka zrealizuje výzkum postojů vyučujících angličtiny na středních školách prostřednictvím rozhovorů a dotazníků s vyučujícími a provede analýzu získaných dat.

Rozsah pracovní zprávy:
Rozsah grafických prací:
Forma zpracování bakalářské práce: **tištěná/elektronická**
Jazyk zpracování: **Angličtina**

Seznam doporučené literatury:

Brown, Adam. 2014. *Pronunciation and Phonetics: A Practical Guide for English Language Teachers*. New York: Routledge.

Celce-Murcia, Marianne, Donna M. Brinton, Janet M. Goodwin and Barry Griner. 2010. *Teaching Pronunciation: A Course Book and Reference Guide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Collins, Beverley, and Inger M. Mees. c2003. *Practical phonetics and phonology: a resource book for students*. Routledge English language introductions. London: Routledge.

Common European framework of reference for languages: learning, teaching, assessment. 2020. 4th print. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harmer, Jeremy. c2007. *The practice of English language teaching*. 4th ed. Harlow: Pearson Education.

Lane, Linda. 2010. *Tips for Teaching Pronunciation: A Practical Approach*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Roach, Peter. 2009. *English Phonetics and Phonology: A Practical Course*. 4th ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ur, Penny. 2012. *A Course in English Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Scrivener, Jim. 2005. *Learning teaching: a guidebook for English language teachers*. 2nd ed. Macmillan books for teachers. Oxford: Macmillan Education.

Vedoucí bakalářské práce: **Mgr. Kateřina Keplová**
Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

Datum zadání bakalářské práce: **2. dubna 2022**
Termín odevzdání bakalářské práce: **30. března 2023**

doc. Mgr. Jiří Kubeš, Ph.D. v.r.
děkan

Mgr. Olga Roebuck, Ph.D. v.r.
vedoucí katedry

V Pardubicích dne 30. listopadu 2022

Prohlašuji:

Práci s názvem *Approaches to teaching English Pronunciation* jsem vypracovala samostatně. Veškeré literární prameny a informace, které jsem v práci využil, jsou uvedeny v seznamu použité literatury.

Byla jsem seznámena s tím, že se na moji práci vztahují práva a povinnosti vyplývající ze zákona č. 121/2000 Sb., o právu autorském, o právech souvisejících s právem autorským a o změně některých zákonů (autorský zákon), ve znění pozdějších předpisů, zejména se skutečností, že Univerzita Pardubice má právo na uzavření licenční smlouvy o užití této práce jako školního díla podle § 60 odst. 1 autorského zákona, a s tím, že pokud dojde k užití této práce mnou nebo bude poskytnuta licence o užití jinému subjektu, je Univerzita Pardubice oprávněna ode mne požadovat přiměřený příspěvek na úhradu nákladů, které na vytvoření díla vynaložila, a to podle okolností až do jejich skutečné výše.

Beru na vědomí, že v souladu s § 47b zákona č. 111/1998 Sb., o vysokých školách a o změně a doplnění dalších zákonů (zákon o vysokých školách), ve znění pozdějších předpisů, a směrnicí Univerzity Pardubice č. 7/2019 Pravidla pro odevzdávání, zveřejňování a formální úpravu závěrečných prací, ve znění pozdějších dodatků, bude práce zveřejněna prostřednictvím Digitální knihovny Univerzity Pardubice.

V Pardubicích dne 30.3.2023

Veronika Kiacová v. r.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

First, I would like to thank my supervisor Mgr. Kateřina Keplová for her help, advice, and consultations regarding the thesis. Furthermore, I also thank my family and my partner for their incredible patience and understanding. Finally, I owe my thanks to the teachers who agreed to participate in the interviews and allowed me to carry out the research.

ANNOTATION

This thesis deals with the approaches of upper-secondary school teachers to teaching English pronunciation. The theoretical part presents significant past and present approaches to teaching pronunciation. Furthermore, the theoretical part presents the main aim of pronunciation and relevant didactic procedures for teaching pronunciation and defines the classification of upper-secondary schools. Finally, in the practical part, the research aimed to find out how English language teachers at upper-secondary schools approach teaching pronunciation is presented. Collecting and analysing the data procedure is demonstrated here, and the research results are presented.

KEY WORDS

Approaches, teachers, teaching pronunciation, upper-secondary education

NÁZEV

Přístupy vyučujících k výuce výslovnosti v hodinách angličtiny

ANOTACE

Tato práce se zabývá přístupy učitelů středních škol k výuce anglické výslovnosti. V teoretické části jsou představeny významné minulé i současné přístupy k výuce výslovnosti. Dále teoretická část představuje hlavní cíl výslovnosti a relevantní didaktické postupy k výuce výslovnosti, a definuje kategorii středních škol. V praktické části je představen výzkum, jehož cílem bylo zjistit jak učitelé anglického jazyka na středních školách přistupují k výuce výslovnosti. Je zde uveden postup sběru a analýzy dat získaných v interview a představeny výsledky výzkumu.

KLÍČOVÁ SLOVA

Přístupy, vyučující, výuka výslovnosti, vyšší sekundární vzdělávání

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	9
THEORETICAL PART	11
1 The Scope of Pronunciation Teaching Approaches	11
1.1 Approaches and Methods throughout the History of Pronunciation Teaching	12
1.2 Communicative Language Teaching and Communicative Competence.....	14
1.3 Intuitive-Imitative Approach	15
1.4 Analytic-Linguistic Approach	16
2 Teaching English Pronunciation in a Classroom	17
2.1 The Aim and Setting of Teaching Pronunciation	17
2.2 When to Teach Pronunciation?.....	19
2.3 Techniques, Tools and Technology Used to teach English Pronunciation	22
2.3.1 Techniques	22
2.3.2 Tools.....	23
2.3.3 Technology.....	24
2.4 Teaching Pronunciation in Upper-Secondary Education	25
PRACTICAL PART	28
3 The Research.....	28
3.1 Introduction to the Research.....	28
3.2 Ethics in the Research.....	28
3.3 Data collection.....	29
3.3.1 Research method and Interview Questions	29
3.3.2 Selection of Participants and Data Recording Procedure.....	31
3.4 Coding and Categorization	32
3.5 Data and Interpretation	33
3.5.1 Teachers' general beliefs on pronunciation teaching.....	34
3.5.2 Teaching pronunciation at upper-secondary schools in practice.....	36

3.5.3	Peculiarities of pronunciation teaching at upper-secondary schools	39
3.5.4	Teachers' views of their pronunciation instruction	40
3.6	Summary and Discussion	41
CONCLUSION		43
RESUMÉ.....		45
BIBLIOGRAPHY		48
APPENDICES.....		51

INTRODUCTION

Pronunciation is one of the areas of language and is also part of the teaching curriculum. “As with other areas of language, pronunciation teaching has historically been influenced by various trends in pedagogical approaches resulting in shifts in focus in teaching priorities and concerns.” (Pennington and Rogers-Revell 2019, 119). However, many authors suggest that teachers often neglect pronunciation because it did not begin to be systematically studied until shortly before the beginning of the twentieth century and is, therefore, less understood than grammar or vocabulary (Celce-Murcia et al. 2010, 2). As a metaphor initially used by Kelly (1969), Celce-Murcia et al. (2010, 2) explain that pronunciation is sometimes seen as the ‘Cinderella’ area of language teaching because, similar to pronunciation, Cinderella’s sisters did not allow her to appear in public.

Since this thesis deals with teaching of pronunciation, it should be defined what this term includes. *Pronunciation* is a prominent term in the field of phonology and practices connected to the sounds of language. The term *phonology* refers to the sound system language or sounds that are meaningful for that language. The sound system is composed of segmental and suprasegmental features. The segmental features can be represented by individual sound elements or phonemes, which create the system of vowels and consonants. The suprasegmental features or prosodic system include tone, intonation, rhythm, and stress (Pennington and Rogers-Revell 2019, 3-5). Celce-Murcia et al. (2010, 163), in addition to suprasegmental features, also mention connected speech. They claim that “with suprasegmentals and connected speech, however, the misunderstanding is apt to be more serious nature. Learners who use incorrect rhythm patterns or who do not connect words together are at best frustrating to the native-speaking listener...”

To put the practical part of this thesis into context, the theoretical part will first discuss pronunciation teaching approaches throughout history and how they influenced each other from the late 1800s to the contemporary approaches. Then, the second chapter of the theoretical part will introduce relevant didactic procedures. It will define the primary aim of teaching pronunciation and how to incorporate pronunciation into English lessons. Furthermore, it introduces possible techniques, tools, and technology that can be exploited in English lessons to teach pronunciation.

The practical part will first introduce the aim of this thesis, which is to find out teachers' approaches to teaching pronunciation at upper-secondary schools. Then, it will review the ethics of research that were taken into consideration. Next, it will introduce the chosen research method, interview questions, and the research sample with the data recording procedure. Then, the data analysis process is described from the coding to determining the main categories - or main chapters - which outline the data interpretation, which is then presented. Finally, at the end of the theoretical part is a summary and final discussion of the analysed data.

THEORETICAL PART

1 The Scope of Pronunciation Teaching Approaches

The first chapter analyses the most significant approaches and methods associated with pronunciation teaching, namely Direct Method, Reform Movement, Audiolingual and Oral Method, The Silent Way, and Community Language Learning. According to Harmer (2015, 64), their influence in language teaching is still recognised today, despite their age, perhaps surprisingly, he admits. Further, it introduces the Communicative Language Teaching. Lastly, it describes the “two general approaches to the teaching of pronunciation: Intuitive-Imitative Approaches and Analytic-Linguistic Approaches” (Celce-Murcia 2010, 2) and the difference between them.

Before the approaches are introduced in more detail, it is essential to distinguish the terms approach and method. Scrivener (2011, 31) says: “A method is a way of teaching. Your choice of method is dependent on your approach, i.e., what you believe about what language is, how people learn, how teaching helps people learn.” Harmer (2015, 54) goes more into detail with his definitions. He defines an approach as a term referring to:

Theories about the nature of language and language learning. These provide the reasons for doing things in the classroom and the reasons for the way they are done. An approach describes how language is used and how its constituent parts interlock – it offers a model of language competence. An approach also describes how people acquire their knowledge of the language and makes statements about the conditions which will promote successful language learning.

A method is the practical realization of an approach, decisions that bring a particular approach to life, too (Harmer 2015, 54). It is achieved with the help of relevant tools, techniques, and technology. Ur (2012, 7) does not use the term *method*. Instead, she uses a *methodology*, still, her definition of methodology is synonymous with the previous definitions of the method. In her words, “a methodology is a collection of teaching procedures that accord with and apply a particular approach.”

The difference between approach and method from these definitions is more than evident. However, approaches and methods are tightly intertwined, they are commonly introduced together, compared with each other, and even arise from each other. This thesis is therefore no exception, approaches and methods are presented in the first chapter together being defined only at the beginning of this chapter.

1.1 Approaches and Methods throughout the History of Pronunciation Teaching

There were undoubtedly more approaches and methods to teaching pronunciation throughout the history of ELT that influenced the way pronunciation is taught today. The first method, which gained popularity in the late 1800s and early 1900s, is Direct Method (Celce-Murcia 2010, 3). As it is stated by Celce-Murcia et al. (2010, 3), “pronunciation is taught through intuition and imitation; students imitate a model – the teacher or a recording – and do their best to approximate the model through imitation and repetition.” Direct Method further influenced succeeding Krashen and Terrel’s (1983) Natural Approach.

Pronunciation teaching went through significant change in the 1890s with the Reform Movement, during which the International Phonetic Association was formed. More importantly, this association invented the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA). In Celce-Murcia et al. (2010, 3) words “a phonetic alphabet made it possible to represent the sounds of any language visually and accurately because, for the first time, there was a consistent one-to-one relationship between a written symbol and the sound it represented.” Together with other charts of English consonants and vowels, the phonetic alphabet became a valuable tool for teachers of English to teach and understand how to produce the consonants and vowels, since the English language does not have a strict sound-to-spelling correspondence (Celce-Murcia et al. 2014, 140-141).

Influenced by the previous approaches, Audiolingual and Oral Approach emerged in the 1940s and 1950s. Similarly to Direct Method, students are expected to imitate or repeat the teacher or a recording, but with the teacher’s use of a transcription system or other articulatory chart (Celce-Murcia et al. 2010, 4). Richards and Rodgers (2014, 71) describe that in a typical audiolingual lesson a teacher pays attention to pronunciation, intonation, and fluency. Mistakes are corrected directly and immediately. The activities are performed in chorus and/or individually. Additionally, Celce-Murcia et al. (2010, 4) give an example of a minimal-pair drill, or minimal pairs, a technique often used by audiolingual teachers. However, Harmer (2015, 57) explains that “much audiolingual teaching stayed at the sentence level, and there was little placing of language in any kind of real-life context,” therefore this drill-focused approach, in his opinion, lacks meaningfulness and mindfulness.

The next approach discussed is The Silent Way, which came to attention in the 1970s. The name suggests that the teacher endeavours to speak as little as possible (Celce-Murcia et al. 2010, 6). Cael (2010, 11-12) explains that the focus is primarily on a learner’s independence,

responsibility, and autonomy. However, that does not mean that teachers lose their role in the learning process, he instead acquires different roles than those in the previous approaches. Among the roles, Cael (2010, 11-13) includes:

setting up a classroom climate where students can learn for themselves, presenting the language in the form of an accessible challenge and then watching and listening to what students do with it, and using the information gained from alertly observing the students at work and from listening to their feedback to decide whether to increase or decrease the level of the next language learning challenge.

He then adds that a teacher is supposed to “help students stay on track without interfering with their learning” and “study the language and know how to make a clear presentation of its essential features, such as the melody, the behaviour or grammatical structures, and the functional vocabulary.” Concerning pronunciation, according to Cael (2010, 14) they can represent more suprasegmental aspects of a sentence, or more specifically, according to Celce Murcia et al. (2010, 7) they can imitate the intonation patterns. Cael (2010, 14) also includes word charts and pointer among the tools. In conclusion, Richards and Rodgers (2014, 291-292) claim that, generally speaking, “these visual devices serve as associative mediators for student learning and recall.”

The last approach this thesis analyses is Community Language Learning (CLL), which emerged in the 1970s. The basis of this approach, as introduced by Richards and Rodgers (2014, 303), is the relation between a teacher, a counsellor, or “a knower” (Harmer 2015, 64) and a learner (a client, a student). In this relationship, the teacher is the one who stands behind the students, asks them to say something in the first language (L1), provides a translation, and helps students to reflect on their sentences in the second language (L2) (Celce-Murcia et al. 2010, 7-8). To be able to reflect students’ pronunciation, Celce-Murcia et al. (2010, 7) mention a tape recorder (or other recording devices), in their belief, a key tool used in CLL. Students record their sentences once they can present them fluently. In addition, Celce-Murcia et al. (2010, 8) introduce the next possible phase that could follow the translating and recording one. It consists of writing transcription of the sentences on a board, replaying the recordings, and matching them to the transcriptions. Afterward, the teacher encourages further pronunciation practice. Harmer (2015, 64) mentions that students also reflect their feelings about the activities, which is in agreement with Richards and Rodgers’s (2014, 304) statement that CLL as a humanistic approach includes emotions and feelings (touches the affective realm of learning).

1.2 Communicative Language Teaching and Communicative Competence

During the development of English Language Teaching (ELT), in the 1980s, a novel approach emerged. The idea behind it was that language primarily serves for communication (Celce-Murcia et al. 2010, 8), or, similarly, that language is the main mean of communication (Richards and Rodgers 2014, 87), therefore it should be the primary focus in every language teaching classroom (Celce-Murcia et al. 2010, 8). Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), or Communicative Approach, is nowadays the dominant approach in language teaching and its primary aim is to develop “communicative competence” which is defined by Hymes (1972, quoted in Richards and Rodgers 2014, 88) as “what a speaker needs to know in order to be communicatively competent in a speech community” and what person acquires is “both knowledge and ability for language use.” One of the critical works on the analysis of communicative competence Richards and Rodgers (2014, 89) mention is that from Canale and Swain (1980) in which four dimensions of communicative competence are presented; grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic competence. However, because the curricular documents in the Czech Republic, more specifically the foreign language section, are created with the use of *The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR)*, the Communicative language competences model introduced in CEFR is the primary model addressed when connecting pronunciation to communicative competence in this thesis.

As the Council of Europe (2020, 129) explains in the CEFR, the Communicative language competences model was influenced by many different competence models developed in applied linguistics, such as Canale and Swain’s (1980), Widdowson (1983), or Bachman and Palmer’s (1996). Although they are organised differently, they share the exact four dimensions as in Canale and Swain (1980). However, there is a difference between the models and the one in the CEFR, in which aspects of communicative competence are divided into only three dimensions; linguistic, sociolinguistic, and pragmatic competence. For this thesis, the most important one is linguistic competence, since one of the aspects included there is phonological control. The Council of Europe (2020, 129) further suggests that “these aspects, or parameters of description, are always intertwined in any language; they are not separate ‘components’ and cannot be isolated from each other.” In the redevelopment of the phonological scale Council of Europe (2020, 129) determined core areas of pronunciation, which include articulation, prosody, intonation, rhythm, word and sentence stress, speech chunking, accentedness, intelligibility, accessibility of meaning for interlocutors, and comprehensibility. These areas were then

organised into three categories; overall phonological control, sound articulation, and prosodic features (intonation, stress, and rhythm).

At the beginning of the CLT era the importance of pronunciation teaching was challenged, Levis and Sonsaat (2017, 1) even suggest its decline. Their research shows that it could have been due to the belief that pronunciation teaching was incompatible with CLT, and that “almost no one knew what it would be like to teach pronunciation communicatively.” However, Celce-Murcia et al. (2010, 8) see an urgent need for pronunciation teaching with a communicative approach. They explain that there exists a certain “threshold level of pronunciation for non-native speakers of English,” she then continues by indicating that if a speaker fails to reach the threshold level, he will have problems in communication despite perfect control of English vocabulary or grammar. Levis and Sonsaat (2017, 6) explain this crucial shift of perception on pronunciation as a part of CLT. What caused this change is, in their opinion, a transition from native-like pronunciation to intelligibility being the main aim of pronunciation teaching. They associate it with the prioritisation of suprasegmental features (stress, rhythm, and intonation) as they were seen as crucial components of communication. For complementation, Celce-Murcia et al. (2010, 11) specifies that “pronunciation instruction is moving away from the segmental/suprasegmental debate and towards more balanced view,” which admits that the inability to distinguish suprasegmentals and sounds carrying a functional load can lead to miscomprehension of non-native speakers.

1.3 Intuitive-Imitative Approach

According to Celce-Murcia et al. (2010, 2), during the development of modern language teaching two general approaches to pronunciation teaching were formed. The first one discussed is an Intuitive-Imitative Approach. As Celce-Murcia et al. (2010, 2) describe it, this approach “depends on the learner’s ability to listen to and imitate the rhythms and sounds of the target language without the intervention of any explicit information.” The presupposition for this approach is that there is always a good model available to listen to. As a result of evolving technology, there are more options to choose from now, Roohani (2013, 92) mentions audiotapes, videos, computer-based programs, and websites used to implement this approach. His study, where he compares the intuitive-imitative approach and analytic-linguistic approach in relation to the learner’s age, indicates that the intuitive-imitative approach may be more beneficial to younger participants (13-16 years old).

1.4 Analytic-Linguistic Approach

The second general approach to pronunciation teaching is an Analytic-Linguistic Approach. It did not replace the previous approach, on the contrary, it complemented it, explains Celce-Murcia et al. (2010, 2). According to them, the analytic-linguistic approach uses tools and aids to supplement listening, imitation, and production, explicitly informing the learner of the sounds and rhythms. Among the tools, Celce-Murcia et al. (2010, 2) mention articulatory descriptions, charts of the vocal apparatus, contrastive information, and the phonetic alphabet, which is discussed further in this chapter. In Roohani's (2013, 92) comparison study, he indicates that this approach may be more effective for older participants (17-20 years old).

2 Teaching English Pronunciation in a Classroom

Now, that the scope of pronunciation teaching approaches has been discussed, this thesis is moving on to the second chapter which introduces pronunciation in the classroom. Specifically, the main aim, the setting of teaching pronunciation, when to incorporate pronunciation teaching in the lesson, techniques, tools, and technology that is used for pronunciation teaching, and lastly, it connects the teaching of pronunciation to the context of upper-secondary schools in the Czech Republic.

2.1 The Aim and Setting of Teaching Pronunciation

The first chapter of this thesis mentioned that during the CLT era, pronunciation teaching underwent a crucial perception shift. Specifically, shift in the aim of pronunciation teaching from a native-like accent to being intelligible. Harmer (2015, 277) explains why the students' native-like pronunciation aim might be an issue. He says there are countless varieties of English, and it is more probable for a learner to encounter speakers of English as a foreign language than native speakers with a specific accent. Therefore, having a specific accent becomes redundant. That is why he thinks "the most important thing about the way we speak English is that we should be intelligible - that is, that we should be understood by other speakers of English, whoever they are."

However, that does not mean that the students who want to sound like native speakers, and it is their aim, are wrong. Ur (2012, 128) agrees that students do not need to sound like a native-like speakers, however, her argument for the idea is different from Harmer's. She suggests that it is standard for some native speakers to be less comprehensible because of their heavy accents. Harmer's argument is supported by Scrivener (2011, 273), who thinks that "students need to learn pronunciation that will allow them to be understood in the contexts where they are most likely to need to use the language." As for the teachers, he believes that teachers should teach the pronunciation they speak themselves since it is challenging to teach an accent that is not natural for them to use (2011, 273).

In addition, there is another side to intelligibility. In Celce-Murcia et al. (2010, 274) opinion, "intelligibility does not refer to a complete lack of accent but rather an accent (which we all have no matter which variety of English we speak) that does not distract the listener." By stating that, they point out that it is interactional between the speaker and listener; therefore, the weight of intelligibility is not entirely on the speaker and depends on the listener and context, too. It may also be interesting to note, as Murphy (2014, 261) does, "that accent is a partially

independent construct since a single non-native English speaker can simultaneously be accented and reasonably or even completely intelligible and/or comprehensible. On the other hand, L2 speakers who struggle with intelligibility and comprehensibility will always be rated by L1 speakers as heavily accented.” In sum, being intelligible is not synonymous with being accent-free (Celce-Murcia 2014, 143). Celce-Murcia (2014, 144) contributes to the discussion by outlining possible aspects that may influence lack of intelligibility. These are misplaced or missing prominence, incorrect word stress, creating unnatural speech rhythm by not differing stressed and unstressed syllables, speaking too slow or fast, too many or too long pauses, little variation in pitch, and unclearly articulating consonants. She suggests that teachers should focus mainly on suprasegmentals, but they should also include segmental features since it may increase learners’ ability to self-correction.

Scrivener and Murcia implied the importance of context in which teachers teach pronunciation and in which students speak. By context it is meant the setting, whether teachers teach English as a Second Language (ESL), English as a Foreign Language (EFL), or English as an International Language (EIL), also known as English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) (Celce-Murcia et al. 2010, 277). Celce-Murcia et al. (2010, 277) suggest that in the first setting, the learners are exposed to English daily since it is the country’s primary language. Usually, they are immigrants who moved to English-speaking countries or students who study there temporarily and commonly do not share the same L1. In most cases, the teacher is a native speaker who often lacks knowledge about learners’ L1. This setting is not the case in the Czech educational system since the majority of learners speak Czech as their L1.

In the second setting, EFL, English is not the official language of the learners’ country, they do not use the language to communicate with each other, and usually, they share the same L1. An EFL teacher is a highly competent L2 speaker rather than a native speaker who speaks the same L1 as the learners; therefore, he is highly knowledgeable of the L1 and experienced with L2 acquisition (Celce-Murcia et al. 2010, 278). Concerning pronunciation, Walker (2001, 13) concludes:

By viewing English as a tool for international intelligibility, we establish a new perspective on pronunciation goals, with priorities that are both fewer in number and more realistic than those previously set. For monolingual groups the learner’s first language is a vital tool in achieving these new goals, and the bilingual non-native speaker teacher is an ideal instructor.

Harmer (2015, 4) comments on the distinction between ESL and EFL, saying that nowadays, it is challenging to tell in which setting a learner learns because ESL speakers may use English to

speak to other ESL speakers instead of a native speaker. He argues that “in a world where English is, ..., so widely used maybe everyone is an ESL student!” Since English is not the official language in the Czech Republic and learners mostly speak Czech to communicate with each other; it should be safe to say that EFL is the setting for teaching English in the Czech educational system.

The last setting is ELF. Jenkins (2012, 487) describes it as English that is used as “a means of communication between people who come from different language backgrounds ... not a language variety in the traditional sense of the term.” Different but similar words to describe this setting use Celce-Murcia et al. (2010, 278) by stating that “in this context, English functions as the medium of communication between speakers who do not share the same L1.” According to Deterding and Lewis (2019, 3), pronunciation in this setting is vital. However, not all aspects are as important as others, therefore, teachers should not insist on students learning all details of a native-like accent, in Deterding and Lewis’s (2019, 2) opinion, it is even inappropriate for ELF students to mimic native-like accents, and it should not be their primary objective. Instead, the teachers should focus on the features necessary for clear speech. Celce-Murcia et al. (2010, 282) agree with this approach because, in their words, it is not possible to teach everything in one pronunciation course. Instead, features essential for intelligible pronunciation that enable teachers and students to focus on more manageable aims should be prioritized. For these features, the term *common core* is used. Jenkins (2000) created a list of these priorities called Lingua Franca Core, where she found five features crucial for international intelligibility for ELF learners. The features are consonants except for /θ/ and /ð/, prominence, tense-lax vowel distinctions, consonant cluster features, and certain positional variation features (Celce-Murcia 2010, 283). In the context of the Czech educational system, although the students usually do not interact with speakers of different language backgrounds in the classroom, it is probable for them to use English in this setting outside the classroom. To support this statement, Deterding and Lewis (2019, 2) claim in their research that “speakers of English as lingua franca (ELF) in places such as Africa, Asia, and Continental Europe far outnumber so-called ‘native’ speakers of English.” Therefore, the features of ELF for teaching pronunciation apply to Czech students as well.

2.2 When to Teach Pronunciation?

The question of when to teach pronunciation could be interpreted in more ways. The first perspective is pronunciation as an individual slot in a lesson. In that case, teachers must decide when to include it in their lesson plan. The second perspective is that pronunciation is integrated

with other language areas. Most researched sources for this thesis deal with the second perspective, only a few of them deal with teaching pronunciation as a separate slot in the lesson. One example of the representative of integrated pronunciation is Celce-Murcia et al. (2010, 282). They state, “ideally, the most effective way of teaching pronunciation is to integrate it with skills such as listening, speaking, or grammar,” In their book, Pennington and Rogerson-Revell (2019, 181) support this idea of integrating pronunciation, and they think that the reason for it is that teachers should be as resourceful as possible given the instructional time and content. To further advocate the importance of integrating pronunciation into other language areas, they say:

Integrating pronunciation teaching into other areas of language learning is a way of reminding learners of its broader significance. It is worth spending some time conveying this awareness and concern for pronunciation to learners as early as possible in the learning process. (2019, 186)

Speaking and listening are the first two skills with which pronunciation can be introduced. However, in Marks’ opinion, “every lesson includes speaking and listening, so every lesson is a pronunciation lesson.” Pennington and Rogerson-Revell (2019, 182) think that students’ listening comprehension increases through pronunciation instruction. For example, they can better distinguish minimal pairs, phonological reduction, or stress placement in words and sentences. There is a wide variety of activities for listening and speaking, and one of them introduces Harmer (2015, 282). When students listen to a recording, a teacher can draw attention to pronunciation aspects appearing on the tape. More creative activities introduce Pennington and Rogers-Revell (2019, 183), including creating and performing news commentaries, student-to-student dictations, and recording and writing answerphone messages. An interesting view was brought to the discussion by Levis and Grant (2003, 14), who think that “Teaching pronunciation in the context of speaking also means that features that are targeted should be those that arise naturally from the speaking activity and contribute to the success of the interaction.” For them, it is frequently not the case for pronunciation instruction.

Pronunciation can also be integrated into other areas of language, such as grammar and vocabulary. Pennington and Rogers-Revell (2019, 183-184) point out several times that integrating these skills with pronunciation may positively affect students’ perception and production of pronunciation features in communication. In fact, Parker (2000, 24) supports the importance of communicative activities for building automaticity and carryover by sharing her experience that after practicing the /th/ sound in minimal pairs, her students still left with “See you next time. Sank you.” However, she does not deny the importance of structured drills. In

her paper, she gives two examples of how pronunciation and grammar can be taught together; through song and video, students practice intonation of connected speech and linking together with the usage of prepositions and phrasal verbs.

Nonetheless, these are not the only aspects students can practice. For example, Pennington and Rogers-Revell (2019, 184) indicate the importance of the distinction between stressed and unstressed syllables in noun/verb homographs, e.g., object, project, overlap, and variable stress placement and phoneme changes in words formed from the same root, e.g., pronounce/pronunciation, resign/resignation, or explain/explanation. Making students aware of these occurrences, Pennington and Rogers-Revell (2019, 184) believe that it will help students to perceive and produce them in speech. Still, Celce-Murcia et al. (2010, 415-416) feel there is a lack of integration between pronunciation and grammar. They believe it deserves more attention from teachers and textbook writers, even though students receive extensive grammar instruction, such as past tense, possessives, or plurals.

To combine pronunciation and vocabulary, Nicolaidis and Mattheoudakis (2012) proposed the PRO-VOC method. "The method exploits the principle of categorisation by organising new vocabulary according to some aspect of the phonological form of the word, i.e., a sound (vowel or consonant) or other feature such as stress pattern. Thus, categorisation can vary according to the pronunciation focus selected by the teacher; both segmental and suprasegmental features can be categorised." (Nicolaidis and Mattheoudakis 2012, 307). In addition, Celce-Murcia et al. (2010, 419) do not discuss vocabulary directly, instead, they deal with related spelling. They think it is meaningful to integrate pronunciation and spelling "so that they (teachers) can teach their learners how to predict the pronunciation of a word given its spelling and how to come up with a plausible spelling for a word given its pronunciation." (2010, 419)

At the beginning of the subchapter, it was said that pronunciation could be presented as an individual slot in the lesson. Harmer (2015, 281-282) shortly deals with this option by naming possibilities of when to teach pronunciation. The first one is teaching pronunciation as the whole lesson. He gives examples of pronunciation features suitable for this format: connected speech, stress, or intonation. Even though the focus is pronunciation, Harmer (2015, 281) admits that other language areas could be integrated, such as listening and vocabulary, to prevent monotony. The next option is discrete slots. Over weeks teachers introduce pronunciation features either separately or in contrasting pairs. Harmer (2015, 281) explains that these slots are usually enjoyed and valuable since they bring welcomed change to the lesson. Nevertheless, he acknowledges that pronunciation is not a separate skill; therefore,

pronunciation should be integrated into longer sequences. Apart from the integrated phases discussed earlier, the last option is opportunistic teaching. It means that pronunciation is dealt with when it ‘comes up.’ Depending on during which activity the issue arose, it could be beneficial to spend a minute on pronunciation or contra-productive because it could interrupt the fluency of the activity.

Although these options are presented separately, Harmer (2015, 282) states that many teachers teach pronunciation in a mixture of these options.

2.3 Techniques, Tools and Technology Used to teach English Pronunciation

So far, this thesis covered the main aim of teaching pronunciation and when to introduce it in the lesson. Now, it discusses techniques, tools, and technology that may help put teachers approaches to teaching pronunciation into practice.

2.3.1 Techniques

There are many techniques teachers can choose from, depending on their approaches to teaching pronunciation. Some techniques may be called traditional because they are used more than those recently developed. For example, Celce-Murcia et al. (2014, 146) include imitation, articulatory explanations, minimal pair exercises, and reading-aloud activities among the traditional ones. These techniques are frequently mentioned in pronunciation-related sources but may sometimes differ in name. For instance, Kelly (2001, 16) uses the term *drilling* synonymously with *imitation*, used by Celce-Murcia et al. (2014, 146), meaning students repeat after a teacher or audio. In addition, Celce-Murcia et al. (2010, 342) mention a specific imitation technique: shadowing, which is brought up also by Pennington and Rogers-Revell (2019, 208). Celce-Murcia et al. describe this technique as “in which learners repeat either along with or slightly after a speaker but do not mirror the speaker’s movements.” In this subchapter, the focus is on the recently developed techniques. For instance, Kelly (2001, 16-17) introduces chaining. In this technique, a sentence is chunked into individual parts, modelled by teachers for students to repeat, and gradually built until the sentence is complete. The next techniques proposed by Celce-Murcia et al. (2010, 335-336) are breathing and relaxation techniques. They are usually performed at the beginning of a lesson to prepare and relax muscles for speaking. Celce-Murcia et al. believe that “breathing and visualisation techniques create a relaxed classroom atmosphere that is conducive to pronunciation learning.” Another technique are drama techniques. They are explained by Celce-Murcia et al. (2014, 147) as short drama scenes. The students get a script and watch the scene. Then, they practice the scene out loud and mark intonation, pauses, and

prominence in their script. After they are finished rehearsing, the students perform the scene in pairs. The scene may be recorded so the students can self-evaluate themselves. This technique may be called a *dramatic imitative approach using video clips*, as by Celce-Murcia et al. (2010, 343). The last technique discussed is kinaesthetic reinforcement. Teachers and students use their body parts, e.g., the head, eyebrows, fingers, or entire body, to indicate rhythm patterns, word stress, intonation, or articulatory position. (Celce-Murcia 2014, 146-147)

2.3.2 Tools

This section introduces tools teachers can find helpful for pronunciation teaching: IPA, songs, games, and poems. These are only representatives of tools that teachers can adapt to teach pronunciation. What teachers have in their toolbox is up to their imagination. The first tool is *IPA*, which can be used in many ways. For example, Scrivener (2011, 276) suggests that students can play phoneme bingo; instead of numbers, teachers say or play individual sounds. He further recommends using IPA for teachers to point out correct sounds when students mispronounce. Harmer (2015, 280-281) supports using phonemic symbols, especially when students work with unknown words in paper dictionaries. However, he admits that working on students' pronunciation is possible without ever using IPA since most online dictionaries have available audio recordings.

Songs are the next tool presented. In their research, Farmand and Pourgharib (2013, 844) concluded that using songs to teach pronunciation leads to improving the pronunciation of words in the song. Furthermore, it increases students' motivation and willingness to speak, enjoyment of the lesson, and spontaneous dialogue in English. Parker (2000, 26-27) supports the usage of songs, saying that "songs in general are well suited to work on recognising and practicing stress and reduction. The songs individual instructors choose will depend on which features they wish to practice."

The third tool discussed is games. Here comes teachers' imagination to turn a desk game into a pronunciation game. One example of a game given by Celce-Murcia et al. (2010, 346) is called Values Topics. Students roll dice, move their figures, and answer the question written in the field where the figure stopped. Another example is dominoes, which can be focused on various pronunciation features; vowel sounds, rhythm, or word stress (Celce-Murcia 2010, 349).

The last tool mentioned is poems, often with strong stressed and unstressed syllables patterns. According to Celce-Murcia et al. (2014, 148), poems help students hear the rhythm of English.

2.3.3 Technology

The last section of this subchapter introduces technology that can be used in pronunciation instruction. Authors such as Pennington and Rogers-Revell (2019, 235), Celce-Murcia et al. (2014, 149), and Pennington and Rogers-Revell (2019, 235) feel that the field of Computer-Assisted Pronunciation Training (CAPT) is developing rapidly, and that interest in using technology is increasing. Similarly to tools, there is more known and utilised technology, such as audio or video recordings, yet, still essential (Celce-Murcia et al. 2014, 148). However, new technology for pronunciation teaching and learning that can improve students' pronunciation is constantly developing, and teachers may not even know about it. In Yoshida's (2018, 209) opinion, technology is a valuable tool for teaching pronunciation. This opinion is supported by Pennington and Rogers-Revell (2019, 250), who say that "within an increasingly globalised, multilingual world, knowing how to use these technologies and resources to learn languages is important for learners as well as teachers." Pennington further justifies technology by claiming that "students are generally eager to learn with technology."

Nevertheless, it does not replace teachers or traditional methods. Pennington (2021, 7) admits certain limitations of technology: "much of the available technology continues to suffer from problems and limitations that impact its value for teaching and learning pronunciation, especially in the areas of feedback and non-segmental features..." In Yoshida's (2018, 209) work, she advises teachers: "your best route is to choose the tools that work the best for you and your students, not necessarily those that seem newest, coolest, or flashiest. Try not to get too attached to a particular website or app; it might disappear or stop working."

Particular importance is seen by Pennington (2021, 7) in technology for online learning, individualised study, and portable electronics, especially smartphones. These can be categorised into those that provide a pronunciation model, record students, and respond to students' practice. Among the providing model technology, Yoshida (2018, 197-199) includes websites and apps such as Sounds of Speech, The Phonetics, or YouGlish. Concerning technology recording students, in Yoshida's (2018, 201) opinion, teachers often use it for students' self-evaluation or for teachers to give students feedback. Yoshida (2018, 201-202) puts Adobe Spark, Voki, or Puppet Pals in this category. Lastly, students can get feedback directly from apps or websites like Schoology and VoiceThread. Besides this, Pennington and Rogers-Revell (2018, 251-252) suggest a technology that functions for conversation exchange: chatbots and conversational agents called 'Talking Heads'.

2.4 Teaching Pronunciation in Upper-Secondary Education

Since this thesis focuses on teachers who teach at upper-secondary schools and their approaches to teaching pronunciation, it is essential to define what upper-secondary schools mean in the context of the Czech educational system. For this purpose, the International Standard Classification of Education 2011 (ISCED) was used. Even though a Czech version (CZ-ISCED) also exists, it is a translation of the original standard. Therefore, the original standard is cited to avoid double translation.

An upper-secondary education is a level three in the ISCED. Main and subsidiary criteria must be met to classify a program as upper-secondary. The main criteria are: Programmes are either general or vocational, and some allow direct access to ISCED level 4, 5, 6, and/or 7. To enter ISCED 3, a student has to complete the lower secondary education or be able to handle ISCED 3 thanks to prior education and life and work experiences. Students begin upper-secondary education after 8 to 11 years since the beginning of ISCED level 1 (in the Czech Republic, it is typically after nine years) at ages 14 to 16. Exit from upper secondary education varies across education systems from 11 to 13 years since the beginning of ISCED level 1. The subsidiary criteria are: ISCED level 3 offers more varied, specialised, in-depth instruction, and the programmes are more differentiated with a broader range of options and streams available. The teachers may be more qualified in the subject they teach in addition to pedagogical training. Upper secondary education may be called in many ways, such as secondary school, senior secondary school, or (senior) high school. (UNESCO 2012, 38-39)

Because the language level students are expected to master at the end of upper-secondary education is determined in the *Rámcový vzdělávací program (RVP)* by CEFR, it is relevant to determine with the help of these documents what level of phonological control the students are expected to achieve, more specifically, what this level includes. As mentioned, upper-secondary schools are either general or vocational, meaning there are separate RVPs for each type of school. For example, the Czech Republic has RVPs for grammar schools and RVPs for secondary vocational education. In these documents, the English language is usually introduced under the subsection Foreign language, where the expected outcome level of the language is specified: “Education in the field of Foreign language builds on the level of language knowledge and communication skills, corresponding to level A2 according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, which the student acquired in previous education, and aims to achieve level B2 according to this framework” (MŠMT 2007, 13). However, the outcome level varies from general to vocational education due to time dotation

for foreign languages. Since the teachers who participated in the research for the practical part were all from grammar schools, this thesis will further focus on the comparison between RVP for grammar schools (RVP G), where the aim is level B2, and CEFR and parts relevant to pronunciation.

Pronunciation is mentioned several times in the Foreign Language subsection. First, one of the expected outcomes for productive language skills is that the student should “formulate his/her opinion in such a way that he/she is understood, using correct grammar, spontaneously and coherently.” In addition, the student should “receive information of a rather complex content ... and be able to convey it in such a way that he/she is understood...” (MŠMT 2007, 17) Meaning that in these situations, the student should be intelligible. The next expected outcome involving pronunciation is for interactive language skills. The student should “communicate fluently on abstract as well as specific topics in less common or specialised situations, respecting the rules of pronunciation.” The last mention of pronunciation in RVP G is in Subject Matter, where pronunciation is incorporated into language means and functions. It includes the phonetic structure of a word, the phonetic aspect of a sentence, phonetic reduction, and phonetic features (MŠMT 2007, 17). Nonetheless, the expected outcome for pronunciation at the B2 level is not further specified. Therefore, CEFR is used to help with the specification.

The description of phonological control in CEFR is divided into three categories: overall phonological control, sound articulation, and prosodic features. The Council of Europe (2020, 134) defines overall phonological control at the B2 level as follows: students “can generally use appropriate intonation, place stress correctly and articulate individual sounds clearly; accent tends to be influenced by the other language(s) they speak but has little or no effect on intelligibility.” They then follow with the sound articulation description, saying that students “can articulate a high proportion of the sounds in the target language clearly in extended stretches of production; is intelligible throughout, despite a few systematic mispronunciations. Can generalise from their repertoire to predict the phonological features of most unfamiliar words (e.g. word stress) with reasonable accuracy (e.g. while reading)” (The Council of Europe 2020, 134). The last description for the B2 level is of prosodic features, stating that students “Can employ prosodic features (e.g. stress, intonation, rhythm) to support the message they intend to convey, though with some influence from the other languages they speak” (The Council of Europe 2020, 134).

Having established the theoretical background of teaching pronunciation by covering the historical and contemporary approaches to teaching pronunciation, defining the main aim and setting, describing possibilities of when to introduce pronunciation in the lesson, comparing techniques, tools, and technology that can be used to teach English pronunciation, and placing teaching pronunciation into upper-secondary education, this thesis is moving into the practical part, where the research on teacher's approaches to teaching pronunciation is introduced.

PRACTICAL PART

3 The Research

3.1 Introduction to the Research

In the practical part of this thesis, essential approaches, and methods to teaching pronunciation, followed by the introduction of teaching pronunciation in a classroom, were introduced to set the theoretical base for the research. Initially, the research was supposed to focus on using IPA in teaching pronunciation. However, due to the nature of the found and studied sources, in which the reference to the usage of IPA was insufficient, it was decided to extend the topic to approaches to teaching pronunciation, and IPA is discussed as a part of teaching tools.

The research aims to find out what are the teachers' approaches to teaching English pronunciation at Czech upper-secondary schools. Qualitative research was chosen to answer this question because, according to Skutil et al. (2011, 70), qualitative research determines how people act in a particular environment, why they act the way they do, and how they organise their daily activities and interactions. For this thesis, a semi-structured interview, which is examined in detail later in the theoretical part, was chosen as a research method.

3.2 Ethics in the Research

As in any research, certain ethical principles were respected throughout the phases of this research: when designing the research, during the realisation of the research, and when publishing the research. The first question was to preserve the anonymity of the participants. Skutil et al. (2011, 26) state that it is necessary to preserve anonymity, however, in solid research, the researcher should provide specific characterizations of the researched subjects, such as age, teaching experiences, subjects teachers teach, or type of school. They admit that balancing those two sides is often tricky. Since this thesis focuses on English teachers at upper secondary schools, the taught subject and type of school are therefore given. Any other information, for example, school name and location or teachers' names, are omitted. The only exception is when teachers agree to be named (Skutil et al. 2011, 27). Individual teachers were randomly assigned numbers for this thesis. Thus, they are referred to, for example, Teacher 1.

The next issue in the preparation phase is informed consent. Skutil et al. (2011, 27) explain that informed consent has two dimensions; the participants must agree to participate in the research voluntarily, and they have been informed about what is the aim of the research, what are its objectives, and the use of the results, e.g., for the practical part of the bachelor thesis. All

participants were informed about these matters and asked either to sign the informed consent, or to agree verbally at the beginning of the recording of the interview since half of the interviews were online through Microsoft Teams. For the template without any signature, see appendix 1.

In the realization phase, one of the risky situations where ethics could be vandalized, Skutil et al. (2011, 30) present, is the researcher's representation. It is a situation when the researchers do not carry out a particular phase of research. Instead, they are represented by another person; a student, friend, or family member. Being represented by someone else increases the risk of vandalizing research ethics due to an unprepared representative. Fortunately, I could conduct the one-on-one interviews myself and ensure that the research ethics were followed.

The last phase is during the writing and publishing of the research (thesis). Most of all, authors must ensure that all ideas taken up by other authors are correctly cited or paraphrased (Skutil et al. 2011, 32-33). That is confirmed by signing the author's statement at the beginning of the thesis.

3.3 Data collection

The next phase of the research is collecting the data. This subchapter includes deciding the research method, creating questions related to the research aim, planning a data recording procedure, and selecting participants.

3.3.1 Research method and Interview Questions

Originally, questionnaires were supposed to be the method for data collection. However, due to the nature of the research aim, which is finding out teachers' approaches, it was decided to collect data through interviews since Gavora (2000, 110) says that "interview is a research method that enables not only to capture the facts but also to delve deeper into the motives and attitudes of respondents." He then adds that an interview is preferred in case there is a high possibility of a low return on the questionnaire, which was the case in this research. For this reason, an interview seemed more fitting since a smaller sample is needed to collect the data (Gillham 2000, 10). There are more reasons to use an interview for this research. In his book, Gillham (2000, 11) provides a table of negative and positive aspects of interviewing, where he thinks that interview is appropriate, necessary, or possible when there is a small number of people involved, people are accessible, questions require an extended answer, everyone is 'key' and losing any is not affordable, and research aims to require insight and understanding.

Next, it was necessary to decide which type of interview was appropriate. Gavora (2000, 111) states that there are three types of interviews: structured, unstructured, and semi-structured. He

describes that in structured interviews, the questions and alternative answers are strictly given. Thus, it is rather an oral questionnaire. Next, Gavora (2000, 111) describes that there is freedom of answers in the unstructured interview, which often leads to unexpected information. On the other hand, it is difficult to evaluate the data. The last type of interview is semi-structured. According to Gavora (2000, 111), the semi-structured interview is a compromise between the previous two types. Respondents are given alternative answers, but the interviewer then asks them to clarify them. Additionally, Skutil et al. (2011, 91) claim that in the semi-structured interview, the interviewer reacts to what has been said by the respondent and, therefore, does not strictly follow the prepared scheme. For those reasons, I have chosen to prepare the semi-structured interview, so there would be room for additional questions that come up to my mind in any situation.

The next step was to create the interview questions. Possible questions related to the topic appeared during the initial phase of the research – reading up the sources. Gilham (2000, 20) advises: “You will also find, as your grasp on your research project progresses, that you can *prioritize* topics you want to ask about - this is important whatever technique you use, but especially for semi-structured interviews.” Therefore, the questions were prioritized and narrowed down. In addition, particular criteria presented by Skutil et al. (2011, 91-92) were regarded when creating the questions. The criteria include leading questions that researchers should ask themselves. The questions are: Is the question related to the research aim? Is the question correct and appropriate? Is the question straightforward and non-ambiguous? Isn't the question misleading? Does the question require knowledge the respondent might not have? Is the question personal or sensitive so the respondent will hesitate to answer it? (Skutil 2011, 91). After, the interview questions were sent to the supervisor for approval. Finally, the interview questions were finalized and ready to be applied.

1. The interview questions are: How important do you think it is to involve teaching pronunciation in your lessons?
2. What is, in your opinion, the main aim of Teaching pronunciation?
3. When do you teach pronunciation to your students? Is it a whole lesson, separate slots, when it comes up, or do you integrate it with other skills and sub-skills (listening, speaking, grammar, vocabulary)? If you don't, why not?
4. What techniques do you use to teach pronunciation?
5. Do you use any tools to teach pronunciation? Vowel and consonant charts, IPA, recordings, songs, games
6. Do you see any potential in Using IPA to teach English pronunciation? Why/Why not?

7. What about technology? Is there any that you use to teach pronunciation?
8. Is there anything you would like to do differently when it comes to pronunciation teaching?
9. Is there anything else you think is important that we haven't yet talked about?

3.3.2 Selection of Participants and Data Recording Procedure

After selecting the method and the interview questions were created, it was time to select and contact the respondents. According to Punch and Oancea (2014, 210), “Qualitative research would rarely use probability sampling, but rather some sort of deliberate sampling - ‘purposive sampling’ is the term often used. It means sampling in a deliberate way, with some purpose of focus in mind.” Similarly, Skutil et al. contend that the selection of participants “must be intentional (always correspond to the aim of the research), gradual, and the selection is based on the willingness of participants to participate in research.” Since the thesis focuses on teachers from upper-secondary schools, the range of possibilities has been narrowed down to this group only. On the other hand, in chapter 2.4. it is mentioned that all the participants are from grammar schools. Thus, teachers from vocational upper-secondary schools are not represented in this research.

All of the participants were contacted via their institution's email, which I was able to find on the institution's web pages. In the end, four interviews were carried out. Therefore, to follow the research ethics, their names are omitted. Instead, they are called Teacher 1, Teacher 2, Teacher 3, and Teacher 4. Two out of the four interviews took place online via Microsoft Teams. The rest were face-to-face, one-on-one interviews at the institutions' grounds. All the interviews were conducted in Czech, purely for personal reasons and preferences, and they took 20 to 30 minutes each.

Since I preferred to maintain the interview flow, not interrupting it by writing the responses down and still preserving the data for transcriptions, all respondents were asked if it was possible to record the interview. Fortunately, they all agreed to do so. I asked the respondents for oral informed consent in the two online interviews, considering that written consent was impossible to acquire. Nonetheless, I was prepared for the possibility of non-obtaining consent to record the interview. For this scenario, I followed the advice of Creswell and Creswell (2018, 190), who advise: “Plan to develop and use an interview protocol for asking questions and recording answers during a qualitative interview. Researchers record information from interviews by making notes, by audiotaping, or by videotaping. Even if an interview is taped, we recommend that researchers take notes in the event that recording equipment fails.” I

prepared an interview protocol with enough space for notes from the interview, but using it was unnecessary. Instead, it was used only as a supporting aid to maintain the interview structure and to memorize the interview questions. For the interview protocol, see appendix 2.

3.4 Coding and Categorization

Once the data was collected, it was time for the data analysis. The scheme of the data analysis process from Creswell and Creswell (2018, 193-195) was used as an inspiration for this procedure. The scheme has five steps, however not all of them were strictly followed, because I drew from other sources on qualitative data as well.

As the first step, Creswell and Creswell (2018, 193) mention organizing and preparing the data. That involves “transcribing interviews, optically scanning material, typing up field notes, cataloguing all of the visual material, and sorting and arranging the data into different types depending on the sources of information.” In my case, it was mainly the transcription of the data. Then, the following procedures were blended with the second step Creswell and Creswell (2018, 193) present, which is reading and looking at all the data. According to them, this step provides the researcher with an overall meaning of the data, general ideas mentioned, credibility, and use of the information. Finally, when the data was transcribed and scanned, it was time for the third step, coding.

Punch and Oancea (2014, 225) explain what *coding* means:

What is coding? Codes are tags, names or labels, and coding is therefore the process of putting tags, names or labels against pieces of the data. The pieces may be individual words, or small or large chunks of the data. The point of assigning labels is to attach meaning to the pieces of data, and these labels serve a number of functions.

During the coding process, somewhat expected codes and codes that were surprising appeared. Creswell and Creswell (2018, 195) explain that there are three categories into which the codes can be classified; expected codes, surprising codes, and codes unusual or of conceptual interest. Since the last category did not appear during the coding of my collected data, it is not further discussed. Expected codes are, according to Creswell and Creswell (2018, 195), “code on topics that readers would expect to find, based on the literature and common sense.” Further, they define the surprising codes as “code on findings that are surprising and could not be anticipated before the study begin.”

After the codes were assigned, the gradual categorization was next. Gillham’s (2000, 63-66) content analysis of transcribed interviews helped me with that, especially from the sixth point, where the categorization of codes begins to be discussed. In his words, “the overall purpose of constructing categories is to be able to assign all the ‘substantive statements to them: you don’t

want to throw any of these away - they are going to be the meat of your write-up.” (Gillham 2000, 60). First, all the codes were assigned categories. With each subsequent transcription, there were fewer new categories since the respondents made similar points in some passages. Next, I went through all the categories to see if any of them could be combined or split up, as it is suggested by Gillham (2000, 64). Occasionally, some codes could not be classified into existing categories, indicating that new categories needed to be added. Nevertheless, it was infrequent, and most codes were easily classified.

At the final stage of the categorization, I ended up with four main categories used as headings in the following analysis and interpretation chapter. The categories are:

- Teachers’ general beliefs on pronunciation teaching
- Teaching pronunciation at upper-secondary schools in practice
- Peculiarities of pronunciation teaching at upper-secondary schools
- Teachers’ views of their pronunciation instruction

However, before this thesis moves on to the analysis and interpretation itself, it is essential to mention the subjectivity of the categorization. “Categories are formed in the human brain: they are a product of, and a characteristic of, human intelligence. They are not an objective property of objects: classification of birds, animals, insects, flowers, trees, and shrubs is a major preoccupation of the relevant sciences. They are conventions, no matter how ‘rationally’ based.” (Gillham 2000, 70). This means that the categories I came up with might be completely different if someone else categorized and analysed the same data. I organized the data in the way I found the best, and it is purely subjective.

3.5 Data and Interpretation

For an introduction to the analysis and interpretation of the data, Gillham (2000, 73) explains the similarity of categorization and interpretation regarding human intelligence. He thinks that interpretation, likewise categorization, “is part of the everyday process of living. And by the same token it is not entirely a self-conscious or even a conscious activity. When you are dealing with a wide range of rather complicated information there is a good deal of unconscious work of this kind.” This statement means the data interpretation is also subjective, as categorization is.

As mentioned in the previous subchapter, four categories emerged during the coding and categorization, now functioning equally as main headings or names of chapters. The first chapter contains teachers’ general beliefs on pronunciation teaching. Specifically, the importance of pronunciation in second or foreign language teaching, the main aim of teaching

pronunciation teaching, and how the teachers believe their students learn English pronunciation. The second chapter introduces the teachers' approaches to teaching pronunciation in their practice. This chapter mentions when teachers incorporate pronunciation in their lessons and what techniques, tools, and technology they use for pronunciation instruction. The third chapter deals with particularities of pronunciation teaching at upper-secondary schools, such as the difference between this level and lower education levels. Finally, the last chapter captures the teachers' personal beliefs about their pronunciation teaching and whether they want to improve themselves in this field.

3.5.1 Teachers' general beliefs on pronunciation teaching

This first chapter is divided into sub-chapters which are first discussed separately. The first sub-chapter deals with the importance of pronunciation in second or foreign language teaching. Two of the teachers agreed that pronunciation is an essential part of learning. For example, Teacher 3 mentioned in the interview that "pronunciation is one of the most important parts because they communicate primarily orally. It is true that I correct my students' pronunciation a lot." The second Teacher, Teacher 4, said during the interview, "When we teach and learn a language we teach and learn three things: vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation, which is an integral part. Therefore, I always say to my students that pronunciation is crucial." On the other hand, Teacher 2 thinks that it depends on the level of language, how much pronunciation is involved in the lessons, and that it is essential to pay attention to pronunciation at lower levels, however at a higher level, such as upper-secondary schools, the Teacher 2 thinks that attention should be paid to pronunciation mainly if it is necessary to correct students if there are significant mistakes in pronunciation. Teacher 2 further comments that pronunciation overlaps with other scenes, such as grammar or vocabulary. This fact is discussed in the second chapter of the analysis. Teacher 1 did not make any comment regarding the importance of pronunciation.

The importance of pronunciation is followed by the next subchapter, which discusses the main aim of pronunciation teaching. All four teachers agreed that for them, the main aim of pronunciation teaching should be the students' intelligibility in the context of communication, especially the ELF context. Teachers 2 and 3 mention the importance of the listener as well since it is a necessary receiving end of the communication. Teacher 3 said that "the main aim is certainly to communicate. Quite often, they come across people who are not native speakers, or it is not their first language." This statement is supplemented by teacher 2, who said, "the main aim is to understand the student or speaker so that his pronunciation does not interfere with the listener's understanding of what the speaker wants to say." Teacher 4 is the only one

who mentioned the importance of being intelligible at the word and sentence levels. However, all the teachers think that sounding like a native speaker should not be the aim of the lessons. For instance, Teacher 1 thinks that “pronunciation should follow international standards, not a specific pronunciation model.” Despite all of this, only Teacher 2 admitted that while this should not be the general aim of pronunciation, the student’s personal aim might be to sound like a native speaker and that this is especially encountered in students with a higher level of language. There is one more aspect of the aim on which Teachers 2 and 3 agree: Students should work on eliminating the influence of their native language so that they are not recognized they are Czechs or, as Teacher 2 called it, “so that they do not sound like a fool from Eastern Europe.” Lastly, this subchapter discusses how teachers believe their students learn and improve their pronunciation. One of the most mentioned things the respondents believe is that students improve their English pronunciation in their free time by watching TV shows and movies in English, playing games, listening to songs, and spending time on social media. For example, Teacher 1 expressed that the children have it in their ears much more today because there are many more stimuli around them. As a result, English naturally surrounds them more than before, and pronunciation has improved significantly. Similarly, Teacher 3 relies on the fact that pupils also live with English outside the classroom and perceive English pronunciation even though the Teacher does not explicitly alert them about it.

Moreover, Teacher 4 represents an opinion that pronunciation is learned by listening, and thus one learns to speak the language. The Teacher said, “I try to make my students realize that listening improves their own speaking. It is crucial for them to not be afraid of speaking in English.” Teacher 1 also thinks that students should speak, speak, and speak in the first place. However, Teachers 1 and 2 agree that some students are much better at English pronunciation than others who, no matter what they do, cannot improve their pronunciation. In Teacher’s 2 opinion, it has something to do with a musical ear - if they hear it, they can learn it. They further agree that an early start is important. Teacher 1 adds that pupils should have the basics of pronunciation from primary school. On the other hand, according to Teacher 4, some students have beautiful pronunciation, but sometimes what they say does not make sense. Therefore, although pronunciation is important when students learn new words, it is not the only thing. Teacher 4 said, “If students want to know a word, they have to say it, and without it, it is useless for them to know the meaning of the word and vice versa.” In sum, the Teacher 3 words are: “I hope they soak up the pronunciation like sponges.”

3.5.2 Teaching pronunciation at upper-secondary schools in practice

The second chapter analyses the relative didactic procedures teachers at upper-secondary schools use to teach pronunciation. As it was in the previous chapter, this chapter is divided into sub-chapters, which are discussed separately one by one, the first being the question of when to incorporate pronunciation in the lesson.

In this matter, all the teachers agreed that they do not donate a whole lesson or separate slots only for pronunciation but rather integrate it with other language areas. For example, Teacher 4 said, “Yes, pronunciation is integrated into everything, and it is not like a separate lesson, or part of a lesson is devoted to it.”

The first area is vocabulary. Teacher 1 commented on this topic as follows: “When we start a new block of vocabulary, there is often a section in the textbook devoted to pronunciation. Whenever a new vocabulary is introduced, we learn the word complexly, both its semantic part of its use in the sentence and the context in which it is used, as well as its correct pronunciation. Sometimes I go through derived words, where the change of pronunciation can at times appear.” Teacher 4 makes a similar comment on this and integrates pronunciation when encountering new vocabulary. Teachers 2 and 3 take a different approach. Teacher 3 said, “especially with a challenging word, I want to make sure that the students can pronounce it correctly, recently we came across the name of the Irish town, which was pronounced entirely different than expected.” Teacher 2 said that “When we go through the whole vocabulary, and there is an IPA, I want to hear them pronounce it, and I try to make them aware of how they can come to the pronunciation using IPA themselves, so I lead them a lot to independence in terms of pronunciation.”

The next area of language is speaking. Here, the opinions and approaches of the teachers differ slightly. They all do pay attention to pronunciation when their students speak, however, Teacher 2 expressed that “When students speak, I barely correct their pronunciation, because when the students use or say a word, it means that they have heard it before, and pronunciation is not usually a problem.” Teacher 4 similarly interferes very little with the students’ speech; instead, the Teacher writes notes on paper, and when the pupils finish the activity, the Teacher points out frequent mistakes in pronunciation, which the students then correct.” On the other hand, Teachers 1 and 3 point out the pronunciation continuously and correct the students when there is a mistake in their speech. Moreover, with teacher 3, it happens that the students correct, or rather mock, each other. Students are also alerted by Teacher 3 about so-called Czenglish, which is very distracting when students speak.

The third area two of the teachers, Teachers 2 and 4, mentioned is reading. They included reading in the interview because both teachers insert reading aloud in their lessons. Teacher 2 defends This approach, saying that “When reading, because I think the class needs to read aloud, I try to get the student to correct the pronunciation, or I try to lead the student to be able to derive the pronunciation and read it correctly.” Teacher 4 also embraces this approach. During the conversation, the teacher mentioned that when they read aloud in class, they also focus on pronunciation. After the students finish reading, the teacher corrects them and points out tricky words and their pronunciation. The teacher also incorporates an examination of reading an article, and pronunciation is also included in the evaluation.

The last area is listening. This topic is tightly connected with the following subchapter: technology, tools, and techniques because all the teachers mentioned that they often use audio and video recordings in connection to pronunciation. That is why the technology the students listen to is mentioned in this chapter rather than with the other technology the teachers referred to in the interviews. In addition, all teachers stated during the interview that they include videos in the lessons. However, three teachers, teachers 1, 2, and 3, mentioned one factor related to the videos that they found important concerning the aim of pronunciation. That factor is the variety of accents. Teacher 2 puts it this way: “For me, video is definitely better than audio because it gives students an additional perception which they can grab hold of, seeing the person talk and articulate, which helps them with their pronunciation. For the students, I like to play videos with speakers with different accents, and I enjoy contrasting and drawing attention to the varieties of accents. I also make students who are at higher levels aware of pronunciation changes in words depending on which pronunciation model is used.” Teacher 1 has a similar opinion on this, thinking that in the recordings and videos, there are deliberately speakers from different parts of the world with different accents because it comes from the fact that students and language learners will meet speakers from different countries with accents in their lives. For this reason, Teacher 1 uses, for example, short BBC news, where presenters with different accents alternate. Finally, Teacher 3 said during the interview that the teacher tries to make the students hear how, for example, Scots or Irish speak, who, although they are native speakers, also have a strong accent and wants students to be aware of the countless varieties of accents. For this reason, the teacher uses videos with various actors to let the students hear the difference. In addition to the video, the teachers also mentioned recordings to which Teacher 4 commented: “I play the recordings to students several times so that at least once they focus only on the linguistic side of the text, that is, also on the pronunciation. I also play them recorded articles from the textbook so they can not only see it but also hear it.” At the end of this subchapter, the

opinion of Teacher 2 is mentioned, who said in the interview: “When it is the holidays, I tell students to watch movies and series in English, preferably with English instead of Czech subtitles, to connect the eye and ear, because that is where you can listen to and improve pronunciation the most.”

The next subchapter is shorter than the others because the teachers commented on it the least. This subchapter discusses the techniques teachers use to teach pronunciation. The most frequently repeated technique was repetition or imitation. Teachers 1, 2, and 4 uniformly state the repetition of both the teacher and the text from the recording. Only Teacher 3 said, “I don’t even want the students to repeat after me.” Teacher 4 was the only one who concurred using the minimal pair technique. Teacher 2 also mentioned the use of tongue twisters; on the other hand, the teacher thinks it sometimes leads to confusion among the students and even doubts their benefit. Finally, teacher 2 summarizes the use of techniques by stating that: “At grammar school, I never did any special pronunciation techniques, but in elementary school, I remember that I did.”

The last subchapter discusses tools and technology together because teachers did not comment very extensively on the tools as well as on the techniques. With this in mind, tools are to be discussed first. When it comes to IPA, teachers’ opinions are split in half. On the one hand, teachers 1 and 4 stated that they more or less do not work with IPA. For instance, Teacher 4 said: “I know what IPA is, but I do not have time for it in my classes. I used to work with it in the past, but at the same time, I had more lessons than I do now. I think they do not even enjoy IPA; it is a static element of language and they are active people.”

On the other hand, there are teachers 2 and 3, who have stated that they work with the IPA to some extent in their lessons. For example, teacher 2 commented on the work with IPA: “An IPA is definitely an interesting thing, and sometimes I incorporate it into my lessons. It is the scientific side of language, and I think knowing that is important. Through IPA, I try to lead my students mainly to independence so they can correctly read a word they do not know.” Teacher 3 adds that “Every year, at the beginning of the school year, I introduce students to IPA, I do not think that it is one hundred percent necessary for the students, but I emphasize to them that it exists and that it may eventually come in handy for other languages. Still, I see that they do not master the IPA much.” Other tools mentioned separately by individual teachers are songs, games, or Quizlet, which may already be classified as a technology, which is the following topic in this analysis.

What was mentioned by all participating teachers were recordings recorded by the students. Teachers 2 and 4 reported similar use of recordings, namely that students record how they speak

to evaluate themselves and then send the recording to the teacher for feedback. Teacher 1 said in an interview that they incorporate pronunciation exercises into the lessons. They use software to listen to the pronunciation first and then record themselves. Everyone has their headphones and listens to themselves individually. On this topic, Teacher 3 said that they used the recordings very often during the time of covid when they were at home. Someone sent audio, and someone even sent video recordings. Teacher 2 also said that technology is used more in the lessons after lockdowns.

During the interviews, three of the four teachers (Teachers 1, 3, and 4) discussed the potential of online dictionaries and the internet. Teachers 1 and 4 associate the irrelevance of teaching IPA with the availability of technology, such as online dictionaries, where a student can click on an icon and listen to the pronunciation of the word in both British and American versions if the pronunciation differs. Comment that Teacher 4 made in connection with online dictionaries and the Internet is: “I taught them where on the Internet to find the pronunciation of a word to listen to, especially for self-feedback. I also draw their attention to the comma that represents stress in the word in online dictionaries. I think it is essential to teach suprasegmentals as well because it is also part of pronunciation, but students often forget about it and do not pay attention to it at all. They do not realize the importance of suprasegmentals.” Teacher 1 adds: “In the online dictionary, they can play the pronunciation. What I did 15 years ago was that students made phonetic transcriptions in a workbook. Now I do not do it at all.” At the end of this subchapter and the chapter as well, teacher 3 stated that the teacher works with the students with the Help for English application and website, which they use mainly for self-study.

3.5.3 Peculiarities of pronunciation teaching at upper-secondary schools

This chapter introduces characteristics of teaching pronunciation at upper-secondary schools that teachers mentioned during the interviews. Unfortunately, although an entire chapter is devoted to this topic, teachers mentioned it only in passing. Nevertheless, even so, this topic should be mentioned, and teachers’ ideas should not be left out.

One of the things mentioned by teachers 1, 3, and 4 was the amount of time. Teachers 1 and 4 have three English lessons for all grades at school, and honestly think they could use an extra hour to devote a little more time to pronunciation and speaking. Teacher 1 cannot imagine plugging in anything else that is already in the lessons. In addition, Teacher 4 said, “There is no time for this (pronunciation). If there were a separate lesson only for oral speech, I would like it very much.” In the case of teacher 3, there are three English lessons in the lower grades,

and in the last two years before the maturita exam, they have four lessons. The teacher mentioned that where they have only three lessons, one extra hour would also come in handy. Another topic they mentioned is previous experiences at lower levels of education and their consequences at higher levels. For example, teacher 4 commented: “Some students come from lower levels with good pronunciation because they had a good teacher who focused more on the students’ pronunciation.” Teacher 3 even admitted to meeting students who were much better in pronunciation than the teacher, and Teacher 2 has students at advanced levels who aim to sound like native speakers. Teachers 1 and 2 agreed that students should have the basics of pronunciation from primary schools and generally make fewer mistakes than in primary schools. Nevertheless, Teacher 2 said that the teacher has met with students who have never heard of how to make intonation in questions and one-word answers. Teacher 2 further expressed the thought that at upper-secondary schools may be already late for significant improvements in pronunciation. It should be functioning from the beginning. At 17, some students have poor pronunciation so ingrained that instant pronunciation correction does not lead anywhere. On the other hand, some students showed progress.

3.5.4 Teachers’ views of their pronunciation instruction

The last chapter of the analysis is about how the participating teachers perceive their pronunciation teaching. Teachers 1 and 3 admitted they would accept further training, inspiration, and ideas on improving pronunciation teaching. Although Teacher 1 admitted it might be laziness not wanting to incorporate more pronunciation teaching into the lessons. Teacher 3 would focus mainly on software and applications, with which Teacher 2 partially agrees. At the same time, Teacher 2 admitted not needing further education in teaching pronunciation, even though it bothers Teacher 2, and knows that teachers should constantly educate themselves.

At the end, Teachers 3 and 4 provided unique information that could not be combined with any other comments from the remaining teachers. However, they are worth mentioning. Teacher 3 said: “In my lessons, I try to speak mainly in English, only the more complicated grammar I summarize in Czech, even though I know that I do not have the best, but also not the worst pronunciation. The problem of why I do not pay more attention to pronunciation is mainly time and energy for me.” Finally, Teacher 4 thinks that: “I teach naturally. Maybe I have a slightly different approach because I lived abroad for a long time, and I think I have great pronunciation.

I used to integrate pronunciation into my lessons a lot when I was teaching at another school with four English lessons.”

3.6 Summary and Discussion

At the end of the theoretical part, it is time for the final summarization and discussion of the analysis. The aim was to find out how teachers at Czech upper-secondary schools teach pronunciation. Most participating teachers agreed that pronunciation is crucial and should be included in English lessons. All of them recognize intelligibility as the main aim of teaching pronunciation. However, only one admitted that some students might aim to sound like native speakers. The idea expressed by all teachers that students learn pronunciation by listening and watching streaming platforms leads to not teaching pronunciation separately but integrating it with other language areas such as listening, reading, speaking, and vocabulary. In the theoretical part of chapter 2.2, the integration of pronunciation and grammar was discussed, however, none of the teachers mentioned this variety. The integration and teachers' belief that students learn pronunciation during differently oriented activities or as self-study might be why teachers have introduced a very narrow repertoire of techniques and tools, they use to teach pronunciation. Nevertheless, what they commented that they use very often is technology. Most often, they use videos, recordings and recordings from students, the Internet, and online dictionaries. The analysis showed that English teachers would welcome at least four lessons a week to incorporate pronunciation more. Time might play a role in the willingness of some teachers to train themselves in pronunciation teaching further because they feel there is simply no time for more attention to pronunciation. Moreover, some feel that what they do now is enough. On the other hand, some teachers would be willing to attend seminars on teaching pronunciation to improve pronunciation instruction and make the integration more effective.

It should be mentioned that the sample for this research is almost negligible compared to how many English teachers there are in the Czech Republic in upper-secondary education. It is possible that if each of them had participated in the research, the results could be completely different. The research is also limited by representing only teachers from grammar schools, since there are more types of schools that are classified as upper-secondary. There is also a possibility of teachers giving misleading answers. However, I sincerely hope that was not the case in the interview.

The results show that the teaching of pronunciation at Czech upper-secondary schools is not nearly as varied as the theory suggested. Interestingly, although teachers consider pronunciation a very important component of language, teachers' testimonies show that pronunciation is rather a by-product and not as much time is devoted to it as to other areas. According to the theory, there are many effective ways how to include pronunciation in English lessons and countless technologies, tools, and techniques to teach pronunciation. In the end, however, the teachers had very little to say on the subject. Lastly, in the chapter 1.4 it was indicated that Analytic-Linguistic approach suits older students (17-20 years old) more, however, the result of the interviews is that teachers prefer the Intuitive-Imitative approach.

However, I am grateful to all the teachers who agreed to participate in the research. It got me thinking about this problem and inspired me for my future practice.

CONCLUSION

This thesis aimed to discover how Czech upper-secondary school teachers teach English pronunciation. First, the theoretical part laid the basis for the practical part. Then, in the theoretical part, the research methodology was introduced, followed by data analysis and interpretation.

The first chapter of the theoretical part firstly defined the terms *approach*, which is seen as a way of teaching, and *method*, which means a set of decisions that bring a particular approach to life. Further, it provided a historical overview of approaches to teaching pronunciation up until the prevailing contemporary approaches. The overview started with Direct Method, continuing with Reform Movement, Audiolingual and Oral Method, The Silent Way, and Community Language Learning. Next, Communicative Language Teaching and Communicative Competence were discussed, and pronunciation's role in them. In this regard, the pronunciation was associated with the CEFR. Lastly, two prevailing contemporary approaches, Intuitive-Imitative and Analytic-Linguistic, were introduced and compared.

The second chapter focused on pronunciation teaching in the classroom. First, the main aim of pronunciation teaching was determined as being intelligible. However, there was a recognized idea that a personal aim for students could be to have pronunciation like a native speaker. The determination of the aim was followed by a discussion of when to teach pronunciation. Pronunciation could be the focus of the whole lesson, individual slots, or only mentioned when it comes up during other activities. The last possibility discussed was to integrate pronunciation with other areas of language. Among the areas are speaking, listening, grammar, and vocabulary. Next, possible techniques, tools, and technology that can be used to teach pronunciation were introduced. It was stated that it is up to teachers' imagination which device they utilize. Finally, since this thesis focuses on upper-secondary school teachers, it was determined with the help of ISCED, RVP G, and CEFR which schools can be classified as upper-secondary and what outcome for pronunciation is expected at the end of upper-secondary education.

The theoretical part first defined the aim of the research, which is finding out what are the teachers' approaches to teaching English pronunciation at Czech upper-secondary schools. The aim was followed by research ethics which were respected during all phases of the research. For the data collection, the method of semi-structured interview was chosen, and nine interview questions were thoroughly designed to answer the main research question regarding the aim of the thesis. For the interviews, four upper-secondary school teachers were contacted via email.

An important fact is that all the teachers were from grammar schools. The interviews took 20 to 30 minutes either online via Microsoft Teams or in person on the school grounds. The data was recorded for later transcription. However, if the teacher did not agree to record the interview, a protocol was prepared to write down the data.

Next, the process of data analysis was presented. It included transcribing the data, coding, and categorizing. In the final stage, four main categories functioning as individual chapters emerged. The data brought some interesting outcomes. Although most participating teachers agreed that pronunciation is one of the essential areas of language and intelligibility is the main aim of teaching pronunciation, simultaneously, they admitted that they do not pay much attention to it. It may be explained by the fact that they feel students should have fundamentals of pronunciation from primary schools. Further, they believe that English nowadays surrounds students daily, and by hearing it, they are learning it. Therefore, they instead integrate pronunciation with other language areas, such as vocabulary, speaking, listening, and reading out loud. The fact that they think there is no time for more pronunciation activities and that four lessons a week would allow them to devote more time to pronunciation might play a role in this. They did not provide a vast repertoire of techniques and tools. On the contrary, they mentioned a considerable amount of technology they use for teaching pronunciation: audio, video, students' recordings, online dictionaries, the Internet, and applications.

As for a personal view of their pronunciation teaching, the opinions split into two sides. One side thought that their pronunciation teaching was sufficient, and no alternations were needed. However, the other side admitted that some seminars for inspiration and ideas for more effective pronunciation teaching would be beneficial.

The results show that pronunciation teaching at Czech upper-secondary schools could be much more varied than it currently is when the theory is taken into consideration. However, the solution to this problem can be very complex and can start at the beginning with the preparation of future teachers.

RESUMÉ

Tato práce se zabývá přístupy vyučujících k výuce výslovnosti v hodinách anglického jazyka na středních školách. Výslovnost je neodmyslitelná součást jazyka, bohužel je často učiteli anglického jazyka opomíjena na úkor jiných řečových dovedností a jazykových prostředků. Byl to také jeden z důvodů pro výběr tohoto tématu a cíle práce, který je zjistit, jaké přístupy učitelé anglického jazyka na středních školách volí k výuce výslovnosti.

Na úvod teoretické části jsou v první kapitole představeny významné přístupy k výuce výslovnosti. V první části se práce přesouvá do minulosti a pojednává o přístupech, které se nejen ovlivňovaly navzájem, ale ovlivnily také to, jak učitelé přistupují k výuce výslovnosti v současnosti. Tyto dominující přístupy současnosti jsou představeny jako další. Mezi ně je zařazena i Komunikativní metoda a s ní související komunikační kompetence. V modelu komunikační kompetence uvedeném v CEFR je výslovnost, nebo přesněji fonologická kontrola, zařazena do lingvistické dimenze. Důvodem zařazení tohoto obecnějšího přístupu k výuce jazyka je to, že výslovnost je nedílnou součástí komunikace, a také proto, že během éry Komunikativní metody došlo k důležité změně v percepci hlavního cíle výuky výslovnosti.

Za dva hlavní přístupy k výuce výslovnosti se považují intuitivně-imitační a analyticko-lingvistický přístup.

Ve druhé kapitole teoretické části se práce přesouvá do hodin anglického jazyka a představuje hlavní cíl a kontext výuky výslovnosti, možnosti zařazení výslovnosti do hodin anglického jazyka, možné techniky, nástroje, a technologie co učitel může využít k výuce výslovnosti a očekávaná výstupní úroveň výslovnosti.

Jak už bylo zmíněno výše, během éry Komunikativní metody došlo ke změně vnímání hlavního cíle výuky výslovnosti, a to z přesvědčení, že by student měl znít jako rodilý mluvčí, k myšlence, že hlavním cílem výuky výslovnosti by měla být hlavně studentova srozumitelnost. Tato myšlenka souvisí také s tím, že se anglický jazyk stal mezinárodním jazykem pro dorozumívání se mezi lidmi, kteří nesdílí stejný rodný jazyk a zároveň tímto jazykem není angličtina. Tento kontext výuky se nazývá Angličtina jako *lingua franca*.

Dalším tématem je otázka, kdy výslovnost vyučovat. Možností je hned několik. Výslovnost může být tématem celé hodiny, oddělený slot, může na ni být upozorněno, když se naskytne příležitost při jiné aktivitě, nebo je možné výslovnost integrovat s jinými řečovými

dovednostmi a jazykovými prostředky. Mezi nimi může být mluvení, poslech s porozuměním, čtení nahlas, slovní zásoba nebo gramatika.

Třetí oblast druhé kapitoly se zabývá technikami, nástroji a technologiemi pro výuku výslovnosti. Možnosti pro učitele je nespočetně a záleží na učitelské představivosti, co za postupy a pomůcky využije. I obyčejné předměty, ač nejsou prvotně určeny k výuce, mohou být modifikovány a využity k výuce výslovnosti. Mezi nejčastější techniky patří například minimal pairs nebo opakování po nahrávce a učiteli. Jako užitečnou pomůckou je vnímána mezinárodní fonetická abeceda, která se dá využít mnoha různými způsoby. Možností je však mnohem více, mezi pomůcky se řadí i písničky, hry, básně, nebo kreslené vtipy. S pomůckami jsou spojené i vyučovací technologie, které se stávají čím dál tím více populárními. Jsou to například videa, poslechy, online slovníky, BBC zprávy, online hry a aplikace.

Na závěr druhé kapitoly je vymezeno, jaké instituce mohou být klasifikovány jako střední škola v kontextu České republiky. Je zde propojen očekávaný výstup pro cizí jazyk uvedený v Rámcovém vzdělávacím programu pro gymnázia s CEFR. Podle RVP G je očekávaný výstup cizího jazyka úroveň B2. Tato kapitola tedy vymezuje, jaká úroveň výslovnosti by měla být očekávána na konci střední školy.

V praktické části se po úvodu práce nejdříve pozastaví nad etickými principy, které byly brány v potaz ve všech fázích výzkumu. Jde hlavně o zachování anonymity zúčastněných učitelů a samozřejmě uvedení všech čerpaných zdrojů.

V dalším oddílu je rozebírána využitá metoda pro sběr dat, výběr vzorku a záznam dat. Za výzkumnou metodu bylo zvoleno polostrukturované interview. Důvodem je to, že na rozdíl od dotazníku, interview lépe zachytí postoje a umožní se účastníkům lépe otevřít a vyjádřit. Vzorek pro interview je mnohem menší, což bylo dalším faktorem pro výběr interview místo dotazníku. Ze tří druhů interview, strukturované, nestrukturované a polostrukturované, byla zvolena třetí varianta, protože výzkumník sice má připravenou strukturu otevřených otázek, může však kdykoliv reagovat na odpovědi dotazovaného a požadovat rozvinutí odpovědi nebo položit otázku, která nebyla původně připravená, ale navazuje na to, co dotazovaný zmínil. Umožní to výzkumníkovi flexibilně reagovat a získat tím rozmanitá data.

Jelikož se práce zabývá učiteli anglického jazyka na středních školách, byla oslovena pomocí e-mailu právě a pouze tato skupina. Je důležité uvést, že všichni účastníci interview byli učitelé z gymnázií. Ostatní druhy středních škol tudíž v tomto výzkumu zastoupeny nebyly. Nakonec byla uskutečněna čtyři interview, všechny v českém jazyce. Ve dvou případech byla on-line

skrz platformou Microsoft Teams, ve zbylých dvou případech byla uskutečněna osobně přímo ve školách. Všichni účastníci byli seznámeni s cílem a účelem výzkumu a ujištění o zachování anonymity a poté požádáni o podepsání informovaného souhlasu, případně on-line interview účastníci potvrdili souhlas ústně na začátku záznamu z interview. Z tohoto vyplývá, že účastníci byli dále požádáni o možnost interview nahrát pro uchování dat k transkripci. Naštěstí všichni s nahráváním souhlasili, ale pro opačný případ byl připraven protokol, který by sloužil pro záznam dat a poznámky z interview. Ten byl využit pouze jako podklad pro interview s připraveným otázkami.

Další fáze byla zpracování dat, kterou pokryl další oddíl teoretické části. Data byla nejdříve přepsána pomocí transkripce. Přepsaná data byla zakódována a ke kódů byly postupně přiřazeny kategorie. Na konci tohoto procesu vznikly čtyři hlavní kategorie, které v interpretaci dat složily jako hlavní kapitoly.

Z výsledků analýzy vzešly zajímavé závěry. Prvním je ten, že se všichni učitelé shodli na hlavním cíli výuky výslovnosti, což je především žákova srozumitelnost. Pouze jeden z učitelů uvedl, že je možné, aby žákův osobní cíl byl znít jako rodilý mluvčí. Přesto že většina učitelů souhlasila s tím, že výslovnost je důležitou složkou jazyka a hodin angličtiny, z dalších výpovědí vyplývá, že výslovnost vnímají jako vedlejší produkt aktivit se zaměřením na ostatní složky jazyka. To by mohlo být vnímáno tak, že výslovnost spíše integrují s ostatními řečovými dovednostmi a jazykovými prostředky, mezi kterými uvedli poslech s porozuměním, čtení nahlas, mluvení a slovní zásobu. Je to možná také důsledek toho, že si myslí, že základy výslovnosti by si žáci měli přinést ze základních škol. Přesto uvedli, že se setkávají s žáky, u kterých je u výslovnosti velký prostor pro zlepšení, ale za celé čtyři roky ke zlepšení nedošlo. Naopak se setkávají s žáky, u kterých je pokrok značný. Jeden z učitelů si toto spojuje s tím, že na výslovnost student potřebuje mít ucho. To znamená si anglickou výslovnost naposlouchat, hlavně ve volném čase sledováním seriálů, filmů, hraním her a časem stráveném na sociálních sítích. S tím souhlasili všichni ze zúčastněných učitelů. Co se týče technik a pomůcek, učitelé uvedli jen malý repertoár a k tomuto tématu se vyjádřili minimálně. K čemu se však hojně vyjádřili byla technologie, kterou využívají i k výuce výslovnosti. Mezi ni uvedli hlavně videa, poslechy, on-line slovníky a internet. V poslední řadě se vyjádřili k tomu, jak oni sami vnímají svou výuku výslovnosti. Dva ze čtyř učitelů uvedlo, že by uvítali nějaký seminář na inspiraci a nápady, jak svou výuku zefektivnit. Zbytek uvedl, že nemají potřebu v tomto ohledu nic měnit.

Závěrem autor vyjadřuje vděčnost učitelům za účast na výzkumu, a že práce přinesla zajímavé poznatky jak pro budoucí studium, tak i budoucí praxi.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bachman, Lyle F. and Adrian S. Palmer. 1996. *Language Testing in Practice: Designing and Developing Useful Language Tests*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cael, Jordan. 2010. "Teaching Pronunciation As A Core Skill Using The Silent Way Approach." *MA TESOL Collection*. 482. https://digitalcollections.sit.edu/ipp_collection/482
- Canale, Michael, and Merrill Swain. 1980. "Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches To Second Language Teaching And Testing." *Applied Linguistics* 1 (1): 1-47.
- Celce-Murcia, Marianne, Donna Brinton, and Marguerite Ann Snow. 2014. *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*. Fourth edition. Boston: National Geographic Learning.
- Celce-Murcia, Marianne, Donna M. Brinton, Janet M. Goodwin, and Barry Griner. 2010. *Teaching Pronunciation: A Course Book and Reference Guide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Council of Europe. 2020. *Common European Reference for Languages: Companion Volume with New Descriptors*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Creswell, John W., and J. David Creswell. 2018. *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. 5th edition. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Deterding, David, and Christine Lewis. 2019. "Pronunciation in English as Lingua Franca." In *Second Handbook of English Language Teaching*, edited by Xuesong Gao, 1-15. Cham: Springer.
- Farmand, Zahra, and Behzad Pourgharib. 2013. "The Effect of English Songs on English Learners Pronunciation." *International Journal of Basic Sciences & Applied Research* 2 (9): 840-846.
- Gavora, Peter. 2000. *Úvod do Pedagogického Výzkumu*. Brno: Paido.
- Gillham, Bill. 2000. *The research interview*. Real world research. London: Continuum.
- Harmer, Jeremy. 2015. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. 5th edition. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Jenkins, Jennifer. 2000. *The phonology of English as an international language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Jenkins, Jennifer. 2012. "English as a Lingua Franca from the classroom to the classroom." *ELT Journal* 66 (4): 486-494.
- Kelly, Gerald. 2000. *How to Teach Pronunciation*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Kelly, Louis G. 1969. *25 centuries of language teaching*. Massachusetts: Newbury House.
- Levis, John M., and Linda Grant. 2003. "Integrating Pronunciation into ESL/EFL Classrooms." *TESOL Journal* 12 (2): 13-19.
- Levis, John M., and Sinem Sonsaat. 2017. "Pronunciation Teaching in th CLT Era." In *The Routledge handbook of English pronunciation*, edited by Okim Kang, Ron I. Thomson, John M. Murphy, 267-283. London: Routledge.
- Marks, Jonathan. 2012. "In Praise of Pronunciation." *English Teaching Professional* 81: 4-6.
- MŠMT. 2007. *Rámcový vzdělávací program pro gymnázia*. Praha: MŠMT.
- Murphy, John M. 2014. "Intelligible, comprehensible, non-native models in ESL/EFL pronunciation teaching." *System* 42 (1): 258-269.
- Nicolaidis, Katerina, and Marina Mattheoudakis. 2012. "The PRO-VOC Method: Combining Pronunciation and Vocabulary Teaching." *IRAL* 50 (4): 303-321.
- Parker, Maria. 2000. "Pronunciation & grammar: Using video and audio activities." *English Teaching Forum* 38 (1): 24-31.
- Pennington, Martha C, and Pamela Rogerson-Revell. 2019. *English Pronunciation Teaching and Research: Contemporary Perspectives*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pennington, Martha C. 2021. "Teaching Pronunciation: The State of the Art 2021." *RELC Journal* 52 (1): 3-21.
- Punch, Keith, and Alis Oancea. 2014. *Introduction to research methods in education*. 2nd edition. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Richards, Jack C., and Theodore S. Rodgers. 2014. *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. 3rd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Roohani, Ali. 2013. "A comparative study of intuitive-imitative and analytic-linguistic approaches to teaching pronunciation: Does age play a role?" *Asian EFL Journal* 15 (1): 87-127.

Scrivener, Jim. 2011. *Learning Teaching: The Essential Guide to English Language Teaching*. 3rd edition. Oxford: Macmillan Education.

Skutil, Martin. 2011. *Základy pedagogicko-psychologického výzkumu pro studenty učitelství*. Praha: Portál.

UNESCO Institute for Statistics. 2012. *International System for Classification of Education: ISCED 11*. Montreal: UNESCO Institute for Statistics.

Ur, Penny. 2012. *A Course in English Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Walker, Robin. 2001. "Pronunciation for international intelligibility." *English Teaching Professional* 21: 10-13.

Widdowson, Henry G. 1983. *Learning Purpose and Language Use*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Yoshida, Marla Tritch. 2018. "Choosing Technology Tools to Meet Pronunciation Teaching and Learning Goals." *The CATESOL Journal* 30 (1): 195-212.

APPENDICES

Appendix A *Informed Consent Template*

Appendix B *Interview Protocol*

Appendix C *Interview Transcriptions*

Appendix A *Informed Consent Template*

Informovaný souhlas

Udělení souhlasu ke zpracování osobních a citlivých údajů

Podle zákona č.101/2000 Sb., o ochraně osobních údajů, ve znění pozdějších předpisů, uděluji Veronice Kiacové souhlas se zpracováním svých osobních a citlivých údajů, poskytnutých v interview v rámci bakalářské práce na Fakultě filozofické Univerzity Pardubice, ke studijním a vědeckým účelům..

Souhlasím, že jsem byl/a obeznámena se zachováním důvěrnosti a anonymity v bakalářské práci formou změny svého jména v datových souborech, v textu bakalářské práce a dalších dokumentech:

ano

ne

Tento souhlas lze kdykoli a bez udání důvodu odvolat.

V dne

.....
jméno a příjmení

.....
podpis

Appendix B *Interview Protocol*

Interview Protocol

Purpose: Bachelor thesis

Name: Approaches to teaching pronunciation

Aim: To find out what are the teachers' approaches to teaching English pronunciation at Czech upper-secondary schools

Introduction to the interview: Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research. This research aims to find out teachers' approaches to teaching English pronunciation at Czech upper-secondary schools and the collected data serves for analysis in the theoretical part in the interviewer's bachelor thesis only. Confidentiality and anonymity will be maintained in the form of name changes in data files, thesis text and other documents. With your consent, the interviewer would like to record the interview to preserve the data for transcription. The interview takes about 30 minutes to complete. If you have any questions, please, do not hesitate to ask.

Question:	Notes:
1) How important do you think it is to involve Teaching pronunciation into your lessons?	
2) What is, in your opinion, the main goal of Teaching pronunciation?	
3) When do you teach pronunciation to your students? Is it a whole lesson, separate slots, when it comes up, or do you integrate it with other skills and sub-skills (listening, speaking, grammar, vocabulary)? If you don't, why not?	
4) What techniques do you use to teach pronunciation?	
5) Do you use any tools to teach pronunciation? Vowel and consonant charts, IPA, recordings, games, poems	
6) Do you see any potential in Using IPA to teach English pronunciation? Why/Why not?	

7) What about technology? Is there any that you use to teach pronunciation?	
8) Is there anything you would like to do differently when it comes to pronunciation teaching?	
9) Is there anything else you think is important that we haven't yet talked about?	

Appendix C *Transcriptions*

The transcribed interviews are available on request from the author of this thesis.