Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (H. U. Journal of Education) 43: 246-257 [2012]

AN INVESTIGATION OF PRONUNCIATION LEARNING STRATEGIES OF ADVANCED EFL LEARNERS

İNGİLİZCEYİ YABANCI DİL OLARAK ÖĞRENEN İLERİ DÜZEYDEKİ ÖĞRENCİLERİN TELAFFUZ ÖĞRENME STRATEJİLERİNİN İNCELENMESİ

Murat HİŞMANOĞLU **

ABSTRACT: This paper aims at investigating the kinds of strategies deployed by advanced EFL learners at English Language Teaching Department to learn or improve English pronunciation and revealing whether there are any significant differences between the strategies of successful pronunciation learners and those of unsuccessful pronunciation learners. After reviewing the studies done on pronunciation learning strategies, it defines the concept of a pronunciation learning strategy, presents how several researchers identify pronunciation learning strategies, and displays the results of a research study.

Keywords: EFL learners, pronunciation learning, pronunciation learning strategies

ÖZET: Bu çalışma İngilizce Öğretmenliği Bölümündeki İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen ileri düzeydeki öğrencilerin İngilizce telaffuzu öğrenmek ya da geliştirmek için kullandıkları strateji türlerini incelemeyi ve başarılı öğrencilerin telaffuz stratejileri ile başarısız öğrencilerin telaffuz stratejileri arasında anlamlı bir farkın olup olmadığını bulmayı amaçlamaktadır. Telaffuz öğrenme stratejileri üzerine yapılmış araştırmalara değindikten sonra, çalışma telaffuz öğrenme stratejisi kavramını tanımlamakta, farklı araştırmacıların telaffuz öğrenme stratejilerini nasıl betimlediklerini sunmakta ve bir araştırmanın sonuçlarını sergilemektedir.

Anahtar sözcükler: İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrenciler, telaffuz öğrenimi, telaffuz öğrenme stratejileri

1. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, strategic learning and pronunciation learning have gained ubiquity in the field of second language research (Brown 2001; Bruen 2001; Dornyei & Skehan 2003; Fan 2003; Norton & Toohey 2001). Although strategic learning research has attempted to promote the comprehension of how learners cope with complex language learning tasks employing learning strategies (Chamot 2004; Chamot & El-Dinary 1999; El-Dib 2004), the area of pronunciation learning research has sought to unearth the areas of pronunciation that are most appropriate for teachers to teach (Celce-Murcia, Brinton & Goodwin 1996; Derwing, Munro & Carbonaro 2000; Riney & Flege 1998; Riney, Takada, & Ota 2000). Since there has been little inter-relation between these two fields, second language researchers are to explore how second language learners deal with difficult pronunciation learning tasks via the use of learning strategies.

The reason why the researcher has focused on pronunciation learning strategies in this paper is that pronunciation learning strategies used by EFL learners have long been ignored by language teachers working in ELT departments in many countries. Especially, in pronunciation lessons, language teachers provide their students with phonetic and phonological knowledge regarding the English language, however, they do not ask learners to reflect on their personal pronunciation learning techniques and report the strategies that they employ, which, undesirably, leads to learners' confronting with communication problems when interacting with (non)native speakers of English beyond the classroom context. As Chamot & Rubin (1994) state, what determines good language learners is the ability learners have of improving a set of personal learning strategies, not the number of learning strategies a learner employs. In this vein, a learner who reports the ability to successfully improve and implement theoretically informed pronunciation learning strategies will likely be a good pronunciation learner.

** Yrd. Doç. Dr., Uşak Üniversitesi, e-posta: murat.hismanoglu@usak.edu.tr

This paper, thus, aims at examining the kinds of learning strategies advanced EFL learners at English Language Teaching Department use to learn or improve English pronunciation and unearthing whether there are any significant differences between the strategies of successful pronunciation learners and those of unsuccessful pronunciation learners. It reviews the studies done on pronunciation learning strategies, defines the concept of a pronunciation learning strategy, presents how several researchers identify pronunciation learning strategies, and displays the results of a research study.

1.1. Background of pronunciation learning strategies

Researchers have taken an interest in pronunciation strategy research only in the last ten years. Peterson (2000) conducted the first study concerning the field of pronunciation learning strategies by reporting twelve strategies identified via the use of diaries and interviews by eleven subjects. Since it is the only study to date that attempts to concentrate on the discovery and classification of pronunciation learning strategies, Peterson's work is extremely prominent. She selected eleven adults to study, nine of whom were female, whereas two were male. The subjects participating in the study were from a variety of proficiency levels. Her methodology consisted of self-report dairies and interviews. Students writing in a diary were asked to log all strategies they were employing or had ever utilized to master Spanish pronunciation. Peterson's study explored pronunciation learning strategies employed by native English speakers learning Spanish as an L2. Her methods were overt and well designed. It was the general approach to gathering pronunciation strategies from diaries and interviews that enabled her to make up the largest and most thorough categorization of pronunciation strategies yet collected, being equivalent to twelve pronunciation learning strategies and 43 tactics, or subsets of those strategies.

Vitanova & Miller (2002) did a pilot study to reveal views of pronunciation students on the instruction that they were receiving. The premise of the researchers was that by teaching pronunciation strategies to students, the students would sustain to develop their pronunciation beyond the classroom context. The study did not make any attempt to validate this assertion empirically; rather it gathered the views and perceptions of the participants, which supported the researchers' premise. In general, the study stressed the need to teach pronunciation students how to evaluate their own pronunciation needs and improve strategies accordingly. Nevertheless, it did not give any indication of how to realize this or what strategies to teach. On the other side, a significant contribution of this study was the statement that affective factors affect pronunciation learning. To illustrate, the researchers revealed that poor confidence, feelings of frustration, and feelings of depression had impact on the student's pronunciation learning.

Derwing & Rossiter (2002) created a much more in-depth study to find out specific pronunciation strategies utilized by ESL learners. The study made use of 100 participants from an adult, college-level, ESL program with 19 different language groups depicted. Over the course of six weeks, the researchers in this study gathered a number of pronunciation strategies described by students. It was revealed that using paraphrasing as a pronunciation strategy to enhance communication was the most popular strategy. Relevant to affective variables, the study indicated that a majority of students (60%) felt that their pronunciation altered when being excited or nervous. Contrary to the strong emphasis on prosody currently found in pronunciation research, this study indicated that merely 10% of the participants asserted prosody as a pronunciation problem giving rise to a breakdown in communication. The study unearthed that students perceiving a pronunciation problem in their communication were either not getting the needed instruction or the received instruction was not helping them. It did mark, on the other hand, that students in higher levels were inclined to individualize their usage of pronunciation strategies more to recover specific communication breakdown. Additionally, it exhibited that students themselves must learn to evaluate their own pronunciation needs and select strategies that will boost their pronunciation inadequacies.

The last study that placed emphasis on pronunciation learning strategies was done by Osburne (2003). Using 50 volunteer participants from a variety of language backgrounds, Osburne examined specifically the pronunciation learning strategies of higher level ESL learners. Osburne's method was effective. Each student, while in a monitored interview, was asked to record a ten-minute language learning autobiography. Following this process, the student's recording was played back and the

moderator asked the student to reproduce a line s/he had heard in the autobiography. The purpose of reproducing the line was to elicit better articulation and inquire concerning what the student did to develop his or her pronunciation. At that point, the moderator would record the strategies reported by the student.

Osburne's (2003) methodology was quite powerful; however, it failed to allocate students extended time to consider pronunciation strategies in the same way that self-report diaries do. Osburne's methodology inevitably restricted the kind of strategies to be mentioned by the participants. These students were restricted to what helped them on specific repetition acts rather than being asked to describe any pronunciation strategy. After gathering strategies from 50 participants, Osburne got each interview transcribed and the strategies delineated. Hence, eight categories of strategies were described for pronunciation enhancement. In spite of defining eight categories of strategy learning, Osburne did not expound the specific actions mentioned by the participants in the interviews. When the eight categories were formed, Osburne identified which categories were most used by the participants.

1.2. Definition of a pronunciation learning strategy

Pronunciation strategies are intentional behaviors and thoughts used by learners so as to enable them to comprehend, learn, or remember L2 pronunciation. A pronunciation learning strategy is an attempt to enhance phonetic and phonological competence in the target language. Every pronunciation learner utilizes pronunciation learning strategies either deliberately or undeliberately when focusing on segmental and/or suprasegmental phonemes in the target language and trying to do tasks given by the teacher in the pronunciation classroom.

Pronunciation learning strategies used by pronunciation learners during the act of studying segmental and/or suprasegmental phonemes in the target language and doing tasks given by the teacher have been identified by researchers, albeit not being many in number. In the section below, how several researchers have identified pronunciation learning strategies will be shortly summed up.

1.3. Identification of pronunciation learning strategies

Pronunciation learning strategies have been identified by a limited number of researchers (Derwing & Rossiter 2002; Osburne 2003; Peterson 2000; Vitanova & Miller 2002, etc.) and, accordingly, most of these endeavours to identify pronunciation learning strategies display more or less the same listings of pronunciation learning strategies without any striking changes. In the following section, Derwing & Rossiter's (2002), Osburne's (2003), Peterson's (2000), and Vitanova & Miller's (2002) identification of pronunciation learning strategies will be handled.

In Derwing & Rossiter's (2002) viewpoint, there are eleven basic strategies employed by learners that contribute to pronunciation learning, which are self-repetition, paraphrasing, increasing or decreasing volume, writing and/or spelling difficult words, using a slow rate of speech, calming down, using pantomime, avoiding difficult sounds, appealing for assistance from native speakers, using clear speech, and monitoring articulatory gestures.

Osburne (2003) identified seven main strategies contributing directly to pronunciation learning, which are focusing on sounds below the syllable level, focusing on individual syllables, focusing on prosodic structures, monitoring global articulatory gestures, focusing on paralanguage, focusing on individual words, and focusing on memory or imitation.

According to Peterson (2000), there are twelve main pronunciation learning strategies, which are representing sounds in memory, practicing naturalistically, formal practice with sounds, analyzing the sound system, using proximal articulations, finding out about the target language pronunciation, setting goals and objectives, planning for a language task, self-evaluation, using humor to lower anxiety, asking for help, cooperating with peers, and representing sounds in memory.

Vitonava & Miller (2002) list two main pronunciation learning strategies, which are self-correction of poor pronunciation and active listening to native pronunciation.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. Sample characteristics

Thirty eight students from the English Language Teaching Department of the European University of Lefke participated in this study. The selection of the subjects was done in random regardless of gender and race. The students ranged in age from 18 to 25, and 10 of the 38 students were male. These thirty eight students took the course entitled Listening and Pronunciation II in the Spring Semester of 2009-2010 Academic Year. Demographic properties of the participants are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic Properties of the Participants

		Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	10	26
	Female	28	74
Age	18-20	30	79
	21-23	5	13
	24-24+	3	8
Year	Freshman	38	100
Total		38	100

2.2. Instrument and data collection

The main instrument in this study was the Pronunciation Strategies questionnaire. It was designed to measure the frequency with which subjects intuitively used pronunciation learning strategies. The other instrument used was students' pronunciation scores derived from the final exam given by the course lecturer at the end of the Spring Semester of 2009-2010 Academic Year.

The researcher developed the items in the questionnaire based on taxonomies of pronunciation learning strategies presented by Eckstein (2007), Oxford (1990), Peterson (2000) and Tseng, Dörnyei & Schmitt (2006). The purpose of the questionnaire was to gather frequency counts of pronunciation learning strategies under six categories that were in line with Oxford's categorization of strategies: memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, social and affective. The questionnaire was made up of items that were representative of one and merely one pronunciation learning category. Each of the six sections consisted of approximately one to four phrases about pronunciation strategies and related one to fourteen pronunciation tactics and asked students to rate how frequently they employed such strategies and related tactics for improving their pronunciation.

The development of the questionnaire was guided by a number of experts working at higher education settings. This panel of experts including one professor of phonetics, two native experts and two non-native senior EFL teachers evaluated the instrument for content and face validity and contended that the questionnaire was appropriate and comprehensive for the context of the study. To check the realibility, the instrument was analyzed through the Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient $\alpha = 0.73$, which shows a high level of reliability.

The questionnaire contained 42 items. It was administered to the subjects at EUL (N =38) at the end of the spring semester of 2009-2010 Academic Year following immediately after their taking the course entitled ELT 176 Listening and Pronunciation II . Subjects indicated on the questionnaire the frequency with which they engaged in the pronunciation learning strategies and related tactics by clicking a box underneath the suitable response category.

Each section contained items that were directly related to pronunciation strategies. The degree of pronunciation strategy usage was measured with a five-point likert scale with five description categories of "always", "frequently", "sometimes", "rarely", and "never." Students were asked to tick

the box which best corresponded to their pronunciation strategy usage. The return rate from the subjects at the first year was 100 % (N=38).

Each subject was given a specific pronunciation score based on their final exam grades. Out of thirty eight pronunciation scores, only seventeen scores differed by more than 65 points. However, twenty one scores were below 65 points.

2.3. Data analysis

Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS. 16). The demographic variables for this study were discrete data (nominal and ordinal); therefore, descriptive statistics were utilized to run for frequencies, percentages, mean and standard deviation (Beins 2004; Heiman 2001; Sekaran 2003).

3. FINDINGS

The subjects were requested to respond to 42 Likert-type statements dealing with the frequency with which they engaged in the pronunciation learning strategies and related tactics and the degree of pronunciation strategy usage was presented on a 5-point likert scale where 5 (always) showed the maximum score and 1 (never) represented the minimum score. The findings were structured along with the following list of research questions comprising the central basis of the concurrent study.

1. What strategies do advanced EFL learners use to improve their English pronunciation?
2. In what strategies do successful pronunciation learners differ from less successful pronunciation learners?

3.1. Strategies advanced EFL learners use to improve their English pronunciation

Of six main types of strategies, the majority of the participants indicated that they employed metacognitive strategies to improve their English pronunciation with a mean score of 2.85 (SD=0.10). Of four sub-categories of metacognitive strategies, self evaluating was the most frequently used pronunciation learning strategy by students of ELT department with a mean score of 3.45 (SD=0.20), which indicated that the participants recorded their voice to listen to their pronunciation as the related tactic to deploy self-evaluating as a pronunciation learning strategy. However, setting goals and objectives was the least frequently used pronunciation learning strategy by the participants with a mean score of 2.54 (SD=0.10), which indicated that they decided to focus their learning on particular sounds of the target language, memorize the sounds (or the alphabet) of the target language and focus their listening on particular sounds of the target language as the related tactics to employ setting goals and objectives as a pronunciation learning strategy.

Another important finding in this section was that a great number of participants indicated that they employed affective strategies to promote their English pronunciation with a mean score of 2.79 (SD=0.18). This showed that the participants paid attention to using humor to lower anxiety and the related pronunciation tactic such as having a sense of humor about their mispronunciations.

The most striking result in this section was that very few number of participants stated that they deployed social strategies to develop their English pronunciation with a mean score of 2.28 (SD=0.13). This implied that the participants did not give importance to using pronunciation learning strategies such as asking for help (M=2.29, SD=0.17) and cooperating with peers (M=2.26, SD=0.15) and the related pronunciation learning tactics such as asking somebody else to correct their pronunciation, asking somebody else to pronounce a word, studying with their classmates, and teaching or tutoring their classmates.

Table 2. Distribution of Mean Scores of Pronunciation Learning Strategies Used by Advanced EFL Learners

Type of Strategy	Pronunciation Learning Strategies	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
1. Memory		2.58	0.12	0.72
1. A	Representing sounds in memory	2.58	0.12	0.72
2. Cognitive		2.47	0.05	0.31
2. A	Practicing naturalistically	2.37	0.06	0.37
2. B	Formally practicing with sounds	2.57	0.07	0.46
3. Compensation		2.74	0.10	0.64
3. A	Using proximal articulations	2.74	0.10	0.64
4. Metacognitive		2.85	0.10	0.59
4. A	Finding out about target language pronunciation	2.66	0.11	0.67
4. B	Setting goals and objectives	2.54	0.10	0.64
4. C	Planning for a language task	2.76	0.20	1.24
4. D	Self evaluating	3.45	0.20	1.22
5. Affective		2.79	0.18	1.09
5. A	Using humor to lower anxiety	2.79	0.18	1.09
6. Social		2.28	0.13	0.78
6. A	Asking for help	2.29	0.17	1.06
6. B	Cooperating with peers	2.26	0.15	0.90

3.2. Strategies successful pronunciation learners differ from less successful pronunciation learners

In the following table, descriptive statistics of successful and unsuccessful students in relation to six major and totally fourteen pronunciation learning strategies including sub-major strategies are presented in terms of mean, standard deviation and standard error means.

Tablo 3. Descriptive Statistics of Successful and Unsuccessful Students in Relation to Six Major and Totally Fourteen Pronunciation Learning Strategies

Type of Strategy	Unsuccessful Successful	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Strategy 1	Unsuccessful	21	2.67	0.60	0.13
	Successful	17	2.47	0.86	0.21
Strategy 2	Unsuccessful	21	2.44	0.26	0.06
	Successful	17	2.51	0.37	0.09
Strategy 2A	Unsuccessful	21	2.42	0.38	0.08
	Successful	17	2.31	0.36	0.09
Strategy 2B	Unsuccessful	21	2.46	0.37	0.08
	Successful	17	2.71	0.53	0.13
Strategy 3	Unsuccessful	21	2.67	0.73	0.16
	Successful	17	2.82	0.53	0.13
Strategy 4	Unsuccessful	21	2.62	0.45	0.10

Table 3 cont.

	Successful	17	3.13	0.63	0.15
Strategy 4A	Unsuccessful	21	2.57	0.73	0.16
	Successful	17	2.76	0.59	0.14
Strategy 4B	Unsuccessful	21	2.54	0.73	0.16
	Successful	17	2.53	0.53	0.13
Strategy 4C	Unsuccessful	21	2.43	1.21	0.26
	Successful	17	3.18	1.19	0.29
Strategy 4D	Unsuccessful	21	2.95	1.02	0.22
	Successful	17	4.06	1.20	0.29
Strategy 5	Unsuccessful	21	2.48	0.87	0.19
	Successful	17	3.18	1.24	0.30
Strategy 6	Unsuccessful	21	2.32	0.78	0.17
	Successful	17	2.22	0.80	0.20
Strategy 6A	Unsuccessful	21	2.38	1.05	0.23
	Successful	17	2.18	1.09	0.26
Strategy 6B	Unsuccessful	21	2.26	0.90	0.20
	Successful	17	2.26	0.92	0.22

It is clearly seen in table 3 that successful pronunciation learners deploy pronunciation learning stategies numbered S2, S2B, S3, S4, S4A, S4C, S4D and S5 more frequently than unsuccessful pronunciation learners do. That is to state that they use cognitive, formally practicing with sounds, compensation, metacognitive, finding out about target language pronunciation, planning for a language task, self evaluating and affective strategies more frequently than unsuccessful pronunciation learners do.

To reveal whether there were any significant differences between the strategies of successful pronunciation learners and those of unsuccessful pronunciation learners, independent samples t-test was utilized. The following table displays the results of the t-test clearly.

Tablo 4. Independent Samples T-test Results for Revealing Differences Between the Strategies of Successful Pronunciation Learners and Those of Unsuccessful Pronunciation Learners

		Levene's test for equality of variances		T-test for equality of mean				
Type of Strategy		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Mean
Strategy 1	Equal variances assumed	2.05	0.16	0.829	36	0.41	0.20	0.24
	Equal variances not assumed			0.799	27.69	0.43	0.20	0.25
Strategy 2	Equal variances assumed	1.48	0.23	-0.666	36	0.51	-0.07	0.10
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.643	28.08	0.52	-0.06871	0.11

Table 4 cont.

Strategy 2A	Equal variances assumed	0.07	0.79	0.865	36	0.39	0.11	0.12
	Equal variances not assumed			0.872	35.29	0.39	0.11	0.12
Strategy 2B	Equal variances assumed	1.94	0.17	-1.671	36	0.10	-0.24	0.15
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.609	27.65	0.12	-0.24	0.15
Strategy 3	Equal variances assumed	2.00	0.17	-0.741	36	0.46	-0.16	0.21
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.767	35.62	0.45	-0.16	0.20
Strategy 4	Equal variances assumed	1.40	0.25	-2.918	36	0.00	-0.51	0.17
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.816	28.06	0.00	-0.51	0.18
Strategy 4A	Equal variances assumed	0.43	0.52	-0.883	36	0.38	-0.19	0.22
	Equal variances not assumed			-0.903	36	0.37	-0.19	0.21
Strategy 4B	Equal variances assumed	0.86	0.36	0.047	36	0.96	0.01	0.21
	Equal variances not assumed			0.049	35.65	0.96	0.01	0.20
Strategy 4C	Equal variances assumed	0.05	0.82	-1.914	36	0.06	-0.75	0.39
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.918	34.62	0.06	-0.75	0.39
Strategy 4D	Equal variances assumed	0.45	0.51	-3.071	36	0.00	-1.11	0.36
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.020	31.66	0.00	-1.11	0.37
Strategy 5	Equal variances assumed	0.93	0.34	-2.044	36	0.04	-0.70	0.34
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.971	27.88	0.06	-0.70	0.36
Strategy 6	Equal variances assumed	0.57	0.45	0.392	36	0.70	0.10	0.26
	Equal variances not assumed			0.390	33.81	0.70	0.10	0.26
Strategy 6A	Equal variances assumed	0.00	0.98	0.588	36	0.56	0.20	0.35
	Equal variances not assumed			0.585	33.79	0.56	0.20	0.35
Strategy 6B	Equal variances Assumed	0.18	0.67	-0.009	36	0.99	-0.00	0.30

Table 4 cont.

Equal variances not assumed	-0.009	34.09	0.99	-0.00	0.30

Based on the results of the t-test, it was unearthed that, relevant to using strategy 4 (Metacognitive strategies), there were significant differences between successful pronunciation learners and unsuccessful pronunciation learners. Since t calculation value at 36 degree of freedom was higher than t table value at the same degree of freedom ($t_{calculation}$= -2.918 > t_{table} = 1.645), H_o - null hypothesis claiming that there was no significant difference between successful pronunciation learners and unsuccessful pronunciation learners in terms of using metacognitive strategies was rejected. Another comparison that helped us to get the same result was that significance value (significance 2-tailed) 0.00 was lower than 0.05 ($p < 0.05$).

Regarding the use of strategy 4D (Metacognitive- Self-evaluating), there were significant differences between successful pronunciation learners and unsuccessful pronunciation learners. Since t calculation value at 36 degree of freedom was higher than t table value at the same degree of freedom ($t_{calculation}$= -3.071 > t_{table} = 1.645), H_o - null hypothesis claiming that there was no significant difference between successful pronunciation learners and unsuccessful pronunciation learners in terms of using self-evaluating strategy was rejected. Another comparison that helped us to get the same result was that significance value (significance 2-tailed) 0.00 was lower than 0.05 ($p < 0.05$).

Concerning the use of strategy 5 (Affective – Using humor to lower anxiety), there were significant differences between successful pronunciation learners and unsuccessful pronunciation learners. Since t calculation value at 36 degree of freedom was higher than t table value at the same degree of freedom ($t_{calculation}$= -2.044 > t_{table} = 1.645), H_o - null hypothesis claiming that there was no significant difference between successful pronunciation learners and unsuccessful pronunciation learners in terms of using humor to lower anxiety was rejected. Another comparison that helped us to get the same result was that significance value (significance 2-tailed) 0.04 was lower than 0.05 ($p < 0.05$). However, related to the use of strategy 1 ($t_{calculation}$= 0.829 < t_{table} = 1.645, p= 0.41 > 0.05), strategy 2 ($t_{calculation}$= -0.666 < t_{table} = 1.645, p= 0.51 > 0.05) , strategy 3 ($t_{calculation}$= -0.741 < t_{table} = 1.645, p= 0.46 > 0.05 and strategy 6 ($t_{calculation}$= 0.392 < t_{table} = 1.645, p= 0.70 > 0.05), there were no significant differences between successful pronunciation learners and unsuccessful pronunciation learners since t calculation values at 36 degree of freedom were lower than t table values at the same degree of freedom.

4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Based on the data presented in Table 2 and considering the major strategies, it was revealed that advanced EFL learners utilized all these six major strategies (memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, affective and social strategies). These results were in line with other studies conducted in different conditions and with other subjects (Ellis and Sinclair 1989; O'Maley and Chamot 1991; Peterson 2000) and exhibited the great variability of strategies the learners applied in learning pronunciation.

Unlike the findings of the study conducted by Samalieva (1999) concerning twenty-nine strategies for learning pronunciation belonging to the three major categories– cognitive, metacognitive and social, the present study found that metacognitive strategies, affective strategies and compensation strategies were the most frequently used three major strategies by the subjects participating in this study. In literature, it has been indicated that suitably applied metacognitive strategies have been powerful for developing learners' performance. If learners do not possess the ability to manage and control via monitoring their progress and evaluate the outcome of their efforts to master the foreign language, they will not be able to apply their repertory of strategies when necessary since they will not know the need where and how to utilize these strategies Thus, the learners should have a rich set of

metacognitive strategies to go beyond the limits of problem solving situation (Samalieva 1999). To put it another way, as Brown (1987) states, 'learners should apply metacognitive strategies besides the cognitive strategies'. As for the least frequently used strategy in this research study, it was social strategies that were the least frequently used strategies in this study.

When taking sub-strategies into account, we noticed that self evaluating (strategy # 4B), which was a sub-strategy of the major metacognitive strategy, was the most frequently used pronunciation learning strategy by advanced EFL learners. However, cooperating with peers (strategy # 6B), which was a sub-strategy of the major social strategy, was the least frequently used pronunciation learning strategy by freshmen EFL learners.

The results of the independent samples t-test exhibited that there were significant differences between successful pronunciation learners and unsuccessful pronunciation learners in terms of two major strategies, which were S4 (Metacognitive strategy) and S5 (Affective – Using humor to lower anxiety). However, no significant differences were found between successful pronunciation learners and unsuccessful pronunciation learners in terms of four major strategies, which were S1 (Memory strategy), S2 (Cognitive strategy, S3 (Compensation strategy, S6 (Social strategy). As for the outcome of the analysis of sub-major strategies, it was seen that there were significant differences between successful pronunciation learners and unsuccessful pronunciation learners in terms of only one sub-major strategy, which was S4D (Self-evaluating strategy). However, no significant differences were seen between successful pronunciation learners and unsuccessful pronunciation learners in terms of other sub-major strategies.

REFERENCES

Beins, B.C. (2004). *Research methods: A Tool for Life.* Boston: Pearson.

Brown, H.D. (1987). *Principles in language teaching and learning.* Englewood Cliffs, Prentice Hall.

Brown, H.D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language.* New York: Longman.

Bruen, J. (2001). The parallel development of oral proficiency and use of language learning strategies. *Teaching German, 34(2),* 158-168.

Celce- Murcia, M., Brinton, D.M., & Goodwin, J.M. (1996). *Teaching pronunciation: A reference for teachers of English to speakers of other languages.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Chamot, A. U., & El-Dinary, P.B. (1999). Children's learning strategies in immersion classrooms. *The Modern Language Journal.* 83(3), 319-341.

Chamot, A. U., & Rubin, J. (1994). Comments on Janie Rees- Miller's 'A critical appraisal of learner training: Theoretical bases and teaching implications'. *TESOL Quarterly, 28,* 771-776.

Derwing, T.M., Munro, M.J., & Carbonaro, M. (2000). Does popular speech recognition software work with ESL speech? *TESOL Quarterly, 34(3),* 592-603.

Derwing, T.M., Munro, M.J., & Rossiter, M.J. (2002). Teaching native speakers to listen to foreign-accented speech. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development,* 23, 245-259.

Dörnyei, Z., & Skehan, P. (2003). Individual differences in L2 learning. In: Doughty, C. & Long, M. (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition.* Madlen, MA: Blackwell.

Eckstein, G. (2007). *A correlation of pronunciation learning strategies with spontaneous English pronunciation of adult ESL learners*. Unpublished M.A Thesis, Birmingham, Birmingham Young University.

El- Dib, M.A.B. (2004). Language learning strategies in Kuwait: links to gender, language level, and cultural in hybrid context. *Foreign Language Annals, 37,* 85-95.

Ellis, G. and B. Sinclair. (1989). *Learning to learn English: A course in learner training.* Cambridge: CUP.

Fan, M. Y. (2003). Frequency of use, perceived usefulness, and actual usefulness of second language vocabulary strategies: A study of Hong Kong learners. *Modern Language Journal, 87(2),* 222-241.

Heiman, G.W. (2001). Understanding research methods and statistics: An integrated introduction for psychology. 2nd edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Norton, B., & Toohey, K. (2001). Changing perspectives on good language learners. *TESOL Quarterly, 35(2),* 307-322.

O'Malley, J. and A.U, Chamot. (1991). *Learning strategies in second acquisition.* Cambridge: CUP.

Osburne, A. G. (2003). Pronunciation strategies of advanced ESOL learners. *IRAL, 41,* 131-143.

Oxford, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies.* Boston: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.

Peterson, S.S. (2000). *Pronunciation learning strategies: A first look.* Unpublished research report. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 450 599; FL 0 26 618).

Riney, T.J., & Flege, J.E. (1998). Changes over time in global foreign accent and liquid identifiability and accuracy. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 20,* 213-243.

Riney, T.J., Takada, M., & Ota, M. (2000). Segmentals and global foreign accent: The Japanese flap in EFL. *TESOL Quarterly, 34(4),* 711-737.

Samalieva, M. (1999). Learner strategies in learning a foreign language. Plovdiv University 'Paisii Hilendarski' Scientific Works, 1999 – Philology.

Sekaran, U. (2003). *Research methods for business: A skill- building approach.* 4th Edition. Singapore: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Tseng, W., Dörnyei, Z., & Schmitt, N. (2006). A new approach to assessing strategic learning: The case of self-regulation in vocabulary acquisition. *Applied Linguistics, 27*(1), 78-102.

Vitanova, G., & Miller, A. (2002). Reflective practice in pronunciation learning. *The Internet TESL Journal, 8*(1). Retrieved July 8, 2005, from: http://iteslj.org.

Genişletilmiş Özet

Bu çalışma Lefke Avrupa Üniversitesi İngilizce Öğretmenliği Bölümündeki İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen ileri düzeydeki öğrencilerin İngilizce telaffuzu öğrenmek ya da geliştirmek için kullandıkları strateji türlerini incelemeyi ve başarılı öğrencilerin telaffuz stratejileri ile başarısız öğrencilerin telaffuz stratejileri arasında anlamlı bir farkın olup olmadığını bulmayı amaçlamaktadır. Telaffuz öğrenme stratejileri üzerine yapılmış araştırmalara değindikten sonra, çalışma telaffuz öğrenme stratejisi kavramını tanımlamakta, farklı araştırmacıların telaffuz öğrenme stratejilerini nasıl betimlediklerini sunmakta ve bir araştırmanın sonuçlarını sergilemektedir.

Lefke Avrupa Üniversitesi İngilizce Öğretmenliği Bölümünde öğrenim gören otuz sekiz öğrenci bu araştırmaya katılmıştır. Deneklerin seçimi cinsiyet ve ırk dikkate alınmadan yapılmıştır. Deneklerin yaşı 18 ile 25 arasında olup, 38 denekten 10'u erkek öğrencidir. Otuz sekiz öğrenci 2009-2010 Akademik Yılı Bahar döneminde ELT 176 Dinleme ve Sesletim II adlı dersi almışlardır.

Bu araştırmada kullanılan ana veri toplama aracı Telaffuz Stratejileri anketidir. Bu anket deneklerin sezgisel olarak hangi sıklıkta telaffuz öğrenme stratejilerini kullandıklarını ölçmek amacıyla tasarlanmıştır. Kullanılan diğer bir araç ise, 2009-2010 Akademik Yılı Bahar dönemi sonunda öğretmen tarafından öğrencilere verilen final sınavından elde edilen telaffuz puanlarıdır.

Araştırmada toplanan veriler Sosyal Bilimler için hazırlanmış olan İstatistiksel Paket (SPSS 16 sürümü) kullanılarak çözümlenmiştir. Bu araştırma için demografik değişkenler ayrı kısımlardan oluşan (isimsel ve sıra gösteren) veriler olduğu için frekansları, yüzdeleri, ortalamayı ve standart sapmayı göstermek için betimsel istatistikler kullanılmıştır.

İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen ileri düzeydeki öğrencilerin İngilizce telaffuzlarını geliştirmek amacıyla hangi stratejileri kullandıkları ile ilgili soruya ankete katılan deneklerin verdikleri cevaplar, deneklerin altı ana stratejinin hepsini (hafıza, bilişsel, telafi, bilişötesi, duyuşsal ve sosyal stratejiler) belirli bir ölçüde kullandıklarını göstermiştir. Bununla birlikte, altı ana strateji türünden, deneklerin çoğunluğu İngilizce telaffuzlarını geliştirmek için 2.85 ortalama ile (SD=0.10) bilişötesi stratejileri kullandıklarını bildirmişlerdir. Bilişötesi stratejilerine ait dört alt sınıftan İngilizce Öğretmenliği Bölümündeki öğrenciler tarafından en çok sıklıkla kullanılan telaffuz öğrenme stratejisi 3.45 ortalama ile (SD=0.20) kendini değerlendirme stratejisi olmuştur. Bu durum, deneklerin telaffuzlarını dinlemek için seslerini kaydetme taktiğini kullandıklarını göstermektedir. Bununla birlikte, denekler tarafından en az sıklıkla kullanılan telaffuz öğrenme stratejisi 2.54 ortalama ile (SD=0.10) amaçlar ve hedefler belirleme stratejisi olmuştur. Bu durum, deneklerin öğrenmelerini amaç dilin özel sesleri üzerine odaklandırmaya, amaç dilin seslerini (ya da alfabesini) ezberlemeye ve dinlemelerini amaç dilin özel sesleri üzerine odaklandırmaya karar verdiklerini göstermiştir.

Bu bölümdeki önemli olan diğer bir bulgu, deneklerin bir çoğunun İngilizce telaffuzlarını geliştirmek için 2.79 ortalama ile (SD=0.18) duyuşsal stratejileri kullandıklarını vurgulamalarıdır. Bu durum, deneklerin kaygıyı azaltmak amacıyla mizah kullanmaya ve ilgili telaffuz taktiği olarak yanlış sesletimleri ile ilgili mizah anlayışına sahip olmaya önem verdiklerini göstermiştir.

Bu bölümdeki en göze çarpan sonuç, çok az sayıda deneğin İngilizce telaffuzlarını geliştirmek amacıyla sosyal stratejileri 2.28 ortalama ile (SD=0.13) kullanmaları olmuştur. Bu durum deneklerin başkasından yardım isteme (M=2.28, SD=0.17) ve sınıf arkadaşları ile işbirliği yapma (M=2.26, SD=0.15) gibi telaffuz öğrenme stratejilerine ve bu stratejiler ile ilgili başka birisinden telaffuzlarını

düzeltmesini isteme, başka birisinden bir sözcüğü telaffuz etmesini isteme, sınıf arkadaşları ile çalışma ve sınıf arkadaşlarına telaffuz öğretme gibi taktiklere önem vermediklerini göstermiştir.

Araştırmanın ikinci sorusu olan başarılı öğrencilerin kullandıkları telaffuz öğrenme stratejileri ile başarısız öğrencilerin kullandıkları telaffuz öğrenme stratejileri arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir farkın olup olmadığını bulmak için bağımsız iki örneklem t-testleri kullanılmıştır.

T-testi sonuçlarına göre, strateji 4'ü (bilişötesi stratejileri) kullanma ile bağıntılı olarak, başarılı öğrenciler ile başarısız öğrenciler arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir fark bulunmuştur. 36 serbestlik derecesinde t hesap değerinin aynı serbestlik derecesindeki 1.645 olan t tablo değerinden büyük olması (t_{hesap}= -2.918 > t_{tablo} = 1.645) ve sig. (significance 2-tailed) değeri olan 0.00'ın testi yaptığımız 0.05'lik yanılgı payından küçük olmasından dolayı (p = 0.00 < 0.05) başarılı öğrencilerin kullandıkları telaffuz öğrenme stratejileri ile başarısız öğrencilerin kullandıkları telaffuz öğrenme stratejileri arasında anlamlı bir fark olmadığı ile ilgili H_o – yokluk hipotezi reddedilmiştir.

Aynı biçimde, strateji 4D'ü (bilişötesi- kendini değerlendirme) kullanma ile ilgili olarak, başarılı öğrenciler ile başarısız öğrenciler arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir fark bulunmuştur. 36 serbestlik derecesinde t hesap değerinin aynı serbestlik derecesindeki 1.645 olan t tablo değerinden büyük olması (t_{hesap}= -3.071 > t_{tablo} = 1.645) ve sig. (significance 2-tailed) değeri olan 0.00'ın testi yaptığımız 0.05'lik yanılgı payından küçük olmasından dolayı (p = 0.00 < 0.05) başarılı öğrencilerin kullandıkları telaffuz öğrenme stratejileri ile başarısız öğrencilerin kullandıkları telaffuz öğrenme stratejileri arasında anlamlı bir fark olmadığı ile ilgili H_o – yokluk hipotezi reddedilmiştir.

Benzer biçimde, strateji 5 (Duyuşsal – Kaygıyı azaltmak için mizah kullanma) ile ilgili olarak, başarılı öğrenciler ile başarısız öğrenciler arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir fark bulunmuştur. 36 serbestlik derecesinde t hesap değerinin aynı serbestlik derecesindeki 1.645 olan t tablo değerinden büyük olması (t_{hesap}= -2.044 > t_{tablo} = 1.645) ve sig. (significance 2-tailed) değeri olan 0.04'ün testi yaptığımız 0.05'lik yanılgı payından küçük olmasından dolayı (p = 0.04 < 0.05) başarılı öğrencilerin kullandıkları telaffuz öğrenme stratejileri ile başarısız öğrencilerin kullandıkları telaffuz öğrenme stratejileri arasında anlamlı bir fark olmadığı ile ilgili H_o – yokluk hipotezi reddedilmiştir.

Diğer taraftan, strateji 1 (Hafıza) (t_{hesap}= 0.829 < t_{tablo} = 1.645, p= 0.41 > 0.05), strateji 2 (Bilişsel) (t_{hesap}= -0.666 < t_{tablo} = 1.645, p= 0.51 > 0.05) , strateji 3 (Telafi) (t_{hesap}= -0.741 < t_{tablo} = 1.645, p= 0.46 > 0.05 and strateji 6 (Sosyal) (t_{hesap}= 0.392 < t_{tablo} = 1.645, p= 0.70 > 0.05) ile ilgili olarak, 36 serbestlik derecesinde t hesap değerleri aynı serbestlik derecesindeki 1.645 olan t tablo değerinden düşük olması sebebiyle, başarılı öğrencilerin kullandıkları telaffuz öğrenme stratejileri ile başarısız öğrencilerin kullandıkları telaffuz öğrenme stratejileri arasında anlamlı bir fark olmadığı saptanmıştır.