WHAT IS MEANT BY COMMUNICATIVENESS IN EFL TEACHING?

AN EVALUATION OF THE PRONUNCIATION COMPONENT IN A

SAMPLE OF ELEMENTARY LEVEL COURSE MATERIALS,

WITH PROPOSALS FOR IMPROVEMENT INCORPORATING A

DISCOURSE INTONATION APPROACH.

by

SEAN BANVILLE

A dissertation submitted to the
School of Humanities
of the University of Birmingham
in part fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Teaching English as a Foreign or Second Language (TEFL/TESL)

This dissertation consists of approximately 13,273 words

Supervisor: John Gosling

Centre for English Language Studies
Department of English
University of Birmingham
Edgbaston, BIRMINGHAM B15 2TT
United Kingdom

September, 2003

ABSTRACT

Pronunciation has traditionally been a skill sidelined from communicative activities in EFL materials, with a segmental, knowledge-oriented and declarative approach being prescribed at articulatory and prosodic levels. Discourse, communication and sociolinguistic rules of use have still to be adopted in coursebooks depriving learners of phonological choice and interactive opportunity. This paper seeks to determine the communicativeness of pronunciation activities in fourteen elementary-level courses, and recommend how a Discourse Intonation approach can advance communicative pronunciation. A range of criteria evaluated whether prescribed activities met conditions for communicative competence and performance; which constituents of communication were evident; whether language was segmentally, prosodically or meaning-based; and the degree to which pronunciation was integrated and interactive, especially with listening. It was found that the vast majority of materials were mechanically taught using bottom-up audiolingual strategies containing minimal communication or meaning. There was an overriding concern for segmentally-based linguistic form rather than discoursal function. Recommendations are made for an industry-wide refocus of emphasis towards communicative pronunciation, and for Discourse Intonation to expedite the exploitation of present materials via a simple paradigm shift towards a phonological focus on choice, meaning and interaction. Learners should consequently experience concomitant increases in communicative competence, and teachers in pedagogical awareness.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

DEDICATION

For my father, John, for lighting a flame.

CONTENTS

CONTENTS OF TABLES

TABLE	TITLE	PAGE

INTRODUCTION

> Language materials have in the past been largely derived from the products of theoretical sentence grammars. We now need materials which derive from a description of discourse: materials which will effect the transfer from grammatical competence ... to what has been called communicative competence.
>
> (Widdowson, 1979b, p.50)

Widdowson's observation is still highly relevant today with structural and declarative knowledge-based approaches to teaching predominant at all levels of syllabus. Minimal regard is afforded phonological choice or potential within the processes of interaction and meaning creation. I contend that although communication is an ostensibly fundamental aim of coursebooks, neither communicativeness nor recognized elements of communicative language teaching is realized in pronunciation materials. Goodwin et als.' (1994) assessment of pronunciation being peripheralized, as "an additional item to be taught when time and syllabus considerations permit" (p14), is pervasive and pertinent.

This paper will try to define 'communicativeness' and evaluate its role in the pronunciation component of fourteen elementary-level courses (Appendix A) used in my English language school. As best-sellers in Japan, these should reflect current practice. I will propose how Discourse Intonation (Brazil et al.,1980, Brazil,1994,1997) (henceforth DI) can be used to improve communicativeness, integrate pronunciation, and greater expedite communicative competence. Its balanced theories of language and learning provide a linguistic and sociolinguistic pedagogic framework, underpinned by intonation, which focus on interaction, contextually-used language, and the meaningful phonological choices which create ongoing discourse.

Chapters One to Four provide the basis for the evaluation criteria in determining what is required for communicativeness. Chapter One outlines the evolving definitions of communicativeness, and communicative competence and performance. I urge a greater recognition of the latter, as it is in this context in which rules of use are tested and applied. An outline of DI, and the tone unit (the building block of speech in DI), is also provided.

Chapter Two outlines components of Canale's (1983) model of communication, which incorporate standard elements of communicative language teaching, i.e. negotiated meaning, pairwork, unpredictability, context, feedback, authenticity, purpose, and outcome. I contend that present mechanical formats of instruction provide little opportunity for consciousness-raising and choice to facilitate communication.

Chapter Three focuses on the theory of language in pronunciation, in particular the segmental/suprasegmental balance, and how representative it is of speech used in and needed for real-world communication. I contend that DI better reflects pronunciation as a dynamic component of conversational fluency than the unitary systems common to materials.

Chapter Four recommends integrated pronunciation teaching to expedite communicative pronunciation throughout the syllabus, especially through listening and comprehensible input. I will show how pronunciation presentations are non-engaging, isolated and decontextualized, depriving learners of additional modes of learning.

Chapter Five summarizes the glossy back cover claims made by publishers towards communication and pronunciation. It highlights a considerable number

of discrepancies between the 'advertising' and the often misinformed linguistic and pedagogic theory underpinning materials.

Chapter Six outlines the evaluation criteria and describes the YES/NO mechanism used for the 327 evaluated activities. Chapter Seven presents my findings and highlights pertinent trends. Examples are taken from coursebooks to support my findings.

Chapter Eight discusses and recommends broad proposals regarding how the ELT industry and DI can meet students and teachers communicative needs. In particular, how DI can increase intelligibility, communicative opportunity and integration within the syllabus.

The Conclusion argues that in the 21st century, with its increasing technologically driven demands for a greater salience on oral communication, it is essential for pronunciation to be presented through real-world discourse. There is an urgent need to abandon time-worn methodologies and empower students in making choices with pronunciation that truly communicate. Changed perceptions of the role of learners and teachers is necessary to expedite this.

Chapter One - "COMMUNICATIVENESS" AND COMPETENCE

1.1 Mythical terminology

'Communicativeness' is a widely used word, often signifying rather vague notions. Ellis (1982) states the term "has no clearly understood and received meaning" (p.73). Similarly, 'communicative competence' is a concept still evolving in definition towards recognizing language use, following its solidly linguistic background. To avoid the multifarious "myths" surrounding these terms, we must "clarify which version of 'communicative' is being referred to" (Johnson,1996.p.173), and determine what constitutes competence. Allwright's (1979) succinct enquiry "Are we teaching *language* (for communication)? *or* Are we teaching *communication* (via language)?" (p.167) centralizes this critical issue.

1.2 Communicative competence

In answer to Allwright, it is probable that both are essential. Richards and Rogers (1986) assert "communicativeness involves acknowledging the interdependence of language and communication" (p.66). However, materials have traditionally focused on the first concept, that linguistic knowledge is central to communication. Chomsky (1956), Hymes (1971), Canale and Swain (1980) and Canale (1983) all separated knowledge and actual use. Unlike Chomsky, who posited that knowledge of grammar alone was sufficient, Hymes recognized a sociolinguistic importance, stating "There are rules of use without which the rules of grammar would be useless" (in Brumfit and Johnson,1979.p15). Canale's assertion that a primarily knowledge-oriented focus is "an exercise in futility and frustration [which fails] to help learners to master the necessary skills in using knowledge" (1983,p.15) advanced a more interactive model, inclusive of discoursal and strategic competencies. However,

he excluded performance, assuming preparation to communicate rather than communication, or "actual use" (p.5), constituted competence,

> the main goal is to prepare and encourage learners to exploit in an optimal way their limited communicative competence in the second language in order to participate in actual communication.

> (1983, p.17)

Conversely, Halliday (1973) highlighted the functional importance of language, recognizing knowledge (or potential ability), and use (actualised potential) as being interdependent. This accords with Krashen and Terrell's (1983) Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis, which recognized two separate processes, that of learning, through conscious studying; and acquisition, through the subconscious processes of comprehending language "that is a little beyond our current level of (acquired) competence" (p.32). Here knowledge and learning, and use and acquisition can be viewed as the separable components of communicative competence as defined by Chomsky, Hymes and Canale. Widdowson's (1978) assertion that acquisition of communicative competence is "the ultimate aim in language learning" (p.67), necessitates reconciling these distinctions for practical classroom purposes. Widdowson usefully and pertinently recognized that communicative competence is

> not a list of learnt items, but a set of strategies or procedures 'for realizing the value of linguistic elements in contexts of use'

> (1979a, p.248)

1.3 Communicative performance

Communication has become fully accepted as an essential and major component of the

> 'product' of language teaching, but it has not yet been given more than a token place, as an essential and major component of the 'process'. A logical extension of the argument would suggest that if communication is THE aim, then it should be THE major element in the process.
>
> (Allright, 1979, p.167)

Allright's call for the centrality of performance is fundamental to teaching language communicatively. Brown (1994) recognizes "students' eventual need to apply classroom learning to heretofore unrehearsed contexts in the real world" (p29). Materials need to provide the contexts in which knowledge and use, or learning and acquisition can be tested, applied and evaluated, as Ellis recognized,

> Communicative opportunity is both necessary and sufficient for acquisition to take place; the contribution of language teaching materials must be to provide this.
>
> (1982, p.75)

Performance identifies for learners how pronunciation and successful communication are mutually dependent, through breakdowns in communication. These create immediate, focused and relevant teaching opportunities to "bring students to the point where they can utilize the outside world" (Krashen,1982.p.183). Similarly, Widdowson urges learners

> do the things they will recognize as purposeful ... and have some resemblance to what they use their own language to do
>
> (1990, p.160)

This combination of competence (knowledge) and performance is termed "communicative performance" by Canale and Swain, or "the realization of competencies and their interaction in the actual production and comprehension of utterances" (1980,p.6). They succinctly encapsulate the essence of

communicativeness,

> The primary objective of a communication-oriented second language programme must be to provide learners with the information, practice, and much of the experience needed to meet their communicative needs in the second language.
>
> (*ibid*, p.28)

Performance also necessitates intelligible pronunciation, also essential to communicative competence (Morley,1987). This provides clear interactive goals and requires actual use. Pennington (1996) states "no communication can take place without a certain level of mutual intelligibility" (p.220). Celce-Murcia et al. (1996) cite evidence indicating a threshold level of phonological competence, below which intelligibility and communication will suffer regardless of grammatical and lexical proficiency.

1.4 Discourse Intonation and communication

1.4.1 The tone unit

This is recognized within DI as being the smallest block of meaningful speech, evident in all spoken English. It is guided by consciously-selected variations in prominence, tone, key and termination, which are subject to differing placement, length, amplitude and pitch movement containing communicative significance. Brazil (1994) categorizes the tone unit as follows

> Each tone unit of ordinary speech has either **one** or **two prominent syllables**.
> The last prominent syllable in each tone unit is also a **tonic syllable**. The tonic syllable is the place at which the significant pitch movement or tone begins.
>
> (p.8)

For elementary-level students a focus on prominence and two of the five tones in

DI, the fall-rise (*referring*) tone, symbol *r*, and the falling, *proclaiming* tone, symbol *p*, is sufficient. These are the most frequent tones in speech (Brazil,1997) and represent the degree of shared contextual understanding between speakers within each movement of discourse. This is manageable and empowers students at this level of ability. Brazil states they are personalized and not grammatical nor attitudinal choices.

> Tone choice … is not dependent on linguistic features of the message, but rather on the speaker's assessment of the relationship between the message and the audience. On the basis of this assessment he makes moment by moment decisions to *refer* to sections of his message as part of the existing common ground or to *proclaim* them as an addition to it. We must stress that tone choice depends solely on *speaker's assessment* and not on any real world 'truth'.

<div align="right">(Brazil et al., 1980.p.18)</div>

An example from Brazil (1997) highlights the meaning of contrasting tones

(1) //when I've finished Middlemarch//I shall read Adam Bede//

(2) //when I've finished Middlemarch//I shall read Adam Bede//

> we can confidently say that example (1) is addressed to someone who is expected to know already that the speaker is reading *Middlemarch*, but to whom the speaker's future intentions are an item of news. In example (2), on the other hand, the question of the speaker's reading *Adam Bede* has already arisen in some way and he is offering information about when he will read it.

<div align="right">(Brazil et al.1980.p.14)</div>

Prominence consists of syllables deliberately highlighted for their communicative significance. Brazil (1994) states there is no "immediately simple way of telling learners what they should do when prominence is needed

(p.11) but highlights its greater communicative salience over citational word form.

1.4.2 Discourse competence

Discourse competence combines linguistic form and meaning to achieve comprehensible speech. Widdowson (1979a) asserts that for a communicative approach to be fully functional, "it is discourse which must be at the centre of our attention" (p.254). Halliday (1985) describes the variables present within ever-evolving discourse,

> Once conversation starts, a new element is added: each new step defines the environment afresh. The meaning of whatever is said is 'with respect' to what has gone before. The process is a stochastic one: the probabilities are reset at each boundary, and the linguistic resources regrouped to face the new situation

(p.58)

DI places pronunciation at the heart of discourse, recognizing the dynamic, interrelated and proleptic nature of communication. It combines observation, analysis, and practice of language in use in recognizing the significance of how consciously-chosen phonological variations represent "*meaningful* choices" (Brazil.1994.p.16). These highly personalized and context-specific choices operate within intonational (tone) units of communication and underpin the process of negotiated meaning. Each tone unit represents a further increment of shared contextual understanding along the stream of speech and embody moment-by-moment and ongoing functional choices regarding that language deemed most salient. Brazil's aim is

> to show that a small set of either/or choices can be identified and related to a set of

> meaning oppositions that together constitute a distinctive sub-component of the
> meaning-potential of English

<div align="right">(1997, p.2)</div>

DI seems to reconcile and accommodate Chomsky's knowledge-based focus with Hymes' sociolinguistic rules of use, Halliday's actualised potential, and Krashen and Terrell's Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis. Its balanced pedagogical theory combines exposure to comprehensible contextual input, student collaboration, consciousness-raising, rule-abstraction and performance. Complementarily, linguistic theory focuses on the significance of form and its primary functions in organizing the very structure of speech.

DI has few detractors. Although Jenkins (2000) states it only provides "important descriptive and explanatory information about 'native speaker' pronunciation" (p.154), and that inexplicably, "it is not teachable" (*ibid*), she incorporates many of its themes within her own philosophy. DI is widely recognized as a user-friendly, consistent and simple system, particularly important for elementary-level students. Cauldwell and Hewings highlight its versatile and comprehensive nature, as

> a 'window on speech' ... a way of observing speech which attends to speech on its own terms; real-time encoding and decoding; tone units, not sentences; variable, not fixed word-shapes of words; tones, pitch-height and pauses not punctuation.

<div align="right">(1996a, p.49)</div>

Underhill (1994) asserts "its orientation is simple and workable … to provide … manageable and useful class learning activities" (p93). Dalton and Seidlehofer (1994) attest to its simplicity in utilizing a limited set of choices which do not

<div align="center">18</div>

"overwhelm learners with a plethora of minute distinctions" (p86). In practical terms they state it overcomes widely-felt teacher concerns regarding an inverse relationship between the communicative importance of intonation and its teachability. Miyauchi's (2001) use of DI with Japanese school students found that

> the contextual meanings and functions of the proclaiming/referring tones seems to be very easily grasped by both teachers and learners.

(p.14)

Likewise, Cauldwell and Allan (1997) reported students motivated by their discovery that speech was "packaged in tone units" (p.10).

Chapter Two - PRONUNCIATION AND COMMUNICATION

2.1 The separation of pronunciation from communication

> Pronunciation – like grammar, syntax, and discourse organization – communicates
>
> (Beebe, 1978, p.3)

Despite this insight being universally accepted in the Literature, pronunciation is still isolated from communication in materials, where an accumulated entities approach largely concerning sounds and vocabulary overrides attention to interaction. Pennington and Richards highlight this folly of treating pronunciation as incidental to communication,

> It is artificial to divorce pronunciation from communication and from other aspects of language use, for sounds are a fundamental part of the process by which we communicate and comprehend lexical, grammatical, and sociolinguistic meaning .
>
> (1986, p.208)

They stress the importance of reconciling referential meaning with "the interfactional dynamics of the communication process" (*ibid*). Grant (1995) maintains a "gap" exists between communicative principles and materials which is "most apparent in the area of pronunciation" (p.118). Celce-Murcia et al. agree,

> Proponents of a communicative approach have not dealt adequately with the role of pronunciation in language teaching, nor have they developed an agreed-upon set of strategies for teaching pronunciation communicatively.
>
> (1996, p.8)

2.2 Canale's components of communication

Canale (1983) describes seven elements of communication,

> [1] the continuous evaluation and negotiation of meaning on the part of the participants [2] ... social interaction ... [3] a high degree of unpredictability and creativity in form and message ... [4] clues as to correct interpretations of utterances ... [5] a purpose ... [6] authentic language and [7] success being judged on the basis of actual outcomes
>
> (pp.3-4)

These should be essential components in materials to expedite communicative competence and form criteria for this evaluation.

2.2.1 "the continuous evaluation and negotiation of meaning on the part of the participants":

Brazil (1994) affirms that "[e]ven in a pronunciation course ... meaning has to be the starting point" (p16). Dalton and Seidlehofer assert pronunciation is "a means to negotiate meaning in discourse" (1994, p.ix). Ellis (1982) stresses for meaning to arise communication "must be *negotiated* rather than *predetermined*" (p.75). Richards and Rogers (1986) state "Language that is meaningful to the learner supports the learning process" (p.72) and aids acquisition. Brazil et al. (1980) state this is created through shared understanding

> All interaction proceeds and can only proceed on the basis of the existence of a great deal of *common ground* between the participants.
>
> (p.14)

Breakdowns in this understanding requires communication to be repaired in real time, or analyzed collaboratively later. Jenkins states that

> even at the level of pronunciation, intelligibility is dynamically negotiable between speaker and listener, rather than statically inherent in a speaker's linguistic forms…

2.2.2 **"social interaction":** Morley's assessment that pronunciation is an "integral part of, not apart from, oral communication" (1987, preface), and Ellis' recognition of language as "a form of social activity" (1982,p.73), embody communicativeness. Central to achieving this is collaboration, which Stern (1992) urges frequent use of, "not just for an occasional communicative activity" (p.180). This is necessary to avoid what Johnson (1979) describes as "communicative incompetence" (p.194). Richards and Rogers state "activities in which language is used for carrying out meaningful tasks promote learning" (1986.p.72). DI gets students to 'do things' with language together by analyzing the product of social interaction and then engaging in the process of performance. An introduction at elementary level can occur through the predictable and conventional routines of phatic communion. These 'intonational idioms' have genuine communicative value and can encourage pragmatic social interaction with simultaneous attention to intonation.

2.2.3 "a high degree of unpredictability and creativity in form and message": By definition, communication is an unpredictable and creative process, driven by choice. Allen (1971) laments the stifling of this creativity by audiolingual techniques,

> too often … there is little carryover into the students' own conversations outside the classroom … mimicry needs to be supplemented by insight into the link between stress and meaning, especially where discourse is concerned.
>
> (pp. 78-9)

Pedagogy seems little changed, with widespread consensus, that coursebooks provide few choices or unpredictability. Ellis (1998) laments that

what is said by the learners is controlled at every point by the book [and needs to] be complemented by real choice

(p.41).

Ideational, cognitive and propositionally-based language is replaced by structural forms largely decontextualized, predetermined and contrived for display purposes. Candlin (1994) observes language "remain[s] the convenient property of the textbook ... unreal and inauthenticatable objects for display and empty acquisition" (p.viii). Xiaoju (1984) found prescribed answers to questions, 'correct' responses to pattern drills; and the recitation of pre-written dialogues masquerading as 'conversation practice'. This is disabling for learner-choice when attempting to personalize language and communicate. DI focuses on the contrasting choices available to the speaker which are context-specific, and pivotal to prediction and meaning creation. Halliday (1973) calls this concept of selection "meaning potential" (p.27),

… sets of options, alternatives, in meaning, that are available to the speaker-hearer… sets of options representing what the speaker 'can do'…   can mean -

(*ibid*, p.29)

This variability in speech requires ongoing decisions to be made regarding prominence and tone. Brazil (1997) illustrates this as an "existential paradigm" (p.23) that central to choice and prediction is a "set of possibilities that a speaker can regard as actually available in a given situation" (p.23). A simple example of binary choice follows regarding direction,

The existing state of speaker-listener understanding determines whether each successive word **selects** one possibility from a number of them, or whether there is effectively no

choice. The procedure can be seen at work in

//in the FIRST street on the <u>LEFT</u>//

<div align="right">(1997, p.28)</div>

2.2.4 "clues as to correct interpretations of messages":   Contextual clues are essential to negotiating discourse to anticipate and deal "proleptically with aspects of the interaction, not just in retrospect" (McCarthy & Carter, 1994,p.178). Johnson warns against 'non-instrumental language teaching' (1979,p.200), whereby language is divorced from context thus removing the clues intrinsic to creating shared understanding. Brazil illustrates a context-specific situation whereby prominence provides the clues to which the listener responds with a mutually conclusive answer,

    (23)   Q: What heart did you play?   R: //the <u>QUEEN</u> of hearts//

    (24)   Q: Which queen did you play?   R: //the queen of <u>HEARTS</u>//

<div align="right">(1997, p.22)</div>

Brazil (1994) states context is also important at the phonemic level,

> the treatment of particular sounds can be more easily appreciated, and their execution more easily practised, if they are set in the context of a communicative utterance whose intonation we are able to take into account.

<div align="right">(p.2)</div>

Realistic contexts are essential with performance to subconsciously acquire or consciously experiment with these phonemic clues. While classrooms can provide this, it seems prescriptive materials cannot.

2.2.5 "a purpose":

> The emphasis is not upon pronouncing words, or even sentences. It is rather upon

speaking language *which is carrying a message,* and doing so in some situation in which that message matters to both speaker and listener.

<div align="right">(Brazil, 1994, p.4)</div>

Brazil's description of purposeful communication is essential to communicativeness. Bradford (1988) describes this as the "pragmatic use of linguistic forms to convey meanings in spoken discourse" (p.2). Motivation is central to communication, thus materials must prioritize it. Johnson (1979) states listeners cannot "approach interactions in a state of readiness [unless provided] with a speaker aim (a communicative intent)" (p.200). DI highlights how phonological decisions are made in contextualized, purpose-driven speech, at the phonemic and prosodic levels. This requires exposure to authentic language, or communicative tasks as the context-specificness of purpose indicates it cannot be learnt.

2.2.6 "authentic language": Authenticity is a fundamental construct of communicative language teaching, being central to interaction and spontaneity in spoken language. Although coursebook material is largely artificial, it can still be illustrative. Marks (1999) states 'artificial' devices can increase salience and accessibility to language for learners. However, overly-contrived, unrealistic language can be unhelpful and misleading. Guariento and Morley (2001) warn many coursebooks "make recourse to simplification with a haste that is often undignified" (p.348). Conversely, Jenkins (2000) asserts that dissimilatory processes, whereby speakers subordinate their speech strategies to accommodate hearers' needs through clearer articulation, may actually aid hearer perception. This could, however, distort discoursal features key to meaning and put at a communicative disadvantage learners who later experience

authentic speech. Brown (1990) states,

> It is … essential that, as soon as the student begins to be capable of understanding quite small pieces of structured English, he should be exposed to some English as it is normally spoken. Otherwise he will learn to rely on un-English signals and he will have no reason to learn English signals.
>
> (p.159)

The main concern with authentic texts is to maintain those features which highlight meaning. The simplicity of DI may allow elementary learners to recognize the 'English' signals to understand authentic texts previously considered too difficult and thus accelerate learning.

2.2.7 **"success being judged on the basis of actual outcomes":** 'Actual outcomes' entails the utilizing of phonological variations and decisions alone to successfully complete communicative tasks. Gilbert (1984) provides a clear example of this, using arithmetical sums which need to be divided into intonational groups,

> *Examples* $(2 + 3) \times 5 = 25$
> two plus three times five equals twenty-five
> $2 + (3 \times 5) = 17$
> two plus three times five equals seventeen
>
> (SB, p.109)

Success could also be based on outcomes at the segmental level, through cognitive exercises. Listening for changes in tones, the placement of prominence, or the intervals between tone units, all represent achievable outcomes, considerably important at elementary level. The best feedback of success, is an achieved end, as seen in Gilbert's example. This incorporates all of the components of communication to varying degrees.

Chapter Three - REPRESENTATIVE LANGUAGE

3.1 Language for learning, or acquisition and use

The theory of language and its description intrinsically determines whether an approach is communicative or not. Krashen and Terrell's (1983) Acquisition-Leaning Hypothesis in which learning does not transfer to acquisition and is only used to self-monitor production, represents a paradoxical situation for coursebooks. A theory which prioritizes language as and for communication, in essence, cannot be confined within prescribed syllabi as this then becomes knowledge available only for learning. This then, suggests language in coursebooks can only be for learning. Hymes' 1971 assertion that "Modern linguistics ... takes structure as a primary end in itself, and tends to depreciate use" (p.8), and Brumfit and Johnsons' (1979) comparison of syllabi to "little more than ordered lists of structures" (p.7), both epitomize a declarative-based approach common in coursebooks. Phonemes, citationally-stressed words, contrived stress patterns, and intonation incorrectly assigned attitudinal and grammatical functions predominate.

The problems with this are outlined in the Literature. Munby (1978) outlines an "attitudinal-tone index" (pp.104-110) listing over 700 attitudes, which is clearly impractical for learning, and highlights the need for something as simple and workable as DI. Cauldwell and Hewings (1996b) argue coursebook rules on intonation are "inadequate as descriptions of what occurs in naturally occurring speech (p.327), even as generalizations, and "and allow us to describe only a fraction of intonation choices made in the language as a whole" (p.333). They recommend a discourse approach as a better model to allow learners to "understand the communicative significance of the patterns of intonation" (p.327).

Such language does not represent communication and is counter-productive to natural discourse and communicative aims. It presents little choice or potential actualization, and largely represents missed opportunities in the classroom. Stern's assessment seems apt,

> A great deal of time has been wasted on routine exercises and irrelevant language which have little purpose and which do not translate into real proficiency and application in language use.
>
> (1992, p.313)

DI prioritizes salient functional and contextual language, which is perhaps "more faithful to what language *is* and what people use it for" (McCarthy & Carter.1994.p.201).

3.2 Reprioritizing phonemes and segments

A reprioritization of phonemes and segments should provide a greater focus only on language which is universally salient or impedes intelligibility. Jenkins' (2000) proposal for a Lingua Franca Core attempts such to avoid the inefficient and linguistically questionable policy of presenting 'standard' phonemes and coarticulatory effects. A recognizable and pertinent example of this is the undue attention afforded the phonemes /ð/ and /θ/, which represent a high level of articulatory difficulty coincided with a low level of communicative salience, and are unlikely to be confused in context,

> the item is rarely learnt, regardless of the time spent on it in the classroom. Such items are irrelevant to EIL intelligibility, so learners are unlikely to be motivated to make the substantial effort required to master them
>
> (2000, p.120)

Other examples include /l/ and /r/, and /u/ and /u:/, which Brown (1995) documents in his account of phonemic functionality based on frequency of use. Brazil's treatment of sounds only when they occur in prominent syllables is pedagogically justifiable as it highlights communicative salience, within context and message. This seems more conducive to both effective learning (minus the checklist approach), and acquisition. This simultaneously allows individual interlanguages to develop independently. He provides an example as follows:

// we'd GOT to the TERminus //

He summarizes the significance of this prominence and the need to listen

> 'GOT' and 'TER-' demand special attention from the listener because ... they distinguish their words as representing significant selections. It is reasonable to suggest that the speaker's attention should be focused there, too. We therefore have a reason for beginning the business of 'listening to sounds' by concentrating on vowels and consonants that occur in such syllables.

(1997, p.24)

The focus on prominent syllables raises questions regarding the teaching weak forms, or reduced vowels. Brown (1990) says it is common for coursebooks to treat the reduced vowel (usually the schwa) as a fixed property. She stresses this is misleading and does not impart to students the communicative significance of non-prominence, nor when it can become prominent,

> It is important however to be clear that every instance of a grammatical word in an unstressed syllable need not be accompanied by vowel reduction.

(p.83)

An example of this is seen in the difference in meaning created by the prominence in 'them' in (1) and the non-prominence in (2) (prominent syllables are underlined:

(1)   I gave it to <u>them</u>   (i.e. I didn't give it to you.)
       aɪgeɪvɪtə<u>ðe</u>m
(2)   <u>I</u> gave it to them   (i.e. It wasn't John who gave it to them)
       <u>aɪ</u>geɪvɪtəðəm

At elementary level, recognizing this is both achievable, motivational and sound communicative teaching practice.

Brazil (1994) describes a contradiction of /ə/ being overtargeted by coursebooks, while in natural speech, its sound quality is because it is *not* targeted. He states that a focus on prominent syllables naturally makes weak forms less prominent by

> giving conscious attention to one aspect of pronunciation produces a result that is consistent with the requirements of the other.
>
> (p.7)

He does recommend beginners "need to be told about / ə/ and to practise it" (p.29). Jenkins argues, again inexplicably, that they are "unteachable" and that "learning rarely follows" (p.147). She places greater receptive importance on them, which is sensible given their difficulty of acquisition.

A further segmental priority which is key to prominence and comprehension, and conducive to learning and acquisition is vowel length. Brown states that for production, "*length* is the variable most students find easiest to control, and is a reliable marker of stress" (1990,p.46). Dalton and Seidlehofer (1994) agree, stating the most important and teachable function of intonation, "is the signalling of prominence achieved through a combination of pitch, loudness, and extra vowel length" (p.44). It is an effective focus for elementary-level students and an identifiable marker of choice.

3.3 Streamed speech, not citational misrepresentation

Primary attention should be afforded the streamed speech of natural language within communicative language teaching, rather than the citational or segmental language typical of many materials. Cauldwell (2002) warns how a citational form approach, sequences of "words bounded by pauses, stressed, with falling tones" (p.18), misrepresents speech and that "in pursuit of segmental accuracy, students practise disfluent speech" (*ibid*.p18). Such may arise from the deductive approaches of coursebooks which rely heavily on orthographic presentations. Cauldwell & Hewings (1996a) warn

> This misrepresentation may disable students from becoming good listeners and fluent speakers, as they expect to assemble and decode speech word by word.

(p.49)

Brazil highlights how language is not fixed, with an example demonstrating why citational word forms are only relevant when words are actually used,

deCISion

31

CONtro VERsial

the deCISion was controVERsial

a CON troversial de CIS ion

VERy controversial inDEED

a VERy controversial decision in DEED

The allocation of prominence to a word can be shown to be consistently the result of a speaker-decision over and above that which resulted in the choice of the particular lexical item

(1997, p.18)

An example of misrepresentation through learning, rather than acquisition through exposure, is evident with a coursebook overemphasis on contractions over blending (Hill & Beebe, 1980). Contractions are written, and described within industry-standard presentations of the sort below:

GRAMMAR
Present simple (2): *to be*

I'm (= I am)
you're (= you are)
he's (= he is) she's (= she is) it's (= it is)
we're (= we are)
they're (= they are)

(*Move Up* Students' Book A, P.5)

Although these are expected to be learnt, they are quite often neither acquired nor used. Contrarily, blending is far more common to spoken speech (Murphy, 1991), and creates more comprehension problems. Although they are more important to intelligibility, they are frequently overlooked by coursebooks.

Coarticulation presents further comprehension difficulties for students. The

debate is divided concerning which coarticulatory effects should be presented, and how, and whether these should be practised or observed. Brown (1990) argues for a lessened emphasis on production as "learner speech seldom meets the conditions for connected speech phenomena to occur naturally" (p.62). Likewise, Roach (1991) and Underhill (1994) question the communicative importance of relatively unimportant aspects, such as assimilation and juncture, which Dalton and Seidlhofer (1994) state are "painstakingly practised" (p.115). DI, with its emphasis on transcription as a learning tool, listening and analysis, would be truer to communicative values of focusing on those aspects which are personally difficult and therefore communicatively salient.

3.4 Stress and intonation

Suprasegmental problems are universally common and therefore universally affect intelligibility. Furthermore, their infinite variety makes them more experientially acquired than segmentals, which are more limited in number and generally systematically learnable, if not always acquired. Dirven & Oakeshott-Taylor (1984) state errors in suprasegmentals cause more miscommunication, and thus deserve greater precedence over segmentals

> In view of the fact that segmental information in the acoustic signal may well be of limited scope and reliability, it is of the greatest importance that the learner's attention is directed to non-segmental information
>
> (p.333)

Pennington (1996) too agrees that prosody should be addressed before minor points of articulation. Jenkins (2000) deems contrastive stress to be key to

making salient the speaker's intended meaning and the greatest threat to intelligibility if incorrectly placed. She states the system of free stress placement is unique to English as it compensates for

> the morphological or syntactic resources that many other languages have to highlight contrasts. … Any word, regardless of its syntactic position, can be given nuclear stress if it is the one which the speaker wishes to make the focus of her or his message
>
> (p.46)

Miyauchi similarly states this 'Englishness' is essential to interpret for his students who do not have similar systems of tonic highlighting or migratory prominence in Japanese,

> In order for Japanese learners of English to sustain oral/aural communication in English, it is not enough to know the exact meaning of every English word, but it seems crucial to share the prosodic knowledge of English… In this respect, DI should be treated more seriously as a priority to improve students' communicative skills.
>
> (2001, p.15)

Jenkins considers the rules for contrastive stress are readily learnable for students to

> 'carry around' with them and automatize as procedural knowledge [and] can be easily integrated receptively and productively into almost all classroom work.
>
> (2000, p.155)

However, she sensibly cautions

> Rules can be taught overtly, though with the caveat that it is not sufficient to tell students simply to stress the 'most important' word – they need help in working out how to identify this word
>
> (ibid. p.155)

However, coursebooks commonly instruct teachers to do the opposite,

Discuss with the class how it is the important words or parts of words in the sentence that are stressed, while the other sounds become weak.

(*Lifelines*, TB. p.90)

In balancing a polarized debate regarding segmental/suprasegmental importance, Brazil (1994) recognizes their interdependence as being "closely related ... to the end of the efficient communication which they serve" (p.2), and that work in one area supports and reinforces work in another. Brazil (1997) describes how pivotal and yet ephemeral intonation is to the process of meaning making

intonation choices carry information about the structure of the interaction, the relationship between and the discourse function of individual utterances, the interfactional "given-ness" and "newness" of information and the state of convergence and divergence of the participants.

(p.11)

Dalton and Seidlehofer identify stress as an area with maximum overlap of communicative importance and teachability, making it a convenient focal point

It is necessarily connected to either end of the continuum: on the segmental side, word-stress is decisive for the quality of individual sounds, on the intonation side, it signifies prominence.

(1994, p.74)

They assert the most obvious and perhaps most serious failure of coursebooks to correctly represent language is the lack of attention to intonation, which is "usually given short shrift, or left out altogether" (p75).

Chapter Four - INTEGRATEDNESS AND INTERACTIVENESS

4.1 Mis-integration

> It is frequently the case that the different sections of the basic formula in coursebooks
> have no principled connection with each other. Indeed, there is often considerable
> disparity between the differing sections.
>
> (Widdowson,1988.pp.145-6)

This seems to be the case for pronunciation, with its fragmented and piecemeal activities. Widdowson's recognition of non-integratedness needs to be heeded by coursebooks. Grant (2000) states that "the carry over from controlled practice into 'real-time' communication" (p77), represents a significant challenge in integrating pronunciation. Global integration is needed to expedite communicative pronunciation across all areas of the coursebook. Almost any elementary-level classroom activity can incorporate pronunciation, from listenings which highlight *r* and *p* tones; inflection within grammar exercises; the spelling-pronunciation relationship in writing; and discussions regarding the effect of prominence. Baker (1982) posited students should find it "difficult to say whether a particular lesson is a 'pronunciation' or a 'coursework' lesson" (p3). Pronunciation seems fundamentally suited for Firth's (1992) "zoom principle" in which there is

> a constantly shifting focus - from overall effectiveness of communication to a specific
> problem, to overall effectiveness of communication, and so on
>
> (p.173)

4.2 Listening

The role of pronunciation in listening is greatly understated and underutililized in coursebooks. Brown states it "is universally 'larger'" than speaking competence

> The importance of listening in language learning can hardly be overestimated. Through reception, we internalize linguistic information without which we could not produce language

> (1994, p.233)

A segmental approach is the coursebook norm, which means students are taught to "rely on acoustic signals which will be denied him when he encounters the normal English of native speakers" (Brown,1990,p.159) and will thus "experience a devastating diminution of phonetic information at the segmental level when they encounter normal speech." (*ibid*.p.60). Cauldwell and Hewings (1996a) welcome more integrated materials which guide listening for intonation, lamenting the misfortune that intonation "is usually seen to fall exclusively under the heading 'pronunciation' and outside the domain of 'listening comprehension'" (p.49). They claim DI provides a manageable and focused basis for "training students to become observers of naturally occurring speech" (*ibid*. p.49). Miyauchi's (2001) research concluded that

> teaching English prosodic systems and features, such as prominence, pitch movements and tone units, is effective as knowledge and techniques for Japanese high school students to improve their ability to listen to English connected speech as discourse.

> (2001, p.17)

Brazil stresses the importance of familiarization with recorded material to reduce the non-phonological burden of unknown vocabulary and grammar. Integrating other skills aids comprehension, which seems highly sensible for elementary level students,

> Its purpose is to engage students in some kind of verbal interchange about what they have heard. This will ensure that they are thoroughly involved with the content, that is

to say with *what* was being said, before they go on to attend to *how* it was said. One reason is that we do not normally attend consciously to the pronunciation of the language we hear or speak ... It is better, therefore, if students are not compelled to do it at the same time as they are having to cope with the quite demanding business of putting together or responding to what is being said. It is better if they have recent working experience of the vocabulary and also of the grammatical organization of the communicative event in question [which] is intended to give them a chance to make active use of as much of the language as possible and to be thoroughly at home with the content of that event, so that it has all become as 'automatic' as possible before they embark upon the much less natural business of listening for, and reproducing, particular sound patterns.

(1994, p.4)

Grant recognizes the difficulties of attending to dual tasks, which can destroy motivation at elementary level,

Simultaneously attending to the high-level cognitive processes involved in expressing a complicated line of thought and to the low-level processes involved in articulation is a difficult task

(1995, p.114)

4.3   Comprehensible input

Krashen and Terrell's (1983) Input Hypothesis whereby acquisition arises through the challenge of working to understand comprehensible input, "roughly tuned" (p.33) to a level of cognitive but achievable challenge, provides a worthy use for underutilized tapescripts and textbook content. Stern (1992) agrees, stating there cannot be opportunities for subconscious assimilation

if exposure to the target language is rigidly controlled and confined to what can be handled by the learner at the conscious level

(pp.179-80)

Holliday (1994) stresses all materials, should serve as comprehensible input,

communicating with the student, who is in the position of the receiver of the text, *in communication* with the producer of the text

Materials should thus allow students to broaden their knowledge of rules of use and subconsciously acquire sounds, patterns and language, though roughly-tuned input. Besides the linguistic element of materials, design and user-friendliness of layout also communicate, serving as additional sensory input. A variety of visual, aural, and kinesthetic devices should be employed to increase awareness of pronunciation and discourse. Gilbert (2001) provides excellent examples of this which may communicate more than the default/generic printing styles currently employed. She states visual representation aids learners whose spoken and written English is poor.

Extra-wide letters are used to show that strong (stressed) vowels last longer.

ban **a** na   (p.ix)

Diminishing letters are used to show how a continuant sound continues.

bussss   bellⅼⅼ   (p.ix)

What's your phonennnnumber   (p.104)

Brazil recognizes the essentiality of such aids to graphically represent units of communication,

transcription conventions are learning tools; and the attempt to transcribe is *first and foremost a learning activity*: there is no question of testing their ability to produce a perfectly accurate transcript.

(1994, p.6)

Bradford (1988) too recommends transcription to aid learner-independence, key at elementary level. She focuses on

the meaningful (phonological) contrasts … [which] represent a finite set of meaning

contrasts and are eminently learnable. … with this simple but comprehensive method of transcription, the learners have an analytical tool which they can use independently for discussion and study purposes.

<div align="right">(p.2)</div>

Chapter Five - WHAT THE TEXTBOOKS CLAIM

5.1   The 'advertising'

> It is the detailed syllabus specification, the target communicative competence, which constitutes the essence of what should be embodied in the course materials.

<div align="right">(Munby, 1978, p.4)</div>

This chapter summarizes back covers, contents and introduction pages (the 'advertising'), to provide an initial insight into the importance attributed to pronunciation as communication, and how communicative competence is embodies in the materials. This provides a yardstick against which the evaluation can be compared. Naturally there was great variation in this 'advertising'.

Two highly popular coursebooks with teachers (*First Impact* and *Fast Lane 2*) did not specify pronunciation anywhere in their syllabi, and were thus excluded from this evaluation, reducing the number of coursebooks to twelve. *English Express*, *Firsthand*, *Grapevine* and *True Colors* are recognized audiolingual courses, and therefore predictably more structural in methodology.

No coursebook claimed to be 'communicative' or proposed communication and pronunciation as a combined concept. A cursory glance at pronunciation would validate this. Liberal use of the terms 'communication' and 'interaction' was found in the advertising. These self-advertized merits were commonly highly inconsistent with actual content and methodology. This supports Ellis' (1982) assertion that "the vast majority of self-labelled 'communicative' courses do not adopt a truly 'communicative approach'" (p.77), and Richards and Rogers' claim of coursebooks being largely structural, "with slight reformatting to justify their

[communicative] claims" (p.79).

One course, *Matters*, advertised a tenuous pronunciation-communication link, encouraging students

> to *use* the language they've learned ... [and] Includes pronunciation work to give students confidence to communicate effectively in everyday situations
>
> (Back cover)

Pronunciation was non-existent in its 'Contents chart' except for 'word stress patterns' in the 'Hellos and goodbyes' introductory unit. This departure from its advertized sociolinguistic approach is explained:

> at this level pronunciation work should be integrated into learning grammar and vocabulary and should not be given a separate section. Students are therefore frequently asked to focus on sounds, stress and intonation as part of a sequence of activities.
>
> (TB.p.14)

The emphasis throughout this and all evaluated coursebooks seemed to be on the articulation and stress of vocabulary, "either as word repetition or in sentences", for students "to get the pronunciation right" (*ibid*. TB.p.12).

Two courses promoted communication and pronunciation independently. *Cutting Edge* promises "Everything you expect from a world-class course ... and more" (back cover) and "places a strong emphasis on pronunciation [which] is integrated into the sections which present new language" (TB.p.10). The Contents includes pronunciation under sub-headings for grammar, vocabulary, writing and 'functions and situations', but not under listening or 'Task and speaking', suggesting a peripheral and non-functional role. Two pages of

pronunciation tips, while correctly recognizing the importance of pronunciation on intelligibility at elementary level, did not stress interaction and rules of use.

Lifelines has "a pronunciation syllabus introducing sounds, stress and intonation" (back cover), and its contents prioritizes pronunciation as one of five main headings which outline a combination of segmentals and suprasegmentals in every unit. However, with three of fourteen lessons on suprasegmentals ('intonation in statements and Yes/No questions', 'intonation in *wh-* questions', and 'sentence stress'), it is doubtful there is any emphasis on extended discourse.

Five coursebooks made no claims to teach communication, but did mention pronunciation, albeit in checklist fashion. It was not listed as a "key feature" in *Move Up*, but the cassette "contains sounds work". This segmental approach is supported by the 'Map of the Book', in which pronunciation is listed in twelve units under 'Skills and sounds', with a wholly phonemic and word-stress focus. In antithesis to this, it proclaims

> The inclusion of each strand of the syllabus is justified by its communicative purpose within the activity sequence
>
> (TB, p.iv)

Unfortunately, this quote is as significant in its heuristic soundness as it is in its failure to be implemented. *American Headway* has "Pronunciation work ... integrated at appropriate points" (back cover), but offers no further methodological guidance. *Powerbase* claims to "practise essential listening and pronunciation skills" (back cover), again with no explanatory support for what is 'essential'.

Four coursebooks use the term 'communication', without reference to

'pronunciation'. *Clockwise* boasts "Clear communicative pay-offs in every lesson" (back cover); *True Colors* provocatively proclaims itself to be "An EFL Course for Real Communication" (back cover); *Grapevine* promised to be "an effective means to early communicative confidence", while *Firsthand* proclaims in bold that it "believes that **people learn English best by actually using English**" (TB.p.vi).

5.2   Beneath the blurbs

While the above *Firsthand* statement is unerringly true, pronunciation did not seem to be integrated into any natural language use in this or any of these courses. Rather, structural and decontextualized language predominated, which seems unlikely to be compatible with any outline for 'communicativeness' made in the above chapters. A closer look between the covers reveals Ellis', and Richards and Rogers' earlier claims may be accurate. A propensity for prescribed form and predetermined discourse seemed to be the basis for pronunciation activities, in antithesis to its function within communication. An audiolingual metalanguage was ubiquitous. *Move Up* embodies this with a startling linguistic ignorance demonstrated by writers in most courses,

> Pronunciation, stress, and intonation work tends to interrupt the communicative flow of a lesson ... At this level it seems suitable to introduce the basic system of English phonemes, most of which the learners will be able to reproduce accurately because similar phonemes exist in their own language"
>
> (TB, p.vi)

This phonemic universality paradoxically negates the need for sound work, and logically suggests a higher challenge is needed than a focus on isolated sounds. It seems, however, an evaluation-wide theme. *Powerbase* practises "the most

common sounds in the English language" (TB.p15); *Cutting Edge* "focuses on the sounds which most affect students' comprehensibility" (TB.p.10) but fails to provide practical guidance except for the schwa, which "is one vowel sound that you shouldn't ignore" as it occurs "in a very high percentage of multi-syllabic words" (ibid.p.10); *Cutting Edge* however, recognizes that "Sentence stress is one of the most important elements in helping students to be easy to understand when they speak (TB.p.10), and that weak forms "contribute to comprehensibility and fluency, and ... are important for the purposes of listening. (*ibid*.p.10). It unfathomably seems to dismiss the entire body of Literature on intonation, and disregard any functional place for it,

> In reality, there are few situations in which wrong intonation leads to serious misunderstanding. Where problems do occasionally occur is in the area of politeness, sounding sufficiently enthusiastic.
>
> (*Cutting Edge*. *TB*.p.10)

'Serious misunderstanding' here is seemingly that of the theoretical underpinning of the coursebook rather than the nature of discourse. This seems representative of a misconception of the nature, importance and value of language and prosody.

Regarding techniques, there seemed to be an almost exclusive preference for recitation, which is "the simplest pronunciation activity to set up and possibly the most effective" (*Cutting Edge*. *TB*.p.10). This simplistic notion communicates well to the novice teacher but is of questionable validity in terms of sound communicative theory and learner needs. *Clockwise* states drills give students "a definite goal, and allows them to concentrate on all the different aspects of pronunciation simultaneously" (TB.p.4). This impossible feat seems

completely converse to the audiolingual nature of the coursebooks, and a heady ambition no coursebook seems even to attempt to incorporate in its materials. *Grapevine* adds a modicum of sense to often outrageous claims by realistically recognizing drills "are not communication, but a step on the road to eventual communication" (TB.p.2). Similarly, *Firsthand*, states,

> While *Listen & Repeat* isn't communicative ... It helps students get past the physical difficulty of saying something in a foreign language for the first time (articulation). ... At the very least, this gets students focusing on the language forms they'll need.
>
> (TB, p.14)

Chapter Six - EVALUATING THE COURSEBOOKS

6.1   The Evaluation Criteria

The factors discussed in Chapters One to Four above produced 51 criteria of varied objectivity and measurability, seen in Appendix B. Supplementary data, is provided to add validity to the results of certain criteria and are included in Tables one to twelve.

6.1.1   Communicative competence: Criterion one evaluates the presence of globally-applicable rules and patterns in expediting 'correct' knowledge. Criterion two evaluates the isolation of language within an accumulated entities approach. Criterion three importantly evaluates whether language is used in contexts of use. Criterion four looks for other competences as part of this underlying knowledge.

6.1.2   Communicative performance: Criterion five assesses Allwright's inquiry whether communication is "THE major element", while criterion six is concerned with opportunities for performance. Criterion seven considers whether pronunciation is part of a greater pedagogic process, serving as a pre-speaking or listening task. Criterion eight evaluates whether the activity is purely mechanical, with further analysis undertaken to determine techniques used (Table 7.2).

6.1.3   Discourse competence: Brazil's focus on the centrality of pronunciation in discourse and the negotiation of meaning has informed criteria 9-12, which evaluate whether coursebooks present the notions of tone and prominence

(criterion 9); whether language is shown in chunks or tonic units/segments (criterion 10); whether a focus on choice of intonation exists (criterion 11); and on the ongoing choices speakers have as discourse progresses (criterion 12).

Although no coursebook makes claims towards a discourse approach, the criteria are justified as activities may contain recognizable elements of Discourse Intonation. Coursebooks rarely promote Silent Way or TPR approaches, although varying manifestations of them can be found.

6.1.4 Components of communication: Criteria 13 to 22 evaluate the existence of Canale's components of communication outlined in Chapter Two. These criteria encompass elements central to communicative language teaching such as meaning, feedback, pairwork, consciousness-raising, purpose, authenticity and outcome. Further analysis was undertaken for criterion 16 to determine the kind of pairwork utilized, shown in Table 7.3.

6.1.5 Representative Language: My outlined theory of language has informed this section, which evaluates the representativeness of coursebook language to that used in authentic communication. Criteria 23-27 focus on segmental areas described in Chapter Three, with a breakdown of presented phonemes shown in Table 7.4. Criteria 28-35 focus on the suprasegmentals, with the type of coarticulation shown in Table 7.5. The metalanguage of DI was not used in the criteria to correspond with its absence from coursebooks. Criteria 36-38 seek to ascertain the segmental-suprasegmental balance employed.

6.1.6 Integratedness: The criteria here address the Chapter Four areas of integratedness, listening, comprehensible input and interactiveness of design. Further analysis was undertaken for criteria 39 and 40 to provide an indication of the degree of integration, with data extrapolated in Tables 7.6 and 7.7 respectively.

6.1.7 Listening: The criteria here evaluated the presence of listening and the associated types of while- and post-listening activities. Breakdowns of activity type are shown in Tables 7.8, 7.9, while Table 7.10 depicts the type of language found on tapescripts. Also evaluated were the speed and naturalness of listenings.

6.1.8 Comprehensible input and interactiveness: This section is somewhat value judgement-based and concerns whether language is sufficiently roughly graded to serve as comprehensible input; whether it is teacher-centred; whether layout communicates; and whether it accommodates different learning styles. The final two criteria are further analysed, with results shown in Tables 7.11 and 7.12.

6.2 The 'Yes/No' evaluation method

I decided the simplest and most concrete evaluative method was to apply a basic 'YES/NO' mechanism, which I felt (a) eliminated the greater subjectivity and complexities involved with assigning scores or scales; (b) was easily and readily replicable for authentication purposes; (c) provided a consistent and quantifiable measure for more confident and assertive interpretation; (d) involved minimal subjectivity in most criteria; and (e) could centralize pronunciation within communicative pedagogy. The summation of yeses and nos for each criterion and coursebook, with pertinent percentages, provided the data for comparative purposes. This was analyzed to ascertain an indication of the relative

communicativeness of the pronunciation materials and formed the basis of recommending changes.

I have been consistent and systematic throughout this evaluation, while attempting to be fair, rigorous, and objective in hoping to achieve reliable and valid results. However, even with seemingly simple yes/no assignations, subjectivity exists, as Sheldon observes,

> it is clear that coursebook assessment is fundamentally a subjective, rule of thumb activity, and that no neat formula… will ever provide a definite yardstick.
>
> (1988, p.245)

Where my initial intuition was not immediate, I gave the activity the benefit of my indecisiveness, and ten years of teaching and coursebook experience, which may have positively distorted the data slightly towards the 'communicative' side. This occurred with the more abstract criteria requiring value judgments, (terms as 'meaning', 'opportunity', 'authentic' etc), rather than with the more concrete criteria (i.e. the presence of coarticulation or pairwork). To avoid misleading the reader with overly positive results, I have qualified the more subjective criteria and inserted these figures in parentheses in Appendix B. An example of this is that an activity might be expected from criterion one to provide clear, comprehensive and instructive explanations, rules or patterns, however, the following typical kind of activity (practice of the weak forms / əv / and / ən / in dates) was assigned a 'yes', but was qualified as other teachers might have disagreed that these patterns are universal.

> We write ... *14(th) July.*
> We say ... **the** fourteenth **of** July.

How do you say these dates?

10 October   21 March

1998 = *nineteen ninety-eight*

2004 = *two thousand **and** four*

<div align="right">(Clockwise, Students' Book, p.5)</div>

This activity met my criterion here but failed others for communicativeness in most other areas.

The term 'activity' used throughout the evaluation ranged from a one-line instruction in the Teachers' Book to practise a single phoneme, as seen below

Practice the unstressed syllable pronunciation / ə/, not "too-day

<div align="right">(True Colors, p.40)</div>

to a quarter-page of work on the intonation of yes/no questions. It was not always obvious what was an activity as many consisted of Teachers' Book instructions not found in the Students' Books.

Chapter Seven - THE EVALUATION FINDINGS

7.1   Pronunciation – the neglected skill

The data cast pronunciation as a neglected skill. Table 7.1 shows the total number of pronunciation activities (327) and pages per book (1178), providing an average number of pages per activity (as opposed to the perhaps more expected and converse ratio of activities per page) of 3.66. The lowest mean was for *Lifelines* (1.81), with the highest being 18.3 for *Firsthand*

	American Headway	*Clockwise*	*Cutting Edge*	*English Express*	*Firsthand*	*Grapevine*	*Language in Use*	*Lifelines*	*Matters*	*Move Up*	*Powerbase*	*True Colors*	*TOTAL*
Activities	17	29	40	14	6	12	39	53	55	15	19	28	327
Pages	107	72	127	102	110	90	96	96	116	48	90	124	1178
Average	6.29	2.48	3.18	7.29	18.3	7.5	2.46	1.81	2.11	3.2	4.74	4.42	3.66

Table 7.1: *The average number of pages per activity*

The results of the evaluation are seen in Appendix B, *The Statistical Findings of the Coursebook Evaluation*. Obvious trends revealed by the data show a coursebook-wide disregard for pronunciation as communication, and a plethora of missed opportunities to fully integrate it. Key indicators supportive of this are

- a minimal regard for communication, communicative competence and rules of use;
- the segmental to suprasegmental imbalance (80.43% to 16.21);
- the extensive use of listen-and-repeat;
- a total disregard for discourse competence and intonation;

- the isolated and fragmented nature of pronunciation;
- the lack of comprehensible input in listening activities;
- the non-communicative design and presentation method.

7.2 Segmental, not communicative competence

The data greatly contradict those expected for learners to attain communicative competence. The 22.32% for criterion one, with 71 of the 73 activities qualified and 96.02% for criterion 2 supports an approach, which presumes segmental knowledge constitutes competence.

Language was presented largely as decentralized phonemes or words with little emphasis on transferable rules. *English Express* presents 362 isolated words in its 14 listen-and-repeat activities, while other courses seemed overly preoccupied with the 'correct' pronunciation of 'problem' vocabulary:

> Check that students are aware of the differences in spelling, pronunciation, and meaning between *quite* and *quiet*.
>
> (*Lifelines*, TB.p.52)

> a common mistake is for SS to stress the first syllable of *hotel* and *police* instead of the second: / haʊˈtel / and / pəˈliːs /. Note that a common pronunciation of *police* is reduced to one syllable /pli:s/ and that this is even more likely to occur in the compound noun *police station*."
>
> (*Matters*, TB. p.56)

> SS often wrongly stress the word *'temperature*. Encourage them to reduce the word to three syllables.
>
> (*Matters*, TB.p.85)

> Go over the pronunciation of each of the colors. Pay special attention to *yellow, purple, orange* and *beige*, which are particularly difficult to pronounce.

Consistent with this is criterion three, showing 33.03% of language is isolated. This represents linguistic forms contextualized by text at least of sentence length, suggesting the remaining 70% is segmental. Only *Language In Use - 79.49%* exceeded a 50% sentential contextualization. Three coursebooks provided no textual support whatsoever. Criterion four revealed that contrary to back-cover claims, no activity was linked to sociolinguistic, discoursal or strategic competencies.

7.3 Mechanical Performance

Communication did not feature as "THE major element" in any activity. Three activities were considered but omitted due to their highly controlled nature and outcomes more dependent on lexical knowledge than phonological competence. A typical example follows:

Pronunciation

1 📷 [2.3] Listen to the stress in these words:

apple   rubber   photos

camera   diary   dictionary

postcard   phone card   credit card

identity card   bottle of water   mobile phone

2 Practise saying the words

2 Point to things in the classroom and ask your partner.

What's that in English

I don't know!

It's a cassette player

What are those?

(*Cutting Edge*, Students' Book, p.17)

Criterion six revealed 11 activities representing opportunities for "purposeful" language to be expressed, with all but one qualified, as follows:

2 What's the matter with the people above?

a) [9.2] Listen to the conversations.
   Match them with three of the photographs.

b) Listen again. Complete the sentences.

1 A: What's _____ ?
  B: I can't _____ the board from here.
  A: I think you should _____ an optician

2 A: What's the _____ ?
  B: I've got a bad _____ and a _____ .
  A: You'd better not _____ _____ then.

3 A: _____ _____ feeling OK?
  B: No, not really. One of my _____ _____ .
  A: Well, you'd better _____ to the _____ .

c) Work with a partner.
   Listen to the conversations again. Practise the stress and intonation. How do we pronounce *should* and *you'd better* in the sentences?

d) Make conversations for the other two pictures

(*Matters*, Students' Book, p.89)

Criterion seven revealed 34.86% of activities represented a component to prepare learners for a follow-up activity, which perhaps suggests they were part of a process culminating in communication. Mechanical performance (criterion 8) was found in 96.02% of activities, revealing a structural and audiolingual dominance, evident in Table 7.2, with listen and repeat constituting 67.73% of activities, including 100% of those in *English Express, Powerbase* and *True Colors*, and significant majorities in *Cutting Edge, Language in Use* and

Lifelines.

ACTIVITY TYPE	Amer. Headway	Clockwise	Cutting Edge	English Express	Firsthand	Grapevine	Language in Use	Lifelines	Matters	Move-Up	Powerbase	True Colors	TOTAL	PERCENTAGE
Listen & Repeat	6	7	31		6	6	34	46	17	12	19	28	212	67.73
Highly controlled practice	4	1	-	-	-	-	-	6	8	-	-	-	19	6.07
Stress marking	1	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	12	-	-	-	17	5.43
Highly controlled listening	-	-	-	14	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	17	5.43
Drills	-	7	1	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13	4.15
Listening discrimination	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	7	-	-	-	9	2.87
Rules	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	5	1.60
Listen	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	1.60
Reading	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	1.28
Gap fill	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	4	1.28
Checking	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	4	1.28
Dialogue reading	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	0.64
Question & answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	0.32
Writing	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.32

Table 7.2: *Mechanical performance by activity type*

7.4 Discourse *in absentia*

This section unfairly evaluates coursebooks which make no claims towards a discourse approach, thus predictably, criteria 9, 11 and 12, concerning DI variables, all registered zero. The nature of this study necessitates revealing the paucity of attention regarding this essential aspect of pronunciation. Activities

that included stress and intonation were decontextualized and recitational. As this example shows, no attention is given to choice and reason of tone selection, rather, unnatural, unhelpful and prescribed intonation curves,

3 Stress and intonation

a Write the sentences on the board and invite students to draw the intonation curves.

Tapescript and answers

1 **Was the exam difficult?**

2 **I had a headache yesterday.**

3 **Why have we got a problem?**

4 **Are you an engineer?**

5 **What day is it tomorrow?**

6 **We arrived in November.**

b Invite students to say the sentences aloud, then come up to the board and mark the stressed syllables and circle the / ə/ sounds.

(*Lifelines*. TB. p.104)

Criterion ten showed 37.31% of activities practised language as chunks (*Language In Use* did so in 87.18% of its activities), but not as units of communication. One example from *Clockwise* shows an emphasis on quantity and recitation rather than quality and interaction,

it is essential that students also practise longer utterances. To this end, ask students to write short sentences ... and then practise saying the complete sentences

(*Clockwise*.TB.p.54)

7.5 Communication

The data were highly consistent evaluation wide, suggesting that communication according to Canale's model was of minimal concern. Instead a prescriptive and

almost entirely coursebook-centred approach predominated.

7.5.1   No meaning: Meaning was non-existent in all but five qualified activities from criterion 17. The instructions in *Clockwise* for the teacher to "Move around the class checking for correct pronunciation" (TB.p.21) were ubiquitous, as was an overemphasis on accuracy of linguistic form, which curtailed most attention towards meaning.

7.5.2   Teacher-dominated feedback: Criterion 14 revealed six activities provided feedback, largely via a teacher-led role to check articulatory or segmental accuracy. The following annotated instructions from *Lifelines* is representative of this universal teacher-centredness.

> Correct pronunciation as necessary ... Read through the examples with the class, paying special attention to pronunciation ... make sure the spelling and pronunciation are clear to the students ... Say the words together with the class, making sure the pronunciation of the final *-s* is correct ... Read through the list of words with the class to establish pronunciation ... Move round the class checking pronunciation and intonation.

> (pp.6-12)

A more 'interactive' example from *Lifelines* (SB.p7) has students have saying a number to which their partner points, to discriminate between the '*-teens*' and ''-*ties*'.

7.5.3   Inter-IN-activeness: Only five activities were deemed interactive enough to allow students to talk without following prescribed patterns, all qualified due to a primary focus on recycling vocabulary.

7.5.4   Mechanical pairwork The data from criterion 16 showed pairwork existed in 67

(20.49%) of the activities, with four books making no use of it whatsoever, while eight coursebooks contained no speaking activities, which is clearly not communication. Table 7.3 reveals most pairwork to be mechanical. Highly controlled practice (44.78%), dialogue reading (19.40%), and checking of answers (19.40%) predominated. Regarding individual coursebooks, 80.95% of *Lifelines* activities, 78.57% of *Matters* and 60% of *Clockwise* were mechanical. The consistent use of asking "students, in pairs, to take turns saying the words" (*Powerbase*,TB.p.15) was a universal example of pairwork.

ACTIVITY TYPE	Amer. Headway	Clockwise	Cutting Edge	English Express	Firsthand	Grapevine	Language in Use	Lifelines	Matters	Move-Up	Powerbase	True Colors	TOTAL	PERCENTAGE
Highly-controlled practice	1	6	3	-	-	2	3	8	1	-	6	-	**30**	**44.78**
Dialogue reading	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	9	-	1	-	**13**	**19.40**
Check answers	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	1	-	3	-	**13**	**19.40**
Speaking	-	3	1	-	-	-	-	3	1	-	-	-	**8**	**11.94**
Question & answer practice	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	**3**	**4.48**
	1	**10**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**3**	**21**	**15**	**0**	**10**	**0**	**67**	

Table 7.3: *Pairwork by activity type*

7.5.5 Predictability concerning form and message: Only eight qualified activities in four courses included an element of unpredictability, suggesting a near-total coursebook dominance, preventing opportunities for students to exercise choice,

and sidelining work on predictive strategies. A prescribed example from *Matters* follows:

d) Work with a partner. Take it in turns to ask questions and spell and pronounce these words. Example:

    A: *How do you spell this word?*

    B: *C – o – m – p – u – t – e - r*

    A: *And how do you pronounce it?*

    B: / kɒmpjuːtə /

(SB, p.7)

7.5.6 **Coursebook control of language:** Criterion 18 showed a near-total degree of coursebook control over language. *Clockwise* and *Lifelines* were the only courses proving otherwise, although these were qualified. Over 98% of language in the pronunciation component overall was wholly prescribed, which effectively expels any publisher claims regarding communication.

7.5.7 **A cognitive vacuum:** Criterion 19 found no consciousness-raising activities beyond a decontextualized presentation of form and mechanical practice. There appeared to be no regard for the correlation between phonology and ongoing communication. An example from the *Lifelines* Teachers' Book provides more explicit rule explanation than discoursal guidance.

Intonation: statements and Yes / No questions:

Explain to students that in English the intonation –
the 'music' in the voice - gives important information
about what the speaker intends to say. ...

🔊 *10.4* Play the tape for the students to listen and recognize
the rising intonation in the question. Write the two sentences
on the board and draw in the intonation curves.

Tapescript and answers

We went to Turkey

Did you like it?

7.5.8 Communicative purpose: Coursebook control was evident in criterion 20, with little for students to experiment with or practice beyond the mechanicalness of the activity. Four books (*Clockwise*, *Cutting Edge*, *Lifelines*, and *Matters)* contained eleven qualified activities with a communicative purpose. In a representative example from *Cutting Edge* (p.13) students listened to *Wh-*questions, and had to "Notice the stress", the communicative purpose being the exchange of information with another student using the prescribed stress patterns. It is questionable whether this pattern necessitated the completion of the task, nor whether the information was particularly meaningful. Furthermore, these activities were 'additional' or 'optional' activities contained in the Teachers Book. Practiced dialogues were recited with unnatural stress drilled (capitalized below), as the following example from *True Colors* shows:

Pronunciation Lesson (Optional)

Sentence Stress

Explain to students that within each sentence or group of words (phrase) certain syllables or words receive more stress (emphasis) than others. The most common pattern is to stress the following kinds of words: nouns, main verbs, adjectives, adverbs, demonstratives, and the *wh-* words. The following words are usually *not* stressed: articles, possessive adjectives, prepositions, conjunctions, personal pronouns, the verb *be*, and auxiliaries.

Play the cassette or dictate the following sentences and questions:

We're EATING in the LIVING ROOM.
I'm EATING in the KITCHEN

They're READING in the LIBRARY on MAIN STREET

Are they STUDYING in the DINING ROOM?

WHY is he WRITING in the BATHROOM?

(TB, p.61)

7.5.9 Prescribed language: Authentic here was deemed as being of sufficient quality to serve as comprehensible input. Simplification and full forms were accepted with this in mind. Five books, all largely audiolingual, contained no authentic language. Of the remainder, 31.19% of language was deemed as being sufficiently authentic. The highest scoring coursebook, *Language in Use*, contained such language in 26 (66.67%) of its 39 activities, which largely consisted of simple display sentences, which supports overall results showing activities to contain little meaning. A typical example follows:

How to say it

1 ▣ Listen to *than* in these sentences. Practise saying them.

This is better than my old flat.

New York's more interesting than Washington.

He's friendlier than his brother.

Germany's colder than Italy.

2 ▣ Listen to the sounds *-est* and *most*. Practise saying the sentences.

It's the biggest in the world.

It's the best in the world.

It's the most beautiful building.

Which hotel is the most expensive?

(*Language in Use*, SB, p.90)

7.5.10 No communicative outcomes: Criterion 22 showed no activities contained a communicative outcome similar to the Gilbert example above, in which task outcome was solely dependent on pronunciation. All outcomes were predetermined. This unfortunate situation effectively bars the student from

seeing how essential pronunciation is in communicative contexts

7.6 Representative Language

The data here from criteria 36-38 showed all coursebooks adopted a predominantly structural approach, with 74.01% being largely segmental, 22.02% being suprasegmental, and 3.36% consisting of both. Figures for individual coursebooks varied, with *English Express* being 100% segmental, *Powerbase* 94.70%, *Lifelines* 88.68%, and *American Headway* 88.24%. It was surprising to find no obvious patterns separating the clearly audiolingual coursebooks from those purporting to have communicative designs. Conversely, *Firsthand* was evaluated as having a 100% prosodic based approach, although five of its six activities were listen and repeat activities to match the teacher's intonation, either orally or silently,

> ...play the tape again, pausing after each line. Either have students repeat, trying to match the stress and intonation of the tape OR have them think about each line, silently repeating it in their minds.
>
> (TB.p.22)

7.6.1 Segmentals

Criterion 23 revealed a highly segmental approach with 254 (77.68%) activities being phoneme-oriented. This varied with each coursebook, ranging from 0% for *English Express* and *Firsthand,* to 100% for *American Headway* and *Language in Use*, with other courses ranging between 94.74% and 67.5%. All phoneme work consisted of the practice of articulation, sound discrimination, inflection, spelling and word stress. A breakdown of the phonemes concentrated on is shown in Table 7.4,

i:	11	ɪ	13	ʊ	7	ʊ:	4	ɪə	0	eɪ	7	a			
e	11	ə	27	ɜ:	7	ɔ:	5	ʊə	0	ɔɪ	0	əʊ			
æ	8	ʌ	4	ɑ:	5	ɒ	7	eə	3	aɪ	6	aʊ	5		
p	2	b	2	t	11	d	11	tʃ	3	dʒ	2	k	1	g	1
f	2	v	2	θ	12	ð	11	s	18	z	13	ʃ	1	ʒ	0
m	1	n	1	ŋ	1	h	3	l	3	r	2	w	3	j	3

Table 7.4: *Phonemic breakdown of activities*

The schwa was the singlemost practised phoneme with 27 occurrences, while all other monophthongs were practised at least four times. Half of the diphthongs received no attention, which correlated to their functional frequency. The consonants /t/ and /d/, /ð/ and / θ/, and /s/ and /z/ were the most practised (an average of 12.33 times each), with the phonemes /ð/ and / θ/ being overly practiced, incommensurate to their functional value. Inflectional concerns regarding present simple tense (/s/, /z/ - nine contrasts); past simple tense verb endings (/t/, /d/ - eleven contrasts); and a focus on demonstrative pronouns and adjectives, and the article 'the' (/ð/, / θ/ - six contrasts) accounted for 69.16% of consonant practice.

Other segmentally-based figures consisted of 160 (48.93%) of activities devoted to citational word stress (criterion 26), used in every coursebook, and constituted 100% of the activities in *English Express* and 64% in *Lifelines*. All but one of the activities in *Powerbase* consisted of only word lists, with a focus on sounds. Little attention given to the movement of stress. One example from *Matters* did attend to this, but in a highly explicit style,

> Mobility of word stress is another area of possible confusion. Consider *It's Japan'ese.* and *It's a 'Japanese car*. As a predictive adjective the stress will be on the third syllable. As an attributive adjective the stress will shift to the first syllable unless it is contradicting a previous statement, in which case it will remain on the third syllable.

Of seemingly lesser importance was the attention given to vowel length (criterion 24 - 6 activities), syllable count of words and phrases (criterion 25 - sixteen activities), and contractions and blendings (criterion 27 - 7 activities). This is converse to the relative importance the literature attaches to these three areas in their contribution to message highlighting and phonological competence.

7.6.2   Suprasegmentals   The data from criteria 28-38 revealed a totally prescribed approach. Coarticulation (criterion 28) appeared in 51 activities (15.6%) across eight courses, with *Language in Use* (14 activities) and *Matters* (16) accounting for 60% of these. Nine courses had three or fewer coarticulatory activities, with four of these having none. Vowel reduction constituted the major component, being in 31 activities (all books except *English Express, Firsthand, Move Up, Powerbase* and *True Colors)*. Explicit rule-giving was the priority with all activities, as this example shows:

> *Does* has a weak form /dəz/, but this is not used in short answers.

It would perhaps be more useful here to highlight why this weak form is not used in short answers to provide a more globally-applicable rule. Table 7.5 reveals that phonemes were used five times more than coarticulation and four times more than word stress. This seems to contradict the claims of using 'natural English' made by coursebooks.

ACTIVITY TYPE	Amer. Headway	Clockwise	Cutting Edge	English Express	Firsthand	Grapevine	Language in Use	Lifelines	Matters	Move-Up	Powerbase	True Colors	TOTAL
Vowel reduction	1	1	6	-	-	3	7	4	10	-	-	-	**31**
Elision	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	2	**5**
Contraction	1	-	2	-	-	1		2	4	-	-	1	**11**
Linking 'r'			1	-	-	-	3	-	3	-	-	-	**7**
Liaison	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	3	-	-	-	**12**
Intrusion	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	**1**
Assimilation	-	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	**5**
Intrusive /j/	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**2**
Intrusive /w/	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**1**
TOTAL	**1**	**2**	**9**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**14**	**3**	**16**	**0**	**0**	**3**	**51**

Table 7.5: *Coarticulatory breakdown of activities*

True Colors contained language in context with counter-productive rules, stating "native speakers" often pronounce *going to* as *gonna* / ɡɒnə / and *want to* as wɒnə /wona

> Emphasize the point that students should practice saying *going to* until they are more
> fluent in English ... it's better for new speakers of English not to attempt this
> pronunciation until they have mastered the unreduced form.

(TB, pp.121-122)

Coursebook-designated language for stress, rhythm and intonation was to be copied by students, with no attention to tone, prominence, intonation, shared contextual understanding, or the availability of choice. This deprived students of a fundamental discoursal strategy.

Coursebook-designated sentence stress (criterion 29) appeared in 51 (15.60%)

activities. Criterion 30 determined only a quarter of this stress seemed natural. Activities were wholly prescribed, with no focus on meaning, as this example shows,

Pronunciation

[🔊] [3.3] Listen again notice the stress on important words

> *Do you live in a big city?*   *Yes, I live in Tokyo.*
> *Do you like chocolate?*   *Yes, I love it.*

Cutting Edge (SB.p.25)

Coursebook-determined rhythm (criterion 32) in 33 activities (10.09%); and coursebook-determined intonational patterns (criterion 33) in sixteen activities (4.89%) likewise cast prosody as greatly underutilized. Seven activities were assigned grammatical meaning and four attitudinal meaning. An example from *Move Up* shows intonation linked to attitude:

2. 🔊 Listen to these questions. Put a tick if the speaker sounds interested.

1. What's your name?	4. What music do you like?
2. What's your job?	5. What's your favorite group?
3. Where's your mother from?	6. What time do you get home from work?

Say the questions out loud. Try to sound interested.

(*Move Up*, SB.p.25)

The Teachers' Book instructs students to "to read out the sentences in an interested and a bored way" (*ibid*.p4) in a near-eccentric and somewhat culturally imposing manner. Similarly, *Lifelines* asks students to make "a particular effort to imitate the 'interested' intonation" (TB.p.59). An example of a grammatical assignation in the *Grapevine* Teachers' Book, stresses students "Take great care on the question intonation of: *Coffee? / Sandwich?*":

Coffee?

Yes, please.

Sandwich?

No, thank you.

(SB, Unit one, Dialogue a)

This particular activity is a prime example of a missed opportunity to increase awareness of the given/new rather than 'question intonation rises' assignation, and an example of how learning perhaps obstructs acquisition.

The coursebook offering most intonation practice, *Lifelines* (6 activities), focused on the rise (for questions) and fall (for statements) of intonation and invited students to draw intonation curves, but offered no guidance regarding these movements, which DI would address. One activity on *Wh-* questions offered six questions with a variety of intonation curves, all arbitrary and confusing:

> 🔲 *11.5* Play the tape for students to listen, check, and repeat.
>
> **Tapescript and answers**
>
> 1   Are you leaving now?
>
> 2   What do you do?
>
> 3   Where are you going?
>
> 4   Is Bill here?
>
> 5   Do you like this dress?
>
> 6   How much are these shoes?

(*Lifelines*, TB. p.85)

Only twelve of the sentence stress activities were regarded as being natural, with the remainder considered as unnatural or misleading, including all those in *Cutting Edge*, *English Express*, *Firsthand*, *Grapevine*, *American Headway*, and *Powerbase*. No attention was afforded contrastive stress (criterion 31).

7.7 Integratedness

7.7.1 The main focus of the pronunciation activity: From criterion 39, Table 7.6 reveals that 'pronunciation only' was the largest constituent with 126 activities, whereas speaking and listening constituted only 4.28% of all activities. Due to its prevalence a separate category was created for listen and repeat, which constituted 14.98% of activities.

ACTIVITY TYPE	Amer. Headway	Clockwise	Cutting Edge	English Express	Firsthand	Grapevine	Language in Use	Lifelines	Matters	Move-Up	Powerbase	True Colors	TOTAL	PERCENTAGE
Pronunciation only	2	4	15	-	6	2	33	30	21	2	1	10	**126**	**38.53**
Vocabulary	4	13	-	14	-	3	-	9	14	5	-	9	**71**	**21.71**
Grammar	9	8	-	-	-	6	-	10	10	5	-	7	**55**	**16.82**
Listen & repeat	-	-	25	-	-	-	-	-	7	-	17	-	**49**	**14.98**
Function	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	3	1	-	-	-	**11**	**3.06**
Speaking	1	3	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	1	-	-	**8**	**2.45**
Listening	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	**6**	**1.83**
Reading	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	**2**	**0.61**
	17	**29**	**40**	**14**	**6**	**12**	**39**	**53**	**55**	**15**	**19**	**28**	**327**	

Table 7.6: *The main focus within the activity*

Communication did not once constitute the main activity of pronunciation activities. The eight activities listed for speaking and the ten for functional

language represent instructions in the Teachers' Book to monitor 'correct' pronunciation for 'accuracy' rather than communicate.

7.7.2 Linking to other skills on the page Criterion 40 reveals slightly over half of the activities (180) were linked to other components within the unit, with the remaining 147 isolated. All of the audiolingual books had no linking. The majority of pronunciation activities were of only token contribution to the skill component to which they were connected, making them largely redundant. Furthermore, no reintegration of pronunciation existed beyond its initial presentation. A breakdown of how pronunciation activities are linked to other components within the coursebook is shown in Table 7.7 below.

ACTIVITY TYPE	Amer. Headway	Clockwise	Cutting Edge	English Express	Firsthand	Grapevine	Language in Use	Lifelines	Matters	Move-Up	Powerbase	True Colors	TOTAL
Speaking	8	12	19	0	0	0	5	17	10	2	1	0	**74**
Listening	2	3	8	0	0	0	5	9	19	3	0	0	**49**
Grammar	1	5	1	0	0	0	4	12	1	0	0	0	**24**
Vocabulary	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	2	1	0	0	**14**
Writing	0	0	1	0	0	0	9	0	1	0	0	0	**11**
Reading	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	**5**
Spelling	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	**3**

Table 7.7: *How the activity was linked to other skills*

The largest co-components were speaking (74 activities) and listening (49). Grammar and vocabulary integrated with pronunciation in 39 activities, while

writing was linked on 11 instances, largely due to the 9 activities on sounds in *Language in Use,* which requested students to

> Write a sentence. Use the words from the box. Read out your sentence.
>
> (SB, p.14).

7.8 Listening

7.8.1 Pronunciation and listening: Criterion 43 showed all coursebooks included listening across 215 (65.75%) activities. The coursebook least utilizing listening was *Clockwise* with six of its 29 activities, while four texts (*English Express, Firsthand, Language in Use* and *Move Up)* used listening for all their activities.

7.8.2 While-listening activities: While-listening activities (criterion 44) occurred in 91.16% of total listenings. All coursebooks except *Firsthand* and *Grapevine* used them, and seven texts included them in every listening. Table 7.8 shows that a straightforward 'listen to the tape' was the most prevalent activity, although the concept 'activity' hear is used very accommodatingly. All 39 activities in *Language in Use* and all 14 in *English Express* constituted this. Of the remainder, only phoneme discrimination and checking of pre-listening work amounted to 10% or more of while-listening. None of the while-listening focused on the sociolinguistic nature of discourse (speaker relationships, new or given information etc.) nor on tones. The listenings were more test-like than samples of real-life communication.

ACTIVITY TYPE	Amer. Headway	Clockwise	Cutting Edge	English Express	Firsthand	Grapevine	Language in Use	Lifelines	Matters	Move-Up	Powerbase	True Colors	TOTAL
Listening	7	-	13	14	-	-	39	10	3	7	1	-	**94**
Discrimination	5	-	2	-	-	-	-	3	6	3	14	1	**34**
Checking	1	-	4	-	-	-	-	19	7	1	-	-	**32**
Gap-fill	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	6	**11**
Noticing	-	5	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	**9**
Perception	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	1	-	-	-	**4**
Syllable counting	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	**3**
Underline	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	**3**
Matching	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	**2**
Marking stress	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	**2**
Reading	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**1**
Word order	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	**1**
	13	**6**	**22**	**14**	**0**	**0**	**39**	**29**	**23**	**15**	**18**	**7**	**196**

Table 7.8: *While-listening activity type*

7.8.3 Post-listening activities: There were 146 post-listening activities (67.91% of all listenings), with a surprisingly negligible amount of language analysis work. Table 7.9 reveals non-analytical listen and repeat constituted 89.04% of post-listening activities, which suggests very little cognitive involvement. Of the remaining sixteen activities, twelve were checking exercises, three for marking stress and one rules explanation.

ACTIVITY TYPE	Amer. Headway	Clockwise	Cutting Edge	English Express	Firsthand	Grapevine	Language in Use	Lifelines	Matters	Move-Up	Powerbase	True Colors	TOTAL	PERCENTAGE
Listen & Repeat	8	6	19	-	6	7	37	32	10	5	-	-	**130**	**89.04**
Check	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	5	**12**	**8.22**
Stress matching	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	**3**	**2.05**
Rules	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	**1**	**0.68**
Tapescript work	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**0**	
	9	**6**	**19**	**0**	**6**	**7**	**37**	**32**	**19**	**5**	**0**	**6**	**146**	

Table 7.9: *Post-listening activity type*

Criterion 46 shows only 19 listenings resulted in student-generated language, with half being sentence-writing activities from *Language in Use*. The language generated did not necessitate any focus on pronunciation, much of which was the highly-controlled copying of dialogues and a focus on words, as seen in the Teachers' Book from *Clockwise* and *Move Up*.

> In groups, students now tell each other about their jobs ... Help with vocabulary and pronunciation where necessary. ... write up words which caused problems with pronunciation on the board.
>
> (*Clockwise*, TB, p.21)

> When you've played the tape several times, ask individual students to read out the list of words to the rest of the class.
>
> (*Move Up*, TB.p.4)

Typical here was that problems involved vocabulary or sounds rather than

communication breakdowns or sociolinguistic rule misuse. There were no instructions regarding intonational or other discoursal features.

7.8.4 Tapes and tapescripts: Criteria 47 and 48 regarding tapescript speech quality and speech speed proved too subjective to provide credible results, especially given the lack of agreement in the Literature over these variables. I discerned, however unempirically, that all listenings could serve as consciousness-raising activities.

The analysis of what students listened to (Table 7.10) gave a better indication as to communicative aims and the role of pronunciation. Dialogues accounted for only 6.67% of activities, one percentage point more than that for phoneme-based activities. This means 93.33% of listenings was to non-contextual and structured language. Half of the coursebooks had no pronunciation activities for dialogue listenings, while that with the highest degree of dialogue use was *Cutting Edge* with 25%. It can perhaps be surmised from criteria 44 and 45 that much of the listening would be followed by listen-and-repeat and is therefore more mechanical than functional. Likewise, criterion 46 suggested very little communicative follow-up would exist. Most listening was concentrated on single words (42.35%) or single sentences (38.04%).

	Amer. Headway	Clockwise	Cutting Edge	English Express	Firsthand	Grapevine	Language in Use	Lifelines	Matters	Move-Up	Powerbase	True Colors	TOTAL	PERCENTAGE

Phoneme	-	-	-	-	-	3	11	-	-	-	-	-	**14**	**5.49**
Single word	7	-	5	12	4	6	10	21	10	12	15	6	**108**	**42.35**
Phrases	-	-	-	5	-	3	-	2	4	-	3	-	**19**	**7.45**
Sentence	8	5	10	-	1	-	33	1-	12	3	4	2	**97**	**38.04**
Dialogue	-	1	5	-	1	-	5	1	4	-	-	-	**17**	**6.67**

Table 7.10: *Type of language used in tapescripts*

No coursebook utilized tapescripts to enhance awareness or communication. Indeed, it seems this data would negate such a need given the isolated and mechanical nature of the language being listened to.

7.9 Comprehensible Input and Interactiveness

7.9.1 Graded Language: Whether or not language was roughly graded just beyond learners' immediate level of comprehension (criterion 49) also proved highly subjective. I used my ten-year experience of Japanese learners and coursebooks to make instinctive decisions here, and undoubtedly other teachers would produce results completely different to mine. I determined that 199 activities (60.86%) were easily comprehensible, while 128 activities (39.14%) were roughly-tuned. Other data may better indicate the value of textual or listening material, notably the overconcern with segmentals or the predominance of word-level activities may suggest that language is of an insufficient length and quality to serve as comprehensible input. Criterion 50 shows 98.17% of activities to be highly teacher-controlled.

7.9.2 The communicativeness of the layout: The data showed a largely sterile, non-dynamic method of presentation which perhaps communicates little to the student. No use was made of the styles outlined in section 4.3. Only 181 activities (55.35%) utilized anything beyond plain typescript. Even standard

ACTIVITY TYPE	Amer. Headway	Clockwise	Cutting Edge	English Express	Firsthand	Grapevine	Language in Use	Lifelines	Matters	Move-Up	Powerbase	True Colors	TOTAL
Nothing	-	14	4	14		11	-	21	2		-	12	**89**
	9	25	29	14	5	12	11	31	18	4	2	28	**167**
Phonemic words	-	2	12	-	-	-	-	11	11	-	-	7	**43**
	4	-	2	-	-	-	2	4	10	1	-	10	**23**
Stress marks	-	4	13	-	-	-	-	3	3	-	-	1	**24**
		2	8	-	-	-	8	3	23	4	-	-	**51**
Single phonemes	-	3	1	-	-	1	-	2	8	-	-	5	**20**
	2	-	2	-	-	-	9	12	4	5	16	-	**45**
Linking symbols	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	**-**
	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	-	-	-	-	-	**-**
Explanations	-	3	2	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	6	**14**
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**-**
PSL	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	1	**12**
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**-**
Intonation curves	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	**5**
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	**1**
Intonation arrows	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	**4**
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**-**
Capitals	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	**2**
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**-**
Underline	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	**1**
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	3	16	-	**21**
Schwa	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**1**
	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	**4**
Circled	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**-**

devices such as intonation arrows were rare. Three coursebooks (*English Express*, *Firsthand* and *True Colors*) used no presentation devices whatsoever in the SB. Table 7.11 shows the layout of coursebooks to present pronunciation materials, with data for Teachers Book in grey.

	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	1	-	**10**

Bold	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**1**

Table 7.11: *The communicativeness of the pronunciation presentation*

The somewhat sterile presentation was exacerbated by the fact that 54.73% of the presentation material evaluated was found in the Teachers' Book only. This was particularly so for the phonemic spelling of words, which deprived the student of information. A total of 158 conventions was found in the Students' Book (some activities used more than one convention). Eight of the thirteen devices found were segmental in nature, relating to single-phoneme or single-word activities. Intonation received graphic representation seven times in the Teachers' Book and once in the Students' Book. Suprasegmental devices which would convey to the student the streamed nature of speech were very few in number.

7.9.3 **The accommodation of different learning styles:** The majority of activities were based on looking at typed print on the page, engaging in mechanical oral and passive aural exercises, or a combination thereof. Little accommodated students with other learning styles or allowed for cognitive or collaborative communication activities. Table 7.12 shows activities listed in seven categories, with a mechanical, audiolingual methodology predominating.

	Amer. Headway	Clockwise	Cutting Edge	English Express	Firsthand	Grapevine	Language in Use	Lifelines	Matters	Move-Up	Powerbase	True Colors	TOTAL
RECITATION													
Listen & repeat	5		3	14	4	5	10	25	4	6	19	11	**106**
Visual + L&R			6				12	6	6	8		3	**41**
Drills			1		5								**6**
Highly controlled practice					1			2	1				**4**
VISUAL													
Visual	2	2	2				2	1	18			4	**31**
Visual + Listening							13						**13**
Phonemic script	2		2						1				**5**
Picture									1				**1**
AUDITORY													
Listening	1		3				2	10	14				**30**
Listening Discrimination	4	1	1							1			**7**
Dictation						2			1				**3**
EXPLICIT RULES													
Explanation								4	1			10	**15**
MUSICAL													
Rhyme	2												**2**
Song / chant					1				1				**2**
Tongue Twister	1												**1**
Explanation								4	1			10	**15**
KINESTHETIC													
Clapping								1					**1**
NOTHING													
Nothing		26	22					4	7				**59**

Table 7.12: *Learning styles breakdown*

Listen and Repeat, in its various manifestations, constituted 157 activities. The

visual mode accounted for 50 activities, although only one activity diverged

from a very standard methodology of simple reading, or instructions for students to look at the page. This was an illustration in *Matters*' TB depicting articulatory settings. Several anomalous exercises were found (one instance of clapping to the rhythm, one tongue-twister, one song and one chant). Generic print accounted for the 59 activities for which no particular learning style was accommodated.

Chapter 8 – RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHOICE AND CHANGE

8.1 A change to choice and success

> The moment one starts to think of language as discourse, the entire landscape changes, usually, forever.
>
> (McCarthy & Carter, 1994, p.201)

A parallel and pressing paradigm shift is that publishers start viewing pronunciation in terms of communication, and thus change anachronistic materials forever. This seems necessary as the over-riding issue from the data is the woefully inadequate linguistic and pedagogical models which failed to provide even a basic communicative underpinning in all of the coursebooks under review. This is most striking in the area of discourse, without which the issue of communicativeness cannot be said to be addressed, nor competence achieved even in Chomskyan terms. A seemingly theoretically unprincipled and unashamedly structural syllabus tied pronunciation to prescriptive and declarative descriptions, and students to mechanical activities devoid of choice and motivationally successful outcomes. The limited exposure to longer stretches of speech and discourse necessary for real-world communication was not exploited for the meaningful decisions behind its creation. Activities were set within a contextual and interactive vacuum, totally misaligned with learner and teacher needs. A questionable pedagogical efficacy nullified communicative notions of collaboration, authenticity, function and use, which in turn quashed any notion of real choice or success for students and teachers alike.

Furthermore, a coursebook-wide catalogue of missed opportunities to fully integrate pronunciation existed at all levels of syllabus. This seems to accord to Swales' (1980) castigation of coursebooks as representing a 'problem' and "in extreme cases are examples of educational failure" (in Sheldon,1988,p.237).

Allwright realistically states

> The whole business of the management of language learning is far too complex to be satisfactorily catered for by a pre-packaged set of decisions embodied in teaching materials.
>
> (1981, p.9)

The following proposals, rather than being classroom remedies, consist of recommendations on how DI can reorient learning and acquisition to increase the likelihood of phonological and therefore communicative competence being expedited, and reduce the chances of 'educational failure'. DI does represent a set of pre-packaged guidelines which can accommodate the 'business' of learning. Although no coursebook can meet the multi-faceted needs of a global learning population, they can all incorporate the consistency of operation, description and application of DI. Where other syllabus considerations warrant a multitude of ethical, cultural or similar concerns, DI remains a simple but powerful linguistic tool, bringing choices and success to learning.

8.2   Communicativeness and Discourse Intonation

This study has revealed gaps which DI's versatility and simplicity could fill in every aspect of the pronunciation component, from transcription style to extended dialogues, and from uninspiring and sterile activities into interactive, cognitively-

engaging and meaningful ones, from reciting meaningless sentences to making choices guiding meaning. It could provide the innovation to warrant Swan's communicative era proclamation that "boring and mechanical exercise types" have been replaced by a "splendid variety of exciting and engaging practice activities" (1985a,p.2) which had bypassed pronunciation. A broader, more integrated, syllabus-wide role for DI within all classroom interaction, could seamlessly integrate a greater focus on meaning, and serve to expedite communicative competence within acquisitional and learning-based approaches. A rich supply of textual and listening materials already exists in coursebooks to serve as comprehensible input for analysis and use, rather than the citational linguistic forms commonly found throughout this evaluation. An example from *Cutting Edge* provides mini exchanges suited to this purpose:

1 Read the conversations and tick the best reply.

1 TEACHER: How do you spell 'cousin' … Simona?
  STUDENT: a) C-O-U-S-I-N
      b) She's fine.

2 TEACHER: Can you write that, please?
  STUDENT: a) Yes, of course.
      b) No, thank you.

3 STUDENT: Excuse me, how do you say this word?
  TEACHER: a) I understand.
      b) Just a minute, let me see … it's 'brilliant'.
      Thank you.

4 TEACHER: What have you got for number 3?
  STUDENT: a) That's right.
      b) I'm not sure.

5 TEACHER: OK, everyone, open your books at page twenty.
  STUDENT: a) Sorry? I don't understand.
      b) Sorry, I don't remember

  TEACHER: Open your books at page twenty.

2 🕮 [2.7] Listen and check your answers. Cross out the wrong answers.

Pronunciation

🕮 [2.7] Listen again and practise the conversations. Copy the voices on the recording.

3 Now practise the conversations with a partner.

<div align="right">(SB, p.21)</div>

These dialogues are simple and yet authentic enough, especially given their classroom metalanguage orientation, to provide engaging exercises for listening for prominence and tone, dividing tone units and guessing which is new or given information. Instead of 'copying the voices' as dictated in the instructions, students could practice their own intonation in activities. A focus on the existence and saliency of ongoing choice here could be expedited by observing the interaction in this tapescript from the participants' viewpoint, especially regarding shared understanding. Such provision of choice, inherent in natural communication, could stimulate and motivate both teachers and students to focus more on language in use.

It seems possible that the introduction of DI could slowly reverse this thinking regarding pronunciation. The resultant salient presentations, consciousness-raising, experiential practice and realistic production, listenings to suitably-graded comprehensible input, and use of transcription devices as educational tools, could be the impetus for a long-needed coursebook revolution.

8.3 Teacher education

None of the above can happen without the awareness and skill of the teacher, who Jenkins says has been poorly served by the ELT industry regarding pronunciation, and who also recommends an industry overhaul,

> The major obstacle to the modernizing of English pronunciation teaching in recent years has been the failure to *educate* teachers. That is, to provide teachers with the facts which will enable them to make informed decisions in their selection of pronunciation models, as opposed to *training* them to reproduce unquestioningly a restricted range of techniques.
>
> (2000, p.199)

There seems to be a self-propelling cycle whereby a lack of quality training continues to create demand for the type of materials found in this evaluation, and for the popular courses omitted from this evaluation (*First Impact* and *Fast Lane 2*) which were 'pronunciation-free', perhaps indicating publishers cater for many who do not wish to, or lack phonological awareness to teach pronunciation. Allwright agrees,

> There may indeed be a closed circle at work here, wherein textbooks merely grow from and imitate other textbooks and do not admit the winds of change from research, methodological experimentation, or classroom feedback.
>
> (1981, p.239)

An approach as 'innovative' as DI naturally meets resistance by risk-averse publishers which may keep DI on the fringes for some considerable time. Ariew's (1982) view suggests so,

> A truly innovative approach may be unfamiliar to teachers and so meet with their resistance; it may be threatening to the public responsible for text adoptions, and it may create public controversy. A publisher's success is based on the ability to satisfy the majority of the public; thus, the preference to aim for the mainstream, to sterilize situations and vocabulary and arouse as little controversy as possible. These products of compromise may be as boring as the innovative materials are threatening. Falling too close to either end of the spectrum can have a catastrophic impact on a text's marketability. Finding a perfect balance between innovation and saleability is maddeningly difficult.
>
> (p.12)

Regardless of this view materials "have the primary role of promoting communicative language use" (Richards and Rogers,1986,p.79). The evaluation found a plethora of products of compromise which constituted wasted opportunities regarding training potential. Most Teachers' Manuals failed to provide sufficient useful and relevant information on linguistic theory and

pedagogic technique to serve for the education of and use by the teacher. Sterilized situations were in abundance. There was also considerable inconsistency and often detrimental and misleading information, which is perhaps a product of a mainstream predilection for Ariew's non-controversial route. They seemed to perpetuate a non-threatening but phonologically damaging belief whereby "teachers … generally assume that pronunciation can improve only through the disciplined practice of individual sounds" (Gilbert,1994,p.38). Indeed, from my experience, as a teacher-trainer who frequently encounters qualified teachers, awareness of the communicative value of pronunciation in longer stretches of speech is rare. More disturbing is a common misunderstanding whether pronunciation communicates at all and a somewhat defensive stance when that concept is proffered for discussion. As a remedy, Goodwin et al. state teachers

> need more than a firm grounding in phonetics, a knowledge of updated methods and classroom activities, and a familiarity with current pronunciation materials. They also need a thorough knowledge of assessment tools and strategies and the ability to apply them appropriately…
>
> (1994, p.14)

A lot of the material revealed a surprising ignorance of coursebook writers who exposed basic misconceptions regarding the theory of language, learning, and pronunciation and its communicative value. This perhaps is partly responsible for the confusion and lack of confidence expressed by many teachers regarding intonation. The Literature is full of references regarding the difficulty of its teaching. Even Brazil acknowledges,

> Its reputation for difficulty and for slipperiness leads to its being neglected in most

teaching programmes.

<div align="right">(1994, p.2)</div>

However, his invaluable contribution to pronunciation teaching can only start to be achieved following an industry-led push to highlight communicative pronunciation. This is evident in Teachers' Manuals,

> Intonation is a source of worry to many teachers and consequently students. Teachers worry that their students (or they themselves) cannot hear it and that whatever they do, their students don't seem to 'learn' it.

<div align="right">(*Cutting Edge, TB*.p.10)</div>

Likewise, Roads (1999) catalogued many teacher opinions regarding confused perceptions over intonation

> It was a frill, something unimportant.
> It was important but not teachable
> … not usually an impediment to intelligibility
> It is not suitable for beginners
> It is hard to reproduce on paper
> I'd like to see materials which make intonation easier to incorporate into general lessons … not something too technical and specialized.

<div align="right">(p.24)</div>

The last comment represents a glaring paradox, given the fact that this particular teacher's request is wholly contained within DI.

Krashen (1982) states "the defining characteristic of a good teacher is someone who can make input comprehensible to a non-native speaker" (p.64). DI is an essential pedagogic tool to expedite this, making pronunciation intrinsically more interesting and teachable, and could forever remove the myths that prosody is difficult to teach, and the commonly held view that pronunciation is

articulatory phonetics. Similarly, Grant's (2000) ruing of the scarcity of "carefully-crafted intermediate tasks that facilitate the transition from highly controlled practice to real-world communicative language use" (p.79) could be reversed through the more pedagogically and linguistically sound approach of DI. Keys effectively summarizes the role of the teacher, who needs to be

> flexible in the presentation of the didactic materials [and more] alert to the possibilities for pronunciation teaching that almost any circumstance in the classroom will provide.
>
> (1999, p.7)

The teacher would then have greater confidence and awareness to experiment with more dynamic prosodic elements and how they affect interaction and negotiation of meaning, and to be creative and more involved with materials development. Teacher success and choice would create likewise for students. DI would make it easier for the teacher to actively use such materials in an integrated, focused way. Such a focus would enable teachers to attend to elements crucial to spoken discourse, but missing from present coursebooks, such as practising students in recognizing rises and falls, pauses, and prominent syllables, or counting syllables, and guiding attention to lengthened vowels. Perhaps most importantly, raising awareness that messages depend on very much more than sounds or word stress.

8.4 The learner – from *tabula rasa* to active participant

The data cast the learner as a minor participant in the learning or communication

process. His/Her role was that of a *tabula rasa*, continually subject to recitation or ticking, listening to uncontextualized dialogues, or in Grant's observation that "Most pronunciation coursework, even discourse level paragraphs and dialogues, is based on scripted read aloud practice" (2000,p.79). Learners perhaps correctly "feel that pronunciation is an endless succession of unrelated and unmanageable pieces" (Gilbert, 1984:1), which have been "drilled to death, with too few results from too much effort" (Gilbert,1994.p.38). Students are subjected to discoursally insignificant form rather than involvement in the language of choice and interaction. Munby indicates a probable reason for this,

It is arguable that the most crucial problem at present facing foreign language syllabus designers, and ultimately materials producers… is how to specify validly the target communicative competence. At the heart of this problem is a reluctance to begin with the learner rather than the text.

(Munby, 1978. p.vi)

The data support this reluctance, suggesting a scenario whereby students sit with eyes fixed on the teacher, ticking or reciting when requested in drills, occasionally checking an 'answer' with their partner (their only collaboration in 'pairwork'), and less occasionally engaging in a 'fluency' activity in which they rarely have to attend to phonology. They are not asked to transcribe, look for patterns, listen for stress, or prominence, or falls and rises in listenings, or analyze meaning. Rarely do they communicate, nor perhaps even think. In essence they do not participate. What is required from students bears little similarity to language acquisition, learning, discourse or expected recognized classroom behaviour. Nor does it prepare them for such. The data wholly accord with Candlin's statement that there is

no ground for personal or collective assessment of their putative significance in the meaning making process, no opportunity for considered choice.

(1994, p.viii)

Ellis (1982) states "What is needed for acquisition is a linguistic environment which the learners themselves help to create and shape" (p.75). It is vital that publishers facilitate this and recognize their neglect, which Morley (1987) calls an abrogation of professional responsibility. Seidlehofer and Dalton (1995) urge a shift in focus from "what is convenient for teachers to teach", to "what is effective for learners to learn" (p.145), although it is arguable whether the staid materials from this evaluation are convenient to teach. Likewise, Allwright's sagacious suggestion is equally valid and most opportune today.

we are not going to want … materials that pre-empt many of the decisions learners might be trained to make for themselves. We are going to need *learning* materials rather than *teaching* materials.

(1981, p.14)

Ellis mirrors this, stating it is essential for a methodology to encourage acquisition, whereby "the learner is free to find his own route; it must be facilitative rather than prescriptive" (p.76). In rejecting the teacher-centredness of the kind the data suggest is present in materials, he astutely recognizes

if the teacher operates as a 'knower' and the pupil as the 'information-seeker, which are the traditional classroom roles, then it is unlikely that the learner will have sufficient independence for acquisition to take place.

(1982, p.76)

DI centralizes learners as active coursebook users, classroom participants, researchers and major participants, accommodating different learning styles and

probably increasing motivation. It engages students in functional processes requiring conscious analysis, observation, decision-making, experimentation and performance. The all-encompassing nature of DI is conducive to McCarthy and Carter's observance that,

> Might it make more sense to think of the learner developing a set of competences, each one essential to using language effectively, but each one separable in terms of what could be described and prescribed for the syllabus?
>
> (1994.p.173)

Pennington (1996) states materials "should seek to motivate and engage learners to make a greater self-investment in their own phonological development" (p218). Learners at least need to know choices exist and that pronunciation does communicate and empower.

8.5 From prescribed knowledge to representative language

Knowledge has traditionally been the basis of communicative competence, however, the confused nature of language in the pronunciation component of current coursebooks barely represents basic linguistics. Even the Chomskyan proposition that linguistic knowledge alone is sufficient is inadequately addressed, with poorly constructed and declarative knowledge-based syllabi. A near-exclusive use of prescribed language and a proliferation of contradictory and misleading rules and stress and intonation patterns deemed to constitute knowledge is detrimental to learning. It greatly misrepresents real-world language. As Cauldwell & Hewings have argued with intonation,

> the rules deal with only a very limited part of the language … they would allow us to

describe only a fraction of intonation choices made in the language as a whole.

(1996b, p.333)

Coursebooks treated language as being a one-dimensional, list-bound, punctuation-replete system. All sentence stress patterns were prototypical of those native-speakers would cite if presented out of context. No consideration was given to how migratory prominence and choice of tone serve as meaning-developing variables. Language, or rather the phonemes and words which were deemed to constitute it, is parceled into simple packets of language which fit nicely onto the blackboard and could be focused on in a sequence more convenient for the teacher. Artificial and short-term success is achieved by teacher and student as each linguistic form is satisfactorily articulated and ticked off before moving to the next item on the list, with little learnt or acquired. Publishers need to consider what exactly the aims of their materials are regarding this language and adopt a more consistent and communicative approach, beyond the kind of "lip service" Allright's 1979 believes is paid to communication.

DI represents a more procedural approach utilizing language representative of discourse in real use rather than theoretical language, realized through series of discrete entities. It recognizes a broader knowledge, including sociolinguistic and discoursal competence, and rules of use to prepare the learner for successful communication in the outside world. DI incorporates a segmental and suprasegmental balance ideal for exploiting all materials. It focuses on what affects intelligibility and the choices involved in affecting it, rather than the standard list of phonemes. It is better informed and better informs.

8.6 From recitational competence to intelligibilty

The theory of communicative pronunciation and the importance of prosody and the stream of speech has existed for over 100 years with Henry Sweet. On the evidence of the evaluation data, coursebooks are still to implement it in practice, choosing recitational activities over promoting intelligibility. In today's world, where interaction, and thus intelligibility are key, the full recognition of Beebe's assertion that pronunciation communicates is essential. The recitational approach, although having some value in teaching articulatory phonetics, does not encompass discourse, nor empower students to do so. It is unlikely that pronunciation, explicitly taught as a fixed series of forms will somehow be acquired and spontaneously, and be recognized and used in comprehension and production. Communicative pronunciation should be taught from the beginning as a stochastic and proleptic system to focus on and expedite intelligibility. As Brazil et al. have noted

> At a time when communicative competence has emerged as a goal for the language learner, it would seem that the time is ripe for considering ways of integrating the teaching of intonation … into the language syllabus.

(1980, p.117)

DI focuses only on those factors, at all phonological levels, which inhibit or enhance intelligibility and meaning. Focusing on communicative salience would refocus pedagogy towards increasing intelligibility, and therefore communicative competence. An extensive, but not exhaustive series of recommendations in which this might be achieved follows:

Current materials need to change…

- from presenting inhibiting grammatical and attitudinal assignations of intonation to focusing on making intonational choices with confidence and success;

- from the minimal-pair phenomenon which creates student anxiety over the correct phonemic articulation due to self-monitoring, to working on relevant problem and personalized sounds in communicative contexts;

- from punctuated speech to blended speech, thus making rapidly spoken speech easier to understand, thus increasing confidence, ability and motivation to listen more attentively and observe speech;

- from focusing on prescribed patterns in sterile contexts to finding the contextual clues regarding how meaning is created;

- from word-by-word citation of pause replete stilted speech to thinking and speaking in intelligible tone units with natural pauses for decision-making;

- from mechanical recitation to increased awareness of what constitutes the linguistic blur of streamed speech;

- from form as declarative knowledge to form a speech organizing device;

- from reciting syllables to counting syllables, from making a sound longer to recognizing its saliency of length, and from guessing to recognizing rises and falls;

- from alphabetized transcription devices to ones involving greater sensory involvement;

- from having no choice or say to saying with choice.

8.7. More guided listening

For an acquisitional approach to be fully exploited whilst serving the above materials should actively involve and empower students in a listening process. The listening in coursebooks seemed to require little more than a passive involvement in texts of little personal interest. Brazil likewise focuses on students as major participants utilizing the variety of engaging facets inherent within listening to intonation, which

> aural discrimination, imitation, prediction and free use of the feature are all involved in varying degrees. ... The approach is inductive. Students are encouraged wherever possible to discover 'rules' and other regularities for themselves, and formulate them in their own terms, before these are stated in their institutionalized form.
>
> (1994. pp.4-5)

DI allows the learners to focus on different things at different times and absorb whatever salience they find relevant or are ready to accommodate within their developing interlanguages,

> Learners have to be given the opportunity to make their own subconscious selections of items to be acquired, based on what they individually find communicatively useful at each stage of their development.
>
> (Ellis, 1982, p.75)

Listening provides endless learning opportunities for all students at varied levels in the same classroom. It also entails a simple remodeling of traditional and familiar techniques. Listen and repeat might take on new meaning if it were retitled 'observe and respond'. Word stress would incorporate greater significance as prominence; Confusing and arbitrary coursebook-designated

intonation curves would become more salient tone unit recognition exercises with simple arrows; and randomly presented phonemes which may never be correctly articulated could become areas of immediate focus on factors affecting meaning in discourse. Cauldwell and Hewings strongly recommend merging the teaching of listening and pronunciation,

> To do so, it is necessary to look at the nature of the spoken language, and the best way to do this is to train people to observe naturally occurring speech.
>
> (1996a, p.56)

DI recognizes the difficulties of acquisition, and therefore takes the pressure off of learners of the common coursebook requirement to 'listen'. It utlilzes collaboration to make listenings more efficient and functional.

8.8 Integrated pronunciation teaching

> Students may well labour hour after hour over minimal pairs, which, although not totally without value, the sad fact is that in many cases here is precisely where pronunciation teaching not only begins, but also ends.
>
> (Evans, 1993, p.42)

Evans succinctly encapsulates another major problem with materials, particularly evident in this study, with the disproportionate attention given to decontextualized segmentals, although not exclusively to minimal pairs. This has a minimal impact even on phonological, let alone communicative competence, yet represents nearly all of the activities evaluated in this study.

In Japan grammar-translation is widely criticized for its non-interactive and heavily prescribed approach, whereby exercises are fixed and the properties of

the writers. Pronunciation proved to be similarly guilty in this evaluation with its non-integration. While other skills have all advanced and received Swan's 'splendid' activities of the communicative revolution, pronunciation, and to a large and associated extent, listening, is still isolated and stuck with listen and repeat, or just 'listen'. Listening in coursebooks was deemed a skill to be integrated with other skills, but to their detriment, not pronunciation.

Pronunciation in coursebooks existed as a communication barrier rather than constituting the essence of interaction and serving as an integral link between skills. A deductive theory of learning meant pronunciation was effectively treated as a blackboard-entrenched 'science', cemented to the realm of the vocabulary notebook. Minimal attention was given to minimalized language, with minimal regard given to learner intelligence, meaning, discourse and communication. Language was compartmentalized as something to be practiced occasionally, rather than as an integral component of every activity and speech act. Goodwin et als' comment regarding time and conditions permitting proved pertinent with pronunciation, although the addition of 'ink permitting' would add greater accuracy to their assessment given the paucity of attention. It was treated as an 'option' in many coursebooks, and was conspicuously absent in Contents pages. This skill-wide absence constituted an array of missed opportunities to increase students' ability and confidence to communicate. Stern concludes,

> the value of pronunciation for learning the language is pervasive, and the teaching of pronunciation under any circumstances cannot be regarded as a luxury one can easily dispense with.

DI would remove pronunciation from its isolated status as one-dimensional to that of an all-encompassing multi-faceted construct. As interfactional rather than referential. Coursebooks do not make claims regarding communicative pronunciation, but need to start doing so and give it a higher priority commensurate to its sociolinguistic importance in driving dynamic and ongoing discourse, rather than its present role in static and sterile language presentations. DI would enhance and add new meaning and possibilities to all aspects of communicative language teaching. Unfortunately, and as a reflection of intonation and communicative pronunciation in this evaluation, intonation is isolated and often left to the end,

> Often textbooks relegate consideration of spoken discourse, and matters such as intonation, to the later chapters, and the treatment of the phenomena of spontaneous speech are not given the amount of attention they deserve
>
> (Cauldwell and Allan,1997.p.i)

CONCLUSION

There is an urgent need for materials to adopt an approach which fully reflects and promotes the communicative value of pronunciation. DI fulfills this as it recognizes phonological and intonational choices as being at the heart of every unit of communication, speech act and message. It is a consistent, simple and user-friendly pedagogical linguistic tool, which fully reflects the cognitive and interactive elements of communicative language teaching, appropriate to twenty-first century learner needs.

The pronunciation component of elementary level coursebooks in this study fell well below expectations of the kind of materials teachers and learners need for communicative competence to arise. Outdated theories of language and learning incommensurate with the professed communicative nature of the courses suggest pronunciation is of token inclusion and value within the overall syllabus. The virtual total lack of opportunity for students to observe, practice or produce pronunciation in use, means students will not progress beyond a superficial understanding of what pronunciation entails students and novice teachers (a significant proportion of coursebook users) will remain blinkered as to the true nature of pronunciation and its fundamental relationship to discourse and communication.

Sheldon notes the pressures of market forces, which is perhaps the largest restraining factor to progress in pronunciation,

> Coursebooks are often seen by potential customers – teachers, learners … as market ephemera requiring invidious compromises between commercial and pedagogical demands.

(1988, p.237)

A self-perpetuating industry conservatism and need for financial survival maintains an anachronistic status quo. However, change needs to occur at all levels for pronunciation to be truly reflected as a pillar of spoken English. From a macro perspective, the audiolingualism institutionalized by publishers needs subjecting to greater leaps of faith and incorporate research and communicative pronunciation theory into their courses. This must see a parallel adoption by teacher-training centres to adopt more proactive policies in focusing on questions of pronunciation, intelligibility and DI, and so create greater demand from publishers. Only then can pronunciation become an equal and integrated skill to empower teachers to approach it as a meaning-focused and syllabus-wide function of communication.

At the micro level, coursebooks need to embody decisions, which focus at the very least on the traditional stalwarts of Communicative Language Teaching (the paradigm) even to begin to do justice to pronunciation. A focus on discourse intonation would do much to connect many of the fragmented exercises and activities which compromise the communicative efficiency of coursebooks, and thus make the teaching of language more cohesive and more globally communicative. Its focus on rules of use and meaning constitute a consistent thread throughout a single coursebook, or whole series, necessary to maintain momentum in acquiring phonological, and therefore communicative competence. Materials must be engaging and interactive enough to motivate students to

recognize this communicative importance and so invest more in their learning and increase learner independence. This is particularly so for those students (and teachers) whose educational backgrounds have convinced them that sounds and articulation are most important. In introducing DI, materials must avoid the danger of maintaining their structural theory of learning and applying it to a the dynamic and interactive theory of language and communication represented by DI. Learners simply reciting and copying neatly transcribed discourse segments along structural lines, while ignoring the choice of prominence or tone, is a style similar to the structural approach on which it is intended to improve. Change must not be cosmetic and choices need to be real.

APPENDIX A - THE EVALUATED COURSEBOOKS

In alphabetical order according to title

American Headway 1A & 1B. Soars, L & J. 2001. OUP.

Clockwise (Elementary). Potten, H & J. 2001. OUP.

Cutting Edge (Elementary). Eales, F., Redstone, C., Cunningham, S., & Moor, P. 2001. Longman.

English Express 1. Rost, M., Thewlis, S. & Schmidt, J. 2002. Longman.

Fast Lane 1. Scott-Malden, S. & Wilson, J. 1996. Macmillan Heinemann.

Firsthand 1. Helgesen, M., Brown, S. & Mandeville, T. 1999. Longman.

First Impact. Ellis, R., Helgesen, M., Browne, C., Gorsuch, G. &Schwab, J. 2002. Longman.

Grapevine 1. Viney, P & K. 1990. OUP.

Language in Use (Beginner). Doff, A. & Jones, C. 1999. CUP.

Lifelines (Elementary). Hutchison & Woodbridge. 1999. OUP.

Matters (Elementary). Cunningham, G. Bell, J. & Gower, R. 1997. Longman.

Move Up (Elementary). Greenall, S. Heinemann 1997. ELT.

Powerbase (Elementary). Evans, D. 2002. Longman.

True Colors (Basic). Maurer, J., Schoenberg, I. & Allison, W. 1999. OUP.

APPENDIX B:

THE STATISTICAL FINDINGS OF THE COURSEBOOK EVALUATION

	American Headway	Clockwise	Cutting edge	English Express	Firsthand	Grapevine	Language in Use	Lifelines	Matters	Move up	Powerbase	True Colors	TOTALS	PERCENTAGES
COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE (6.1.1)														
1. Does the activity impart globally applicable and learnable phonological rules?	3 (3)	6 (6)	6 (6)	0	0	6 (6)	7 (7)	5 (5)	22 (20)	1 (1)	0	17 (17)	73	22.32
2. Does the activity practice grammar in isolation (i.e. as a list of learnt items)?	17	29	38	14	6	12	39	49	48	15	19	28	314	96.02
3. Does the activity include linguistic elements in contexts of use?	0	8 (6)	18 (17)	0	2 (2)	0	31 (29)	17 (14)	20 (4)	3 (2)	2 (2)	7 (7)	108	33.03
4. Does the activity raise awareness of sociolinguistic, discoursal or strategic rules of use?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
COMMUNICATIVE PERFORMANCE (6.1.2)														
5. Is communication "THE major element" (Allwright.1979.p.167) in the activity?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. Does the activity represent an opportunity for purposeful language to be expressed?	0	2 (2)	1 (1)	0	0	0	1 (1)	3 (3)	4 (3)	0	0	0	11	3.36
7. Is the activity a component to prepare the learner for language use in a follow-up activity?	4 (4)	9 (6)	28 (10)	14 (4)	0	11 (10)	0	6	38 (2)	0	1 (1)	3 (0)	114	34.86
8. Does the activity involve mechanical performance? (note type – Table 7.2)	17	20	39	14	6	12	39	52	55	13	19	28	314	96.02
DISCOURSE COMPETENCE (6.1.3)														
9. Is attention given to tone (T) or prominence (P)?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10. Is language presented, analyzed or practised in chunks or tonic units/segments?	5	10	18	5	3	3	34	16	17	3	0	8	122	37.31
11. Is language presented, analyzed or practised with a focus on choice within intonation?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12. Does the context create learner awareness of the 'stochastic' nature of discourse?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
COMPONENTS OF COMMUNICATION (6.1.4)														
13. Does the activity focus on meaning?	0	3 (3)	1 (1)	0	0	0	0	1 (1)	0	0	0	0	5	1.53
14. Is there provision for intraspeaker feedback (continuous evaluation and negotiation)	0	3 (3)		0	0	0	0	2 (2)	1 (1)	0	0	0	6	1.83
15. Is the activity genuinely interactive (do students talk about what they want to)?	0	3 (3)	0	0	0	0	0	2 (2)	0	0	0	0	5	1.53
16. Does the activity require pairwork? (what kind? – Table 7.3)	1	10	4	0	0	3	3	21	15	0	10	0	67	20.49
17. Is there a degree of unpredictability concerning form or message?	0	3 (3)	1 (1)	0	0	0	0	3 (3)	1 (1)	0	0	0	8	2.45
18. Is language entirely coursebook controlled?	17	26	40	14	6	12	39	50	55	15	19	28	321	98.17
19. Does the activity raise consciousness as to the ongoing nature of discourse?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20. Is there a communicative purpose connected to the activity?	0	3 (3)	4 (3)	0	0	0	0	3 (3)	1	0	0	0	11	3.36
21. Does the context involve authentic language being comprehended or produced?	5 (4)	16 (13)	18 (11)	0	0	0	26 (19)	17 (4)	17 (16)	3 (3)	0	0	0	31.19
22. Does the activity have a communicative outcome dependent on correct pronunciation?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

	American Headway	Clockwise	Cutting Edge	English Express	Firsthand	Grapevine	Language in Use	Lifelines	Matters	Move Up	Powerbase	True Colors	TOTALS	Percent-ages
REPRESENTATIVE LANGUAGE (6.1.5) **SEGMENTAL**														
23. Does the activity solely focus on phonemes? (which ones? – Table 7.4)	17	21	27	0	0	10	39	44	45	12	19	20	254	77.68
24. Is attention given to vowel length?	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	6	1.83
25. Is attention given to syllable count of words and phrases?	2	0	2	0	6	0	0	2	1	3	0	0	16	4.89
26. Is the activity citational-form based (i.e. word stress)?	10	16	19	14	2	4	13	34	28	7	1	12	160	48.93
27. Are contractions and blendings practised?	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	7	1.83
SUPRASEGMENTAL														
28. Is the activity coarticulatory based? (note type – Table 7.5)	1	2	9	0	0	3	14	3	16	0	0	3	51	15.6
29. Is stress prescribed as part of coursebook-designated 'sentence stress'?	1	4	10	5	6	1	5	0	15	0	1	3	51	15.6
30. Is the stress natural?	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	9	0	0	2	12	23.53
31. Is attention given to the conscious selection of contrastive stress?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
32. Is rhythm practised as part of coursebook-determined patterns?	0	3	2	5	6	0	8	4	3	1	1	0	33	10.09
33. Is intonation practised as part of coursebook-determined patterns?	0	4	1	0	0	2	0	6	1	2	0	0	16	4.89
34. Is attention given to rising or falling tones regarding new or given information?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
35. Is intonation attributed grammatical (G) attitudinal (A) assignations?	0	A	A	0	0	G2	0	G3	G1	A2	0	0	10	3.06
36. Is the activity solely segmental?	15	20	27	14	0	10	15	26	46	39	11	18	242	74.01
37. Is the activity solely suprasegmental?	1	6	9	0	6	2	1	13	7	16	4	1	72	22.02
38. Is the activity both segmental and suprasegmental?	1	3	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	3.36
INTEGRATEDNESS (6.1.6)														
39. Is pronunciation the main focus of the activity? (note main focus – Table 7.6)	9	18	26	14	0	9	9	17	41	6	1	19	169	51.68
40. Is the activity linked to other skills on the page? (note type – Table 7.7)	12	22	29	0	0	0	27	45	37	7	1	0	180	55.05
41. Is the activity readily identifiable and signposted in the Students' Book?	17	24	20	14	0	0	39	39	48	15	19	0	235	71.86
42. Is the activity only an instruction in the Teachers' Book?	0	5	20	0	6	12	0	14	7	0	0	28	92	28.13
LISTENING (6.1.7)														
43. Does the pronunciation activity involve listening?	14	6	19	14	6	12	39	34	31	15	18	7	215	65.75
44. Does the listening involve while-listening perception exercises? (what kind – Table 7.8)	14	6	19	14	0	12	39	29	23	15	18	7	196	91.16
45. Is the listening followed by language analysis (incl tapescripts)? (note type – Table 7.9)	9	6	19	0	6	12	32	32	19	5	0	6	146	67.91
46. Does the listening lead to student-generated language?	1	3	1	0	0	0	9 (9)	1 (1)	3	1 (1)	0	0	19	5.81
47. Are tapes over-dissimilatory / assimilatory?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
48. Are tapes too slow/fast?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
COMPREHENSIBLE INPUT AND INTERACTIVENESS (6.1.8)														
49. Is language roughly graded just beyond learners' immediate level of comprehension?	8	15	29	5	6	9	39	25	37	6	1	19	199	60.86
50. Is the activity highly teacher-centred?	17	26	40	14	6	12	39	50	55	15	19	28	321	98.17
51. Does the layout communicate? (note how – Table 7.11)	17	2	14	0	0	0	30	50	39	10	19	0	181	55.35

102

REFERENCES

Allen, V.F. 1971. 'Teaching Intonation, from Theory to Practice'. *TESOL Quarterly 5*.

Allwright, R. 1979. 'Language learning through communication practice'. In Brumfit, C.J. & Johnson, K. (Eds.). *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching*. OUP. First published in 1977. ELT Documents 76,3:2-14. The British Council.

Allwright R. 1981. 'What do we want teaching materials for? *ELT Journal* 36 (1).

Ariew, R. 1982. 'The textbook as curriculum'. In T. Higgs (Ed.), *Curriculum, Competence and the Foreign Language Teacher*. National Textbook Co.

Baker, A. 1982. *Introducing English Pronunciation*. CUP.

Beebe, L. 1982. 'Teaching pronunciation: Why we should be'. *IDIOM* 9.

Bradford, B. 1988. *Intonation in Context - Teacher's Book*. CUP.

Brazil, D., Coulthard, R.M. & Johns, C. 1980. *Discourse intonation and language teaching*. Longman.

Brazil, D. 1994. *Pronunciation for Advanced Learners of English - Teacher's Book*. CUP.

Brazil, D. 1997. *The Communicative Value of Intonation in English*. CUP.

Brown, A. 1995. 'Minimal pairs: minimal importance?'. *ELT Journal* 49 (2).

Brown, H.D. 1994. *Teaching by Principles*. Prentice Hall.

Brown, G. 1990. *Listening to Spoken English (2nd Ed.)* Longman.

Brumfitt, C.J. & K. Johnson. 1979. *The Communicative Approach to Teaching Foreign Languages*. OUP.

Canale, M. & Swain, M. 1980. 'Theoretical bases of communication approaches to second language teaching and testing'. *Applied Linguistics* 1/11-47.

Canale, M. 1983. 'From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy'. In Richards, J.C. & Schmidt, R.W. (Eds.). *Language and Communication*. Longman.

Candlin, C. 1994. In Preface - McCarthy, M. & Carter, R. *Language as Discourse: Perspectives for Language Teaching*. Longman.

Cauldwell, R. & M. Allan. 1997. *Phonology*. University of Birmingham (CELS).

Cauldwell, R. & M. Hewings. 1996a. 'Discourse Intonation and   Listening'. *Speak Out #18: Changes in Pronunciation*. IATEFL.

Cauldwell, R. & M. Hewings. 1996b. 'Intonation rules in ELT textbooks'.   *ELT Journal* 50 (4).

Cauldwell, R. 2002. 'Streaming Speech: listening and pronunciation for advanced learners of English'. *IATEFL Talking Computers*.

Celce-Murcia, M., Brinton, D.M. & Goodwin, J.M. 1996. *Teaching Pronunciation*. CUP.

Chomsky, N. 1965. *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. MIT Press.

Dalton, C. & B. Seidlhofer. 1994. *Pronunciation*. OUP.

Dirven, R. & Oakeshott-Taylor, J. 1984. 'Listening comprehension (Part 1). State of the art article'. *Language Teaching*, 17.

Ellis, R. 1982. 'Informal and formal approaches to communicative language teaching'. *ELT Journal* 36/1.

Ellis, R. 1998. 'The evaluation of communicative tasks'. In Tomlinson, B.   (Ed.). *Materials Development in Language Teaching*. CUP.

Evans, D.W. 1993. 'Rightside-up Pronunciation for the Japanese – Preparing Communicative Lessons'. *JALT Journal*. 15 (1).

Firth, S. 1992. 'Pronunciation syllabus design: A question of focus'. In Avery, P. & Ehrlich, S. (Eds.), *Teaching American English pronunciation*. OUP.

Gilbert, J. 1984. *Clear Speech*. CUP.

Gilbert, J. 1994. 'Intonation: A Navigation Guide for the Listener (and gadgets to help teach it)'. In Morley, J. (Ed.). *Pronunciation Pedagogy and Theory*. TESOL.

Gilbert, J.B. 2001. *Clear Speech from the Start*. CUP.

Goodwin, J., Brinton, D. & Celce-Murcia, M. 1994. 'Pronunciation   Assessment in   the ESL/EFL Curriculum'. In Morley, J. (Ed.).   *Pronunciation Pedagogy and   Theory*. TESOL.

Grant, L. 1995. 'Creating Pronunciation-Based ESL Materials for   Publication'. In Byrd, P. *Material Writer's Guide*. Newbury House.

Grant, L. 2000. 'Teaching Pronunciation Communicatively: Merging Form   and Meaning'. *Speak Out* #25: The Americas. IATEFL.

Guariento, W. & J. Morley. 2001. 'Text and task authenticity in the EFL classroom'. In *ELT Journal* 55 (4).

Halliday, M.A.K. 1973. 'Towards a sociological semantics'. In Brumfit, C.J. & Johnson, K. 1979.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1985. *Spoken and Written Language*. OUP.

Hill, C. & Beebe, L.M. 1980. 'Contraction and Blending: The Use of Orthographic Clues in Teaching Pronunciation'. *TESOL Quarterly* 14 (3).

Holliday, A. 1994. *Appropriate Methodology & Social Context*. CUP.

Hymes, D. 1971. 'On communicative competence'. In Brumfit, C.J. & Johnson, K. 1979.

Jenkins, J. 2000. *The Phonology of English as an International Language*. OUP.

Johnson, K. 1979. 'Communicative approaches and communicative processes'. In Brumfit, C.J. & Johnson, K. (Eds.). *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching*. OUP.

Johnson, K. 1996. *Language Teaching and Skill Learning*. Blackwell.

Keys, J.K. 1999. 'Current Trends in Pronunciation Teaching: the Teaching/Learning Environment and Pronunciation'. *Issues* #151. IATEFL.

Krashen, S.D. 1982. *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Phoenix ELT.

Krashen, S.D. & Terrell, T.D. 1983. *The Natural Approach: Language Acquisition in the Classroom*. Alemany Press.

Marks, J. 1999. 'Is Stress-timing Real?. *ELT Journal* 53/3.

McCarthy, M. & Carter, R. 1994. *Language as Discourse: Perspectives for Language Teaching*. Longman.

Miyauchi, S. 2001. 'Brazil's PALE and the contrastive teaching of Japanese prosodic features'. *Japanese Bulletin of Shikoku English Language Education Society.*

Morley, J. (Ed.). 1987. Current perspectives on pronunciation. *TESOL*.

Munby, J. 1978. *Communicative Syllabus Design* CUP.

Murphy, J.M. 1991. 'Oral Communication in TESOL: Integrating Speaking, Listening, and Pronunciation'. *TESOL Quarterly* 25 (1).

Pennington, M. & J. Richards. 1986. 'Pronunciation Revisited'. *TESOL Quarterly* 20 (2).

Pennington, M. 1996. *Phonology in English Language Teaching*. Longman.

Richards, J.C. & T.S. Rogers. 1986. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. CUP.

Roach, P. 1991. *English Phonetics and Phonology (2nd Ed.)*. CUP.

Roads, J. 1999. 'Teaching Intonation: Beliefs and Practices'. *Speak Out* #25. IATEFL.

Seidlhofer, B. & Dalton, C. 1995. 'Appropriate units in pronunciation teaching: some programmatic pointers'. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*. 5(1).

Sheldon, L. 1988. 'Evaluating ELT textbooks and materials'. *ELT Journal 42.*

Stern, H.H. 1992. *Issues and Options in Language Teaching*. OUP.

Swales, J. 1980. 'ESP; the textbook problem.' *Mextesol Journal* (1).

Swan, M. 1985a. 'A critical look at the communicative approach'. *ELT Journal* 39 (1).

Underhill, A. 1994. *Sound Foundations*. Heinemann.

Widdowson, H.G. 1978. *Teaching Language as Communication*. OUP.

Widdowson, H.G. 1979a. *Explorations in applied linguistics*. OUP.

Widdowson, H.G. 1979b. 'Directions in the teaching of discourse'. In Brumfit, C.J. & Johnson, K. (Eds.). *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching*. OUP. First Published in Corder, S.P. & Roulet, E. (Eds.). Theoretical Linguistic Models in Applied Linguistics. AIMAV/Didier.

Widdowson, H.G. 1990. *Aspects of Language Teaching'*. OUP.

Xiaoju, L. 1984. 'In defence of the communicative approach'. *ELT Journal* 38 (1).