UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE SANTA CATARINA

PÓS-GRADUAÇÃO EM LETRAS/INGLÊS E LITERATURA CORRESPONDENTE

THE EFFECT OF INSTRUCTION ON SANDHI-FORMS ON L2

LISTENING COMPREHENSION TASKS

por

Margareth Perucci

Dissertação submetida à Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina em cumprimento parcial

dos requisitos para obtenção do grau de

MESTRE EM LETRAS

FLORIANÓPOLIS

Novembro 2005

Esta Tese de Margareth Perucci, intitulada *The Effect of Instruction on Sandhi-forms on Listening Comprehension Tasks*, foi julgada adequada e aprovada em sua forma final, pelo Programa de Pós-Graduação em Letras/Inglês e Literatura Correspondente, da Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, para fins de obtenção do grau de

MESTRE EM LETRAS

Área de concentração: Inglês e Literatura Correspondente
Opção: Língua Inglesa e Lingüística Aplicada

_____
José Luiz Meurer
Coordenador

BANCA EXAMINADORA:

_____
Barbara Oughton Baptista
Orientadora e Presidente

_____
Rosana D. Koerich
Examinadora

_____
John Robert Schmitz
Examinador

Florianópolis, 29 de novembro de 2005.

To my parents,
Romeu and Lucinda,
with all my love

To my cousin Elizete (in memoriam)
I treasure the moments shared with you

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Woolf family (in London) and The Hawkes (in Bognor Regis). It was much more than language and culture what I learned in England with you.

Anneliese, my friend since I was 7. No money in the world pays what your friendship means to me. You always have the right word, in the right time. You are a sister to me, and my soul doctor.

My close cousins (Regiane, Edilene, Glauce, Edilze, Gisele and Eliete). Thanks for the support.

My brothers Maurício, Marcelo and Moacir. I love you dearly.

Andréa, my sister-in-law,for her sweetness, always. Thanks for making this world a better place.

Thomas and Matheus, my twin nephews. You are a lesson of life to me. I love you with all my heart and soul.

Last but not least, my parents. Words would never do justice to the wonderful human beings you are. Thanks for being my very first educators. Your attitudes and your zest for life are priceless.

God. For giving me faith and strength to persevere.

November 29th, 2005.

ABSTRACT

THE EFFECT OF INSTRUCTION ON SANDHI-FORMS ON L2

LISTENING COMPREHENSION TASKS

MARGARETH PERUCCI

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE SANTA CATARINA

2005

Supervising Professor: Barbara Oughton Baptista

The present study investigated the effects of instruction on word-boundary sandhi-forms on L2 listening comprehension tasks. The main challenge, but also motivation for this study was the lack of research in this field. Two main factors are rendered responsible for this gap: (a) simplification of listening comprehension tasks in EFL coursebooks, in the *communicative approach*; and (b) greater interest in instruction on sandhi-forms for speech production, rather than perception. The participants of this study were thirty-eight intermediate-level Brazilian EFL students from a language school in the State of Sao Paulo. They were divided into two groups: The Treatment Group (TG), which received instruction on sandhi-forms; and the Control Group (CG), which worked on pre-listening tasks. Students in both groups carried out the same five listening comprehension tasks during the

last two months of classes. The purpose was to check which treatment (instruction on sandhi-forms, or work on pre-listening tasks) would have a better effect on the results of listening comprehension tasks when these tasks were not (over) simplified. The five listening passages used in the listening comprehension tasks were extracted from the students' coursebook, and the tasks themselves were designed by the researcher. The main types of sandhi-forms were the following: (i) assimilation, (ii) deletion, (iii) reduction, and (iv) linking. The data collected were analysed quantitatively; that is, only correct answers were considered. The findings are consistent with the notion that instruction on sandhi-forms affects comprehensibility, outweighing the pre-listening work. In the current study this effect occurred mostly when the speaker was a native speaker of the language. Although there was a ceiling effect in Task 3, findings signalled better results over time during the instruction period for the TG. Lastly, notwithstanding the reduced number of tasks, the results for questions checking listening comprehension and questions checking metalanguage showed significance; that is, it was easier for both groups (TG and CG) to deal with listening comprehension questions. Metalanguage questions were always more difficult for the two groups.

RESUMO

THE EFFECT OF INSTRUCTION ON SANDHI-FORMS ON L2

LISTENING COMPREHENSION TASKS

MARGARETH PERUCCI

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE SANTA CATARINA

2005

Professora Supervisora: Barbara Oughton Baptista

O presente estudo investigou os efeitos de sândi externo em tarefas de compreensão oral em L2. O principal desafio, mas também motivação para este estudo, foi a falta de pesquisa nesta área. Dois fatores são tidos como os principais responsáveis por esta escassez de estudo: (a) simplificação das tarefas de compreensão oral em livros didáticos, na *abordagem comunicativa*; e (b) maior interesse no ensino de sândi para produção, e não percepção. Participaram deste estudo trinta e oito alunos brasileiros de nível intermediário de uma escola de línguas no Estado de São Paulo. Eles foram divididos em dois grupos: O Grupo Tratamento (TG), que recebeu instrução em sândi; e o Grupo Controle (CG), que trabalhou em tarefas de preparação para a compreensão. Alunos dos dois grupos realizaram as mesmas cinco tarefas de compreensão oral nos últimos dois meses de aulas. O propósito

era checar qual tratamento (instrução em sândi ou trabalho em tarefas de preparação para a compreensão) teria um efeito melhor nos resultados das tarefas de compreensão oral, quando estas tarefas não eram (excessivamente) simplificadas. As cinco gravações usadas nas tarefas de compreensão oral foram extraídas do livro-texto dos alunos, e as tarefas em si foram desenvolvidas pela pesquisadora. Os principais tipos de sândi foram os seguintes: (i) assimilação, (ii) apagamento, (iii) redução e (iv) ligação. Os dados coletados foram analisados quantitativamente; ou seja, somente as respostas corretas foram consideradas. As descobertas são consistentes com a idéia de que instrução em sândi influi na compreensão oral, tendo mais peso que o trabalho de preparação para compreensão. No estudo atual este efeito foi ainda maior quando o falante era nativo. Apesar do efeito teto na Tarefa 3, os resultados sinalizam melhores resultados para o TG à medida que o tempo de instrução avança. Por último, apesar do número reduzido de tarefas, os resultados para as questões que checavam compreensão oral e questões que checavam metalinguagem foram significativos; ou seja, para os dois grupos (TG e CG) foi mais fácil lidar com as questões de compreensão oral. As questões de metalinguagem foram sempre mais difíceis para os dois grupos.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF APPENDICES

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

CHAPTER 3

CHAPTER 5

Batter my heart, three-personed God, for you
As yet but knock, breathe, shine, and seek to mend;
That I may rise and stand, o'erthrow me and bend
Your force to break, blow, burn, and make me new…

John Donne, Holy Sonnets, 1633

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Preliminaries

Oscillating in prestige and importance here and there, L2 listening comprehension (speech perception) has been for some time in the scope of interest of researchers (Helgesen, 2003; Celce-Murcia, 1996; Gilbert, 1987, among others) in both Applied Linguistics and Psycholinguistics. The former is more interested in how a foreign language is learned, as far as teaching pedagogy and learning are concerned, and the latter also is concerned with the mental processes involved.

As this study is concerned with the instruction of sandhi-forms in listening comprehension, two areas in which sandhi will be looked at are the pedagogical field concerning the teaching of sandhi (Gilbert, 1993; Celce-Murcia et al., 1996; Goodwin, 2001; Jenkins, 2004), and the phonological field concerning the environments that call for sandhi (Prator & Robinett, 1972; Celce-Murcia et al., 1996; Bisol, 2000). By dealing with sandhi features in listening comprehension tasks, learners will have to divide their attention between meaning and form (Van Patten, 1990; Lucena, 1998). Thus, by providing L2 learners with systematic instruction on sandhi-forms, therefore creating opportunities for these phonological processes to become automatized, it is likely that learners' attentional resources will be freed, enhancing the chances for retention of meaning.

Theories of L2 listening comprehension and pronunciation instruction have grounded this study. Secondarily, but also of great importance, is Van Patten's work on attention (1990). Chapter two will show the theoretical background that supports this study.

1.2 Brief overview of research on L2 pronunciation instruction

There seems to be agreement among researchers about the importance of instruction on pronunciation for listening comprehension (Celce-Murcia et al., 1996; Gilbert, 1993; Henrichsen, 1984; Murphy, 2003; Pennington, 1997; Richards, 1983; Wong, 1987, among others). Not many, though, point to the need of instruction on sandhi for comprehensibility in EFL.

Although pronunciation instruction has gained space again recently, it had not had its days of glory for long. As Moley (1994) points out, "pronunciation teaching in ESL is alive and increasingly well today after a prolonged period of being, quite literally, out of sight and out of mind in many programs" (p.66). Baptista (1995) also points to the lack of prestige given to pronunciation since the audio-lingual method started to be seen as 'unfashionable'.

With the revival of pronunciation in the SLA scenario, there was a shift from teaching individual sounds to teaching suprasegmentals. Murphy (2003) claims that "a serious flaw of pronunciation teaching was the tendency to teach speech sounds isolated from meaningful content" (p.115). He also adds that "lessons should engage learners in using sounds in more personalized ways and through more spontaneous ways of speaking" (p.115). Hence, the teaching of sandhi-forms seems to fit perfectly into this scenario, as not only are sandhi-forms part of natural speech, but they are also part of the universal principle

that all languages in the world have sandhi (Prator & Robinett, 1985; Celce-Murcia et al., 1996).

This is the theoretical environment in which this study is inserted. That is, the need for pronunciation instruction in context, with special attention devoted to suprasegmentals (sandhi), and focus on listening comprehension (speech perception).

1.3 The present study

The objective of the present study was to investigate the effect of instruction on sandhi-forms on L2 listening comprehension tasks. The study departed from difficulties in listening comprehension skills demonstrated by Brazilian upper-intermediate and intermediate-level students of EFL. Due to the scarcity of studies in the area of instruction on sandhi-forms for comprehensibility of English as L2, the research questions and the corresponding hypotheses in this study were generated from the pilot studies previously conducted. The five listening comprehension tasks, as well as the sandhi-form instruction tasks, aimed to a great extent at resembling real-life situations. Although Henrichsen's work (1984) provided some important information on sandhi for this investigation, this study is not a replication of hers.

The research questions pursued by this study, and their respective hypotheses were the following:

1) Does instruction on sandhi-forms have any effect on the results of L2 listening comprehension tasks?

(a) Instruction on sandhi-forms improves L2 listening comprehension.

(b) Instruction on sandhi-forms outweighs pre-listening tasks at this level (intermediate) when listening comprehension tasks are not (over) simplified[1].

(c) Instruction on sandhi-forms will put to the test students' belief that *understanding native speakers (NS) is more difficult than understanding non-native speakers (NNS)* in the context of audio listening comprehension tasks.

(2) Do results for the listening comprehension tasks improve over time during the instruction period?

    (a)   Results in the TG (and not in the CG) will gradually improve from the first to the last task, demonstrating the need for instruction *on a regular basis*.

    (b)   Familiarity with the task may help students from both groups improve over time. However, students in the TG are expected to improve more than those in the CG.

(3) Are the results of listening comprehension questions similar to the results of metalanguage questions?

    (a) Listening comprehension questions (part *a* of Tasks 3,4,5 together) will be easier than metalanguage (part *b* of the same tasks together) for the CG. For the TG the results will not be significant; that is, students who received

---

[1] For this study (over) simplified listening comprehension tasks are the kind of tasks that do not access comprehension. Instead, they focus on specific, obvious, salient information.

instruction on sandhi-forms, thus dealing with metalanguage during instruction, should be able to deal with both parts equally.

(b) When comparing results for Tasks 3, 4 and 5, separately, in the TG and in the CG, the following is expected: TG $\Rightarrow$ M of part a is similar to M of part b, and similar to M of parts $a+b$ (together). That is, questions on listening comprehension or metalanguage will not influence the group that received instruction. CG $\Rightarrow$ M of part a > M of part b. M of parts $a+b$ (together) < M of part a. That is, questions on listening comprehension or metalanguage will influence the group that received no instruction.

As can be seen, the focus was not only on the instruction of sandhi itself, but also on the consistency of this instruction over the time.

1.4 Relevance of the Study

More often than not, listening comprehension skills have been reduced to testing, as opposed to teaching (Almeida Filho & El-Dash, 2002; Anderson & Lynch, 1995). It was in attempt to change this panorama, and also aiming at providing insights for the instruction of sandhi-forms (connected speech) in L2 listening comprehension contexts, that this empirical study was conducted. Also, the dearth of findings that would call for this type of instruction adds to the disdain rendered to this research area.

Given that the last empirical study, to my knowledge, investigating the effect of sandhi-forms on the comprehensibility of English input dated from 1984 (Henrichsen, 1984), the significance of this current study lies in the fact that there seems to be a need for

updated information in this field. Also, participants of that study were mostly Asian students. Hence, a study that accounts for data obtained with Brazilian students would benefit the teaching/learning of EFL in both Brazilian and global contexts.

1.5 Organization of the thesis

The present thesis is divided into six chapters. This introductory chapter contextualizes this research in the SLA scenario concerning pronunciation instruction on sandhi-forms on L2 listening comprehension. Still part of this chapter are the research questions that motivated the present study. In Chapter 2, the relevant literature, including important studies in the field of pronunciation, listening comprehension, and task design, is reviewed and discussed. Chapter 3 describes the pilot study, and discusses the reason for its not having been successful. In Chapter 4 there is a detailed description of the method employed in this study. Chapter 5 reports and discusses the statistical analysis of the data, in light of the research questions that guided the study. Lastly, in Chapter 6, there is a summary of the findings and conclusions are drawn. Also in this chapter, limitations of the study, pedagogical implications and suggestions for further research are included.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter aims at providing the reader with an overview of the main SLA theories and pronunciation theories that grounded this study. Therefore, the chapter will encompass the following items in this order: (a) sandhi-forms, (b) listening comprehension in SLA theories, (c) an overview of listening comprehension roles, (d) listening comprehension teaching, (e) pronunciation instruction in listening comprehension, and (f) task design.

2.1 Sandhi-forms

As it is the main focus of this study, and the pronunciation feature on which SLA theories and pronunciation theories will be described in this chapter, I start with a definition of sandhi. I will use Prator & Robinett's (1972) definition, which is very similar to that used by Crystal (1988), Celce-Murcia (1996), and Bisol (2000)[2]:

> "The word sandhi, usually pronounced /sændiː/ in English, is a borrowing from Sanskrit, in which language it means, 'placing together'. It is used by grammarians to refer to the differences in the pronunciation of words or endings that depend on the environment in which these occur" (p.189).

Sandhi-forms can occur within words and between words. Although examples of both within-word and between-word sandhi are given below, in this study the focus will be

---

[2] A few researchers like Celce-Murcia (1996) and Henrichsen (1984) use the term sandhi-variation instead of sandhi-forms, but with the same definition as the one given for sandhi-forms in 2.1. In this study *sandhi-forms*, not sandhi-variation, is the term used.

placed on between-word (also known as external or word-boundary) sandhi. Different environments call for different kinds of sandhi. Researchers (Prator and Robinett, 1972; Celce-Murcia et. al, 1996; Bisol, 2000, among others) categorize sandhi-forms in various types. For this study (a) assimilation, (b) deletion (c) reduction, and (d) linking (liaison) will be considered. Definitions of each of them, as well as examples, are provided below.

(a) Assimilation: Changing the voice and/or the point of articulation of adjacent sounds so as to make them more similar. E.g., worke<u>d</u> /t/, bag<u>s</u> /z/, is tha<u>t y</u>our car? /tʃ/, di<u>d y</u>ou?/dɪdʒə/.

Celce-Murcia calls attention to the fact that "some speakers perceive assimilation as 'lazy' or 'sloppy' speech but that it by no means marks the speaker as inarticulate or nonstandard" (1996, p. 159).

(b) Deletion: Ignoring entirely a sound suggested by the spelling of a word. E.g., dou<u>b</u>t /daʊt/, interesting /ˈɪntərestɪŋ/; le<u>t</u> me open it /lem/, tell <u>h</u>im to go /telim/

(c) Reduction: Words that due to a certain grammar function are considered obvious in certain grammatical structures (function words, for Prator and Robinett) are often reduced. E.g., show <u>them</u> the way /ðem/ becomes /ðəm/ go <u>to a</u> store /tuː/ becomes /tə/.

Prator and Robinett list some of the principal factors which affect the degree of reduction. They are: (a) sentence stress, (b) frequency of use, (c) speed of utterance, and (d) formality of situation. For this study, contractions (e.g., do not /dont/will also be seen as a type of reduction.

(d) Linking (liaison): The connecting of the final sound of one word or syllable to the initial sound of the next. E.g., *how is he?*, *left exit,* all in all .

Although according to the environment in which it occurs this linking receives different names (juxtaposition, diphthongization, and resyllabification), it is not the objective of this study to get into details of each of them. Thus, here we will adopt the more general term linking.

Given the definition of sandhi, the principal kinds of existing sandhi, and the sandhi-forms that will be of interest for this study, we now move to contextualizing the teaching/learning of sandhi in SLA.

2.2 SLA theories in this study

In order to approach the role of pronunciation in listening comprehension theories, it is important that we first have an overview of the theories of Second Language Acquisition (SLA). Castro (1996) summarizes the most relevant theories of teaching and learning into: (a) theory of Linguistic Universals, (b) discourse theory, (c) cognitive theory, (d) the monitor model, and (e) Vygotsky's socio-interactionist model.[3] We will look into the ones more directly associated with this investigation.

2.2.1 Linguistic Universals

Within the theory of Linguistic Universals, Castro highlights the concept of markedness. According to this concept, if an item of a language is more marked, it means

---

[3] My translation

that it is lacking in many other languages; therefore, foreign language learners would find this item difficult to be learned. On the other hand, if an item is less marked, it means that it exists in most of the world languages; hence, learners would find it easy to learn when learning a foreign language. Guitart (1976, cited in Gurevich, 2001) argues that sounds are not always marked or unmarked, but that they are in a continuum of 'relative markedness'. Guitart proposes three possibilities of markedness categories in phonology: (a) Elements that are unmarked both physiologically and perceptually; (b) elements that are marked physiologically but not marked perceptually; (c) elements that are unmarked perceptually but marked physiologically. But no phonological elements are marked both physiologically and perceptually. Other researchers (Bisol, 2000; Celce-Murcia, 1996; Prator and Robinett, 1972) focusing on sandhi-forms, claim that these forms are part of Linguistic Universals. Therefore, they are unmarked[4], which makes them easier to be learned in the L2 context and, for the teacher, connections to L1 can, and in my view, *should* be made when first introducing those forms to L2 learners.

In order to have a more in-depth discussion concerning Guitart's claims, an investigation of each type of sandhi would be necessary. Although that would deviate from the objective here, which is to provide the reader with an overview of sandhi in the concept of markedness, it is an aspect that deserves to be looked at in future research. Next we will look at the cognitive theory.

2.2.2 Cognitive Theory

---

[4] Sandhi-forms in general, as a phenomenon. Sandhi processes considered separately would probably show particularities, and their relationship of markedness for L1/L2.

Cognitive theory sees L2 learning as a mental process. This process needs structured practice of (sub) skills until they become automatized. Controlled analytical processes, such as structured practice, are seen as a support that makes the development of automatic processes possible (Schultz, 1991, cited in Castro, 1996). Bringing this theory to the context of sandhi in listening comprehension, it is possible to say that by means of structured instruction, sandhi-forms can become automatized. By having the sandhi-process automatized, chances are that learners will be able to carry out more challenging listening comprehension tasks. Although some practice will be necessary to obtain automaticity, assuming that intermediate-level learners have the previous knowledge of sound structure to rely on, interacting the new knowledge to the old, or acquiring this new knowledge should be 'easier'. This interaction or acquisition of knowledge is part of a phenomenon recently investigated by cognitive psychologists called *restructuring*. Lightbown & Spada (1993) define it as follows:

> Restructuring refers to the observation that sometimes things which we know and use automatically may not be explainable in terms of a gradual build-up of automaticity through practice. They seem rather to be based on the interaction of knowledge we already have, or on the acquisition of new knowledge, which – without extensive practice – somehow 'fits' into an existing system and may, in fact, 'restructure' this system (p.23).

This can explain the lack of sense of achievement perceived at intermediate levels in the learning of some skills, one of them being listening comprehension. Lightbown and Spada call it 'bursts of progress'. For the EFL teacher, the importance of this theory resides in the fact that, by knowing that the processes of automaticity and restructuring occur, and how they occur, he will be better equipped to evaluate the consequences of each process to the various aspects involved in the learning context.

Although individual differences may emerge in this context (Tudor, 1996), and it is expected that they do, sciences like Linguistics and Applied Linguistics are prepared to give support to the cognitive theory. As Lightbown and Spada (1993) put it, "the cognitive theory is incomplete without a linguistic framework of some kind". Grabe (1992) recognizes the importance of interdisciplinarity to Applied Linguistics saying that "…it is probably impossible to do applied linguistics without incorporating expertise from some related discipline, be it anthropology, psychology, education, sociology, psychometrics, or some other field". (p.35).

Having attempted to show the connection between cognitive theory and this study, we now move to the monitor model.

2.2.3 The Monitor Model

This model, also known as Krashen's model, is grounded on five principles: (a) the acquisition-learning hypothesis, (b) the monitor hypothesis, (c) the natural order hypothesis, (d) the input hypothesis, and (e) the affective filter hypothesis (Castro, 1996; Lightbown and Spada, 1993; Richards & Rodgers, 1995). Although Krashen's hypotheses are widely known and, also, quite debatable, in this study we will look into the input hypothesis and the affective filter hypothesis in listening comprehension.

2.2.3.1 The Input Hypothesis

The main claim of the input hypothesis is that "for acquisition to occur, it is necessary for the learner to understand INPUT language which contains linguistic items that are slightly beyond the learners' present linguistic competence" (Richards et al., 1992, p. 182).

Due to the fact that listening comprehension *tasks* in the course material used in this study were (over) simplified, new tasks had to be designed to cater to the principle of i+1, that is, input that is a level beyond the level of comprehensibility, advocated by the input hypothesis. Although the sources of oral input presented in the material were quite authentic examples of real world situations, the authenticity was hidden by the simplicity of the tasks.

2.2.3.2 The Affective Filter

Lightbown and Spada (1993) give the following definition of affective filter:

> The 'affective filter' is an imaginary barrier which prevents learners from using input which is available in the environment. 'Affect' refers to such things as motives, needs, attitudes, and emotional states (…). Thus, depending on the learner's state of mind or disposition, the filter limits what is noticed and what is acquired. The filter will be 'up' or operating when the learner is stressed, self-conscious, or unmotivated. It will be 'down' when the learner is relaxed and motivated (p.26).

In order to understand the role played by the affective filter in this study, we will look at it in situations dealing with listening skills. Listening being one of the skills learners in this study wanted to improve, and audio listening passages being responsible for learners' feelings of both panic and difficulty in perceiving what was uttered in the audio CDs (information gathered through a needs analysis questionnaire in Appendices **B** and **C**), this research took into account those feelings in the design of listening comprehension tasks. Motivation of the participants was attempted through repetition of the patterns of instruction on sandhi-forms, provision of opportunities for learners to experiment with the new sounds (and also test them in their L1) inserting tasks in real-world contexts. Thus, it

was hoped that by lowering learners' affective filter, their chances of learning[5] could be enhanced.

Most probably individual differences would emerge if the affective filter, alone, were considered in the results of the tasks carried out here. However, looking at this aspect is out of the scope of this study.

Those were the three most important SLA theories relevant to this study. A section will not be dedicated to socio-interactionism because Vygotsky's theory aimed at (a) L1, and not L2 acquisition, and (b) young learners, and not adults or young adults, and the latter are the ones on focus in this study.

Thus, our next goal is to look at the listening comprehension theories.

2.3   An overview of listening comprehension roles

2.3.1 Listening comprehension and the Total Physical Response

Listening comprehension did not have an important role in the translation-based method, as in this method the focus was on reading and writing. The first appearance of listening comprehension in the learning of foreign languages came in the mid-nineteenth century with the French Gouin (Richards & Roger, 1986). Gouin's observation of children learning a first language, and Palmer's *English Through Actions,* in 1925, were the approaches which Asher drew upon to develop the Total Physical Response (TPR) method later on. The TPR claimed the importance of oral comprehension before oral production, thus reinforcing that instead of verbal responses, learners should use actions to show their

---

[5] Although Khrashen makes a distinction between learning and acquiring. Here the two terms are used interchangeably.

understanding to the commands given. TPR was based on the L1 learning system, as part of how children responded to their mother's commands. DeCecco claims that "already at the age of one, children respond to words about four times faster than they respond to other sounds in the environment" (1968, cited in Richards & Rogers, 1995, p.89). He reports the case of Percival, a one-year old boy who responded immediately to the command of his mother when she said 'ball', by going and fetching the ball.

Notwithstanding the importance of TPR for L2 listening comprehension learning, we should not forget that the applicability of this theory is more effective with young learners and beginners as, in these phases, "learners have little influence over the content of learning" (Richards & Rogers, 1995, p.93). Anderson and Lynch (1988) also report the major influence of L1 to the Comprehension Approaches, among which is TPR. To Anderson and Lynch non-verbal actions (performing physical actions or marking worksheets), and the use of L1 are good ways of responding to listening situations in the beginning phase of a language course.

The Direct method came a bit later, but followed the same principle of Gouin, that is, observation of child language learning. For this reason, it was also known as the Natural Method. Its exponent, Charles Berlitz, named the method the 'Berlitz method' (Richards & Roger, 1995, p.9). Contrary to the principle of Asher's TPR, the direct method was not confined to teaching young learners or beginners.

The direct method "promoted the teaching of listening comprehension and the idea that new teaching points should be introduced orally" (Nunan, 2003, p.9). Among the principles that are guidelines for teaching oral language in the Direct Method are (a) never speak with single words: use sentences; (b) never speak too slowly: speak normally; (c) never speak too quickly: speak naturally; (d) never speak too loudly: speak naturally.

Therefore, listeners in the direct method would be exposed to a totally controlled oral input. It is also important to highlight that in the Berlitz method the "use of native speaking teachers was the norm" (Richards & Rogers, 1995, p.10), which makes sense bearing in mind its framework and principles.

2.3.2   Listening comprehension, The Oral Approach and the Audiolingual Method

Two frameworks for foreign language learning were developed in the 50's in Britain and in the United States in tandem. The Oral Approach in the former, and the Audiolingual Method in the latter. The main characteristics of the oral approach for listening comprehension were as follows:

(1) Language teaching begins with the spoken language. Material is taught

orally before it is presented in written form.

(2) The target language is the language of the classroom.

(3) New language points are introduced and practiced situationally.

As speech production was regarded as the basis of language (Richards & Rogers, 1995, p.34), listening was not seen as a skill itself, but as a means to achieve good speaking. Oral practice was obtained through controlled sentence patterns in situations that would allow for as much practice as possible. Substitution drills, choral and individual imitation, repetition of patterns, words and sounds, were some of the activities in which listening played a role in this method.

Having its roots in World War II, when language learning had to be achieved in the best way and in as short time as possible, the audiolingual method was heavily influenced by behavioral psychology (Brown, 1994; Richards & Rodgers, 1995; Helgesen, 2003). The

heavy load of grammatical-based drills, in the listen-repeat pattern, was carried out in language laboratories with no space for improvising. Therefore, listening activities were both predictable and passive.

If, on the one hand, the oral approach and the audiolingual method differed in terms of emphasis (in the former learners were exposed to the language, used it, and gradually absorbed its grammatical pattern, while in the latter learners started with basic patterns and grammatical structures), on the other hand they had one common point: practice makes perfect (Richards & Rodgers, 1995, p. 47).

2.3.3 Listening Comprehension and The Communicative Approach

It was in the late 1970's and early 1980's, with the advent of the Communicative Approach that listening had its status changed from a predictable and passive skill into an active skill. It also became the basis for real communication needs. Now listening comprehension required building the context (schemata), as opposed to using an existing context for repetition, thus creating more opportunities for successful comprehension. The great influence at this moment was Krashen's input hypothesis, which postulated that comprehensible input (input language that contains linguistic items that are slightly beyond the learner's present linguistic competence) is necessary for language learning to occur (Helgesen, 2003, p.25).

Despite the various versions of communicative language teaching (CLT), what is common to all of them is that "language teaching starts from a communicative model of language and users" (Richards & Rogers, 1986, 69). Therefore, a different paradigm is assigned to teaching listening comprehension, which is now grounded on more 'authentic' oral input, that is, input which is similar to that found in everyday situations of most

languages (e.g. understanding somebody on the telephone, understanding the news on a TV program, listening to/watching a video conference and discussing it, etc).

The concept of tasks, thus, comes to fore, and with it, interaction, problem solving, and a *purpose* for the learning of a language. If input is as close as possible to what happens in real-life, what makes this input more comprehensible for the level of the learner is the grading of the tasks. Therefore, the same input is the source for a wide range of tasks, which progress in level of demand according to the learner's language level.

Having looked at the different roles assigned to listening comprehension over the time, we now endeavor to look at the teaching of listening comprehension, bearing in mind the context of this study.

2.4 Teaching listening comprehension

In the last decade, with the communicative approach living a more *mature* phase, considerable importance was assigned to *teaching* listening comprehension as opposed to *testing* it only (Almeida Filho & El-Dash, 2002; Anderson & Lynch, 1995; Celce-Murcia at al.,1996; Helgesen, 2003; Richards, 1995; among others). Therefore, a considerable amount of research was carried out in order to obtain new findings about processes that involved a better understanding of L2 listening skills.

One of the most important findings in the teaching of listening comprehension was the concept of bottom-up and top-down processing (Richards, 1994) and, with it the textual schema. Helgesen (2003) uses the metaphor of a brick wall to explain top-down and bottom-up processing, saying that by standing at the bottom of the wall we could see brick by brick, the details. In language learning, the details are the sounds, the grammar, the vocabulary, etc. This would be the bottom-up process. By standing on the top of the wall

we would miss the details, but we could see the landscape, which in this case would be general knowledge/life experience (content schema) and knowledge of situational routines (textual schema), that is, top-down processing. Peterson (2001, cited in Helgesen, 2003, p.29) proposes a combination of the two, top-down and bottom-up processing, calling it interactive processing.

Brown (1994), however, calls attention to the fact that when listening is part of a conversational discourse, as opposed to academic lectures, for instance, the listener does not want to "dwell too heavily on the bottom-up, for to do so may hamper the development of a learner's all-important automaticity in processing speech" (p.246).

It is of paramount importance for the teacher to be aware that these processes need to be activated before/while listening comprehension is taking place. However, extensive work on schemata building (top down processing), which is normally part of the pre-listening tasks proposed in intermediate-level course materials (the level of learners in this study) may lead to lack of interest in the listening passage itself. Buck points out that a great deal of time is normally spent on pre-listening tasks, for a minimum time spent on the listening comprehension passage, suggesting a balance between the two (Buck, 1995, cited in Helgesen, 2003, p. 29).

Being aware of the benefits of the two processing systems for listening comprehension, other factors like language-level, strategy learning and tasks should be taken into account when planning instruction on listening comprehension. More will be said later about strategy learning and tasks. However, it is worth pointing out that intermediate-level learners are, generally speaking, the learners more acquainted with top-down processing, as strategy learning throughout a few years of study enabled them to (quasi) automatically develop both content and textual schema. Therefore, they need

challenges that go beyond the pre-listening tasks based on the usual schemata building. I am not proposing, though, that pre-listening tasks be taken out of intermediate-level course materials, but rather that the *listening* comprehension tasks be modified to become challenging in a way that they (a) pose a need for students to carry out the pre-listening tasks, and (b) provide opportunities for bottom-up processing, one of them being work on sandhi-forms.

Richards (1994) proposes four steps to be considered in the design of a listening comprehension teaching curriculum, which were the steps adopted for the design of the curriculum for this study: (a) assessment of learner needs; (b) isolation of micro-skills, that is, features of the target-language that the learner will encounter; (c) diagnostic testing, that is, a test that measures learners' listening proficiency; and (d) formulation of instructional objectives (1994, p.197). In chapter four (method and participants), the reader will find a detailed description of these steps within the scope of the current study. It was through the assessment of learners' needs (Appendix B and C) that the need for instruction on sandhi-forms was perceived, as it was one of the difficulties mentioned by participants of this study. Other difficulties, though, are found to be common in L2 listening comprehension and we will examine some of them.

2.4.1   *Difficulties in listening comprehension*

Taking into consideration learners' needs and desire to understand more than what was required by the task, and also their perception of the 'fast' way of speaking of native/proficient speakers (Richards, 1994; Anderson & Lynch, 1995), we will look at the common difficulties these learners have in situations of L2 listening comprehension when tasks are not (over) simplified.

Brown (1994) compiles listening difficulties into eight categories, among which four are of interest for this study: (a) reduced forms (either phonological – *did you eat yet* /dɪdʒəiːjet/– or morphological – I will, I'll), which are one kind of sandhi-form; (b) performance variables (among them hesitations, false starts and pauses); (c) colloquial language (reduced forms are within this category as well); and (d) rate of delivery (amount of pausing)[6] (1994, p. 238). Anderson and Lynch (1995) group the difficulties of L2 listening comprehension into three broader categories: (1) the type of language we are listening to, (2) our task and purpose of listening, and (3) the context in which listening occurs. To them, the close relationship between input and task is what grades a listening passage as more or less difficult. Therefore, by grading the input as difficult, the task should be less demanding, and the other way around.

Although there are many other factors affecting the level of difficulty of listening passages, we have chosen here those of interest in this study, which are basically the forms that somehow relate to sandhi.

2.4.2 Listening strategies

Although it is not the scope of this study to focus on the work on listening strategies, we will highlight here the importance of strategic work in listening comprehension, as it was an important issue in the pilot study (see Chapter 3), and the major responsible factor for a failure in the first data collection.

---

[6] Richards argues that "pausing also affects our perception of the pace of speech. The impression of faster or slower speech generally results from the amount of intra-clausal pausing that speakers use. If such pauses are eliminated, the impression of rapid speech is created." (1985: 195)

There is nothing new in saying that a lot of *understanding* is necessary before we *use* a language to communicate with others (Asher, 1982; Krashen, 1982; Pinker, 1994; Nunan, 1999, among others). Thus, in order to be a successful listener we need to access some input we previously received, then look for more information by looking at the context of the situation and lastly, bridge the gap between the information given and the information missing by accessing the strategies available. Although this seems to be a long process, it happens all the time in a matter of seconds or even milliseconds.

Rost (1994, cited in Nunan, 1999) lists six strategies he found to be of common use among successful listeners: (1) Predicting: Effective listeners think about what they will hear (this fits into the ideas about pre-listening mentioned earlier); (2) Inferring: It is useful for learners to "listen between the lines"; (3) Monitoring: Good listeners notice what they do and do not understand; (4) Clarifying: Efficient learners ask questions (What does____ mean? You mean___?) and give feedback (I don't understand yet.) to the speaker; (5) Responding: Learners react to what they hear; and (6) Evaluating: They check on how well they have understood (p. 200).

It is widely thought today that teachers should invest time on teaching strategies already at the beginning levels, so that learners gradually build up strategic behavior. Fortkamp (2002) claims that the learner has to take actions in the sense of making choices in the process of learning. These actions are based on reflections. A strategic behavior is one in which the elements of choice and, therefore, reflection, are present[7]. Thus, if a learner lacks strategic knowledge, in this case strategic knowledge about listening comprehension, he cannot cope with the minimum requirements of a task that aims at meaning only, much less with a more demanding task in which he has to divide his

---

[7] My translation

attention between meaning and form. Using Oxford's (1990) terminology, we can say that this learner mainly lacked direct strategies (1990, p. 15)[8]. As will be seen in Chapter 3 , one of the factors that led participants in the first data collection to fail in task accomplishment was their lack of strategic knowledge.

As previously said, going into an in-depth discussion on strategies would deviate from the focus of this study. However, it was important to pinpoint the importance of strategic work in order to guide the reader to Chapter 3.

Having looked at the most important reasons for teaching listening comprehension within the scope of this study, the next step is to provide the reader with the main reasons for teaching pronunciation (sandhi-forms more specifically) in listening comprehension.

2.5   Teaching pronunciation in listening comprehension

As with listening comprehension, pronunciation has also been assigned different roles throughout time. One of its roles, though, remained the same until recently: Speaking. Murphy (2003) observes that pronunciation was *for long* seen as "the sounds we make while speaking" (p.112), thus, part of speech production, but not part of speech perception (listening comprehension). Later, though, another feature was added to the definition of pronunciation: "...pronunciation stresses more the way sounds are perceived by the hearer"[9] (Richards et al., 1992, p.296). Pronunciation focus shifted, and so did the pedagogy for pronunciation instruction.

---

[8] Oxford, R. (1990) groups the strategies into direct and indirect. The direct strategies are cognitive strategies, compensation strategies and memory strategies. The indirect strategies are metacognitive strategies, affective strategies, and social strategies.
[9] Underlining added.

Celce-Murcia et al. (1996) trace the roles of pronunciation throughout the years. It started with a more imitative and repetitive role (Direct Method), followed by imitation of sounds, introduction of the International Phonetic Alphabet -IPA-, and minimal pair drills (audiolingualism). It also had a period of decline, in between, when researchers in cognitive psychology claimed that "pronunciation was not part of habit formation and, therefore, could never achieve nativelike features" (1996, p.7). So far speaking was the focus. Then it reached its current stage, in which pronunciation is *taught* for communication.

Goodwin (2001) suggests three goals for pronunciation instruction: (a) to enable our learners to understand and be understood, (b) to build their confidence in entering communicative situations, and (c) to enable them to monitor their speech based on input from the environment (p.117). Bearing in mind that communication in EFL occurs between Native (NS) and Non-native speakers (NNS), as well as between NNS and NNS, intelligibility[10] has become a very important matter in pronunciation, and pronunciation pedagogy. Celce-Murcia et al. claim the need of a minimum level of intelligibility: " (…) evidence indicates that there is a threshold level of pronunciation for nonnative speakers of English; if they fall below this threshold level, they will have oral communication problems (…)." (Celce-Murcia et al., 1996, p.7). The threshold is, in fact, the pronunciation requirements (grouped into segmental and suprasegmental features) that draw the line between what is intelligible and what is below the level of intelligibility.

Morley (1987), advocating the teaching of pronunciation, highlights four major groups of speakers/listeners the new pronunciation teaching pedagogy should have in mind: (1) foreign student teaching assistants in colleges and universities; (2) a growing population of

---

[10] I adopt the definition of intelligibility proposed by Goodwin (2001): "spoken English in which an accent, if present, is not distracting to the listener" (p. 118).

foreign-born technical, business, and professional employees in business and industry; (3) adult and teenage refugees in resettlement and vocational training programs, and (4) international businessmen and businesswomen who need to use English as an international *lingua franca[11]*. (1987, p. 2). Thinking of pronunciation for speech perception other groups could possibly be added, such as Internet/on-line phone users.

If the communicative approach brought with it the need to *teach* pronunciation for comprehension (Celce-Murcia et al., 1996; Goodwin, 2001; Nunan, 1999, among others), and if the situations of listening comprehension in class should be good samples of real-life situations preparing our *listener-learners* for real situations they may be faced with outside the classroom, then the context that calls for instruction on pronunciation is set. But the reader might ask, why teach sandhi-forms of all pronunciation features (e.g., individual sounds, tone units, intonation patterns, etc)? The answer is that they are one of the main reasons for the difficulties in listening comprehension (see 2.4.1), and also because its frequency in natural speech contexts is very high.

Given that a good deal of listening tasks learners carry out in class are based on *audio* listening materials, which pose more difficulties than video or interactive listening comprehension (El-Dash, 1993), understanding this natural speech where sandhi-forms of all kinds (assimilation, deletion, reduction, linking, etc) occur becomes twice as difficult. Celce-Murcia et al. (1996) consider the importance of pronunciation instruction in listening comprehension stating that

> (…) the learners ability to perform the following processes is important in decoding native speaker speech: (a) discerning intonation units; (b) recognizing stressed

---

[11] "A language that is used for communication between different groups of people, each speaking a different language." (Richards et al., 1992, p. 214).

elements; (c) interpreting unstressed elements; and (d) *determining the full forms underlying reduced speech[12]*. (p.223)

Gilbert (1994) adds that "oddly enough, students of ESL are not usually taught about liaison[13], but in fact English also runs words together, that is, links them in certain ways. Ignorance of linking badly affects both speech clarity and <u>listening comprehension</u>"[14] (p.39). Despite the fact that Gilbert stresses the ESL context, with EFL teaching the situation is not different. Gilbert even uses a metaphor comparing connected speech to magnets by saying that "the metaphor is the irresistible attraction between succeeding words, specially if the following word begins with a vowel" (p.39).

Although the Communicative Approach shifted the focus from teaching segmentals to teaching suprasegmental features (Celce-Murcia, 1996; Nunan, 1999; Murphy, 2003), where sandhi fits in, Goodwin (2001) argues that "pronunciation has emerged from the segmental/suprasegmental debate to a more balanced view, which recognizes that a lack of intelligibility can be attributed to both micro and macro features" (p.117).

Despite this growing body of research-based publications supporting pronunciation instruction in listening comprehension, researchers still have to strive to narrow the gap between the findings and their incorporation in EFL course materials. More will be said about this in task design (2.6).

As important as instructing learners on pronunciation is the consistency of this instruction. Gilbert (1987), arguing in favor of the teaching of pronunciation and listening comprehension claims that " both skills can be improved by concentrating pronunciation

---

[12] Italics added.
[13] The way words run together
[14] underlining of my own

class time on the systematic teaching of the most important elements of pronunciation" (p.33). Wong (1987) adds to that claiming that "an unsystematic approach has rarely made an impact on learners; for example, one or two lessons on the pronunciation of final *s* or *ed*, or lessons focused exclusively on so-called reduced forms, only contribute to the feeling that pronunciation teaching is ineffective" (p.20). And a feeling of ineffectiveness is just the opposite of the feeling we want learners to have. Therefore, a balance is necessary in class so that motivation towards the learning of pronunciation is created, and systematization seems to be one of the facts that enhance motivation.

If, on the one hand, this important body of theoretical research advocating for the teaching of pronunciation gives us confidence to say that there is room for instruction on sandhi-forms in listening comprehension in L2 classes, empirical research, on the other hand, fails to do so. To my knowledge, the most recent study dealing specifically with sandhi-forms in listening comprehension dates from 1984. In this study Henrichsen shows that the presence of sandhi-forms affected the comprehensibility of ESL learners. Although participants of her study had training, and not systematic instruction on sandhi, the comprehensibility was better for those who had training than for those who did not. Her findings also showed differences across levels. Training had minor effects on advanced students, and major effects on lower/intermediate level learners. Despite the fact that in Henrichsen's study sentences were deprived of context, the sandhi-forms they dealt with are sandhi features present in most of the listening passages in current EFL material. Thus, more empirical studies are necessary, especially studies focusing on EFL and systematic sandhi instruction, so that conclusions can be drawn with more confidence.

2.5.1   Intelligibility

Although it is not the focus of this study to have an in-depth discussion on intelligibility, a word should be said about this matter, as it directly relates to the context of teaching sandhi-forms in the twenty-first century. Seidlhofer (2005) states that "as a result of the unprecedented global spread of English, roughly only one out of every four users of the language in the world is a native speaker of it" (R92). This may be an argument in favor of the instruction on sandhi-forms, and also a support for a threshold level of pronunciation at intelligibility level advocated by Celce-Murcia et al. (1996).

Jenkins (2004) states that "the main focus of EIL (English as International Language) research to date has been the role of pronunciation in promoting intelligibility in NNS-NNS communication…" (p. 114). She also proposes five stages of pronunciation learning: (1) addition of core [i.e., Língua Franca Core] items to the learner's productive and receptive repertoire, (2) addition of a range of L2 English accents to the learner's receptive repertoire, (3) addition of accommodation skills, (4) addition of non-core items to the learner's receptive repertoire, and (5) addition of a range of L1 English accents to the learner's receptive repertoire (Jenkins 2002, cited in Jenkins, 2004, p. 115). Although there is no explicit mention of the learning of sandhi-forms for more intelligibility, it is possible to say that it is implicitly encompassed by items (1), at least at a receptive/perceptive level, and (5), especially.

Jenkins (2002) argues that pronunciation is by far the most frequent cause of intelligibility problems in ELF (English as Lingua Franca) interactions. She also includes six items which are *not* crucial for mutual intelligibility (Jenkins, 2002, cited in Seidlhofer, 2004), one of them being features of connected speech, such as assimilation. We have to bear in mind, though, that Jenkins is looking at speech production and not speech

perception, in NNS-NNS interaction. In speech perception sandhi seems to be an important feature of intelligibility. In this study *good* examples of NNS talk can be found in the listening comprehension passages, thus catering to ELF and, hence, intelligibility.

EFL material writers seem to have recognized the importance of adding NNSs to listening passages, thus exposing learners to different models of intelligibility.

2.5.2 The Role of Attention

It is known that when learners carry out a listening comprehension task in a foreign language their attention is primarily devoted to meaning (Van Patten, 1990; Call, 1990; Ellis, 1997 among others), as opposed to form. However, if the listening passage does not pose much difficulty in terms of content, learners may eventually pay attention to other features while attending to meaning (Lucena, 1998; Call, 1990). Ellis calls this "incidental learning". He defines it as "learning which takes place when learners pick up L2 knowledge through exposure" (1997, p.55).

Van Patten (1990) carried out research in an attempt to investigate whether or not learners could attend (consciously) to form and meaning when processing input. He investigated four different conditions: (a) attention to meaning alone; (b) simultaneous attention to meaning and an important lexical item; (c) simultaneous attention to meaning and a grammatical function, and (d) simultaneous attention to meaning and a verb form. He concluded that "conscious attention to form in the input competes with conscious attention to meaning and, by extension, that only when input is easily understood can learners attend to form as part of the intake process" (p. 296). When Lucena (1998) replicated Van Patten's study with Brazilian EFL learners, the results she found were akin to his. In both studies, language proficiency seemed to play an important role, as learners

could attend to meaning and form simultaneously only when the listening passage 'sounded' easy to them.

Instructing students on sandhi-forms systematically should enhance the chances of automatization of these processes. Therefore, more space could be freed in the learners' short-term memory, and they would be able to attend to meaning more successfully. Again, it is important to recall that when these two processes of attention (meaning and form) are competing, one is going to be favoured in detriment of the other. Call (1990) says that "focusing on listening for the formal properties of the target language before they are asked to listen for meaning will provide students with tools they need to process comprehensible input more efficiently and to acquire the target language more quickly" (p. 778).

Call (1990) examined the relationship between audio short-term memory and listening skill, and found that "(a) short-term memory is an important component of listening comprehension, (b) memory for syntax, as measured by the sentence and probe subsets, emerged as the best predictor of listening skill in the test battery" (p. 776).

Understanding the role of attention was important (a) to analyse the listening passages in the EFL material of this study, and their level of difficulty, (b) to propose the design of the new tasks and, (c) to support instruction on sandhi in listening comprehension.

2.5.3 About Metalanguage

As important as instructing learners on sandhi-forms, was to give them tools that would help them better understand the processes of sandhi. The work on metalanguage aimed at enhancing learners' chances of getting acquainted with sandhi formation and, thus, providing them with more tools to carry out a successful listening comprehension task.

Richards et al. (1992) define metalinguistic knowledge as "knowledge of the forms, structure and other aspects of a language, which a learner arrives at through reflecting on and analyzing the language" (p.228).

Oxford (1990) also talks about the importance of metalanguage as part of learning strategies. She calls it 'analysing and reasoning' and recognizes it as part of direct strategies used by language learners. As part of analysing and reasoning are: (a) reasoning deductively, that is, using general rules and applying them to new target language situations; and (b) analyzing contrastively, that is, comparing elements (sounds, vocabulary, grammar) of the new language with elements of one's own language (1990, p. 46). These two aspects are said to enhance the chances of language learning.

Students in this study, during an informal feedback session, mentioned having profited from the comparisons made between L1 and L2 sandhi-forms. That, apparently, seems to have motivated them for some more work on sandhi and other pronunciation features.

2.6 Task design

Although it seems to be a consensus among researchers that pronunciation instruction aids listening comprehension, EFL materials still focus on pre-listening tasks, not on pre-pronunciation tasks. But why should they? If listening tasks are (over) simplified and students can carry out tasks successfully, it makes sense not to instruct them on sandhi-forms, as this type of instruction would probably not change the results of their performance, given the tasks learners are presented with.

Brown (1994) makes a distinction between target tasks and pedagogical tasks. "Target tasks are tasks which students must accomplish beyond the classroom, and

pedagogical tasks are tasks which form the nucleus of classroom activity" (p.228). We can

add to that by saying that a pedagogical task prepares learners for tasks they may carry out

somewhere other than in the classroom. Nunan (1999) looks at three important principles of

task design: (a) The authenticity principle, (b) the form/function principle, and (c) the task

dependency principle (p.26). Briefly we can say that the authenticity principle calls for

authenticity and clarity in the relationship between linguistic form and communicative

function to the learners. Nunan argues that "the advantage of using authentic data is that

learners encounter target language items" (p.27). The form-function principle, which

complements the principle of authenticity, claims that tasks should be designed in a way

that makes form and function relationships transparent. He adds that "the challenge in

activating this principle, is to design tasks that require learners to use inductive and

deductive reasoning…" (p. 28). Lastly, in the task dependency principle, Nunan claims that

the task designer should think of the principles he will draw on in order to promote a

logical instructional sequence that leads one task to the other in a logical way (p.30). Some

points to be considered here are sequence (receptive tasks, then productive ones), salience

for the learners of the pedagogical goals, learning strategies and experiential learning

(learning by doing). Although much more can be said about task design, these are the basic

principles behind the designing of tasks in this study, some to a greater extent than others in

certain tasks, but all of them taken into account. Breen et al. (1998) propose three important

steps to be considered in material designing within the communicative approach. They are

the following: (a) learners' contributions, (b) a route/script within the activity, and (c)

learners' outcomes[15] (p. 45). Although we won't have detailed discussion of these items, it

is important to say that for Breen et al., and also for this study, learners' outcomes included

---

[15] my own translation.

both success and failures in the results, which would then promote reflection so that new tasks/materials could be designed.

This chapter aimed at giving an overview of the main theories that guided this study. Having hopefully included the most important theoretical issues, we now move to Chapter 3, which looks at the pilot study.

CHAPTER 3

PILOT STUDY

The aim of this chapter is to present the reader with information about the two pilot studies and the first data collection that guided this study, and also report the unsuccessful outcomes generated by the latter, which led the researcher to develop new tasks with different material, in a different institution. Students' failures in carrying out the tasks and the possible reasons for them are detailed in this chapter. The final data collection of this study and their results can be found in Chapter 4.

In order to maximize the chances of having a successful data collection, two pilot studies were carried out during two semesters at UFSC (Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina). At the end of the first term adjustments in the tasks were made so that the tasks, already adjusted, could be piloted again. The first data collection took place in the first term of the following year. The majority of the students however, were misplaced this time regarding proficiency level; hence, they were not prepared to deal with even basic listening strategies, much less work on sandhi-forms. This interfered directly with the results of the study, making it unsuccessful. As this was an important part of the overall study, which required time investment and effort, it is important to report what went wrong. Thus, this chapter reports briefly on the second pilot study , and in more detail the first data collection.

The following are the research questions, and the respective hypotheses which guided the first data collection:

(1) Does instruction on sandhi-forms have any effect on the results of L2 listening comprehension tasks?

a) Instruction on sandhi-forms improves L2 listening comprehension.

b) Instruction on sandhi-forms outweighs pre-listening tasks at this level (Upper intermediate) when listening comprehension tasks are not (over) simplified.

(2) Do results for the listening comprehension tasks improve over time during the instruction period?

(c)   Results in the TG (and not in the CG) will gradually improve from the first to the last task, demonstrating the need for instruction *on a regular basis*.

(d)   Familiarity with the task may help students from both groups improve over time. However, students in the TG are expected to improve more than those in the CG.

The research questions were asked in order to investigate a problem that was preventing students from getting a sense of achievement every time they had to work on listening comprehension tasks. This was documented in the first needs analysis questionnaire in the pilot phase, and the results are summarized next.

3.1 Needs analysis questionnaire and results

The results of the needs analysis questionnaire[16] in both Treatment (TG) and Control Group (CG) in the pilot phase, and in the first data collection, yielded the following findings, which were common for the majority of the students: (a) they wanted to improve listening and speaking; (b) they found listening comprehension challenging; (c) they needed to improve listening comprehension in order to achieve immediate and future goals; (d) they did not have much extra-class practice.

Another needs analysis aiming at diagnosing students' listening comprehension level was applied in both pilot studies and first data collection and confirmed some of what had been shown by the Needs Analysis questionnaire. The results are shown for the group of the first data collection (see Appendix L). It is important to highlight some of the findings revealed by that questionnaire here: When dealing with a listening comprehension task, the majority of the students (a) could understand the general idea proposed by most of the tasks; (b) found it hard to understand specific questions where sandhi-forms occurred; (c) felt frustrated at not understanding specific chunks at this point.

3.2 Procedures

3.2.1 The groups and tasks in the second pilot study

Two groups participated in this pilot phase. The TG, which had instruction on sandhi-forms, with 15 students, and the CG, which worked on pre-listening tasks, with 12 students at UFSC (Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina). The groups were in the seventh semester and the material used was Cambridge Passages 1 (coursebook and workbook).

---

[16] The questionnaire for this pilot study was the same as the one applied later on for the real data collection of this study (see Appendix B and Appendix C).

The groups had classes twice a week with a total of forty-five hours per term. Each group carried out four listening comprehension tasks (see Table 1) during the term. The tasks had the following format: (a) Part I evaluated listening comprehension; (b) Part II evaluated unstressed words, normally functional words, which would be obvious in that environment, and (c) Part III evaluated chunks where sandhi-forms occurred (see Appendix L and Appendix M- Diagnostic Task and Listening Comprehension task, respectively). Both groups worked on a follow-up questionnaire right after carrying out the listening comprehension task itself. This questionnaire aimed at informing the researcher of the difficulties posed by the listening passage and, thus, confirm or reject the need for instruction on sandhi-forms. A syllabus established for both TG and CG started in the 3rd class and finished in the 24th class, allowing time for overall feedback and action plan for the following term (see Table 3.1).

Task	TG	CG
1 (3rd class)	Diagnostic task + follow-up questionnaire	Diagnostic task + follow-up questionnaire
2 (8th class)	Pronunciation instruction + Listening Passage 2 (played twice) Follow-up questionnaire	Listening Passage 2 (played twice) Listening for the 3rd time + tapescript Follow-up questionnaire
3 (16th class)	Pronunciation instruction + Listening Passage 3 (played twice)+ Follow-up questionnaire	Listening Passage 3 (played twice) Listening for the 3rd time + follow-up questionnaire
4 (24th class)	Pronunciation instruction + Listening Passage 4 (played twice) + Final follow-up questionnaire	Listening Passage 4 (played twice) Listening for the 3rd time + tapescript follow-up questionnaire

Table 3.1 Overview of the division of time and tasks in TG and CG.

As can be seen in Table 3.1, in the 24th class students were evaluated on their final listening comprehension task for the term. This is when they carried out Task 4 (see

Appendix M), whose results are the ones we will look at in the *Results and Discussion* section next. It is worth recalling that in this class the TG carried out a task of instruction on sandhi-forms (see Appendix M) before working on the listening comprehension task, while the CG worked on the pre-listening activity suggested in the course material. This same procedure (instruction on sandhi for the TG, and pre-listening work for the CG) had been applied to tasks 1, 2 and 3 as well.

3.2.2 First data collection

3.2.2.1 Proficiency problems

The first data collection was conducted with two upper-intermediate level groups (seventh semester groups) at the Extracurricular English course offered by UFSC. The Treatment Group (TG) attended classes twice a week, and the Control Group (CG) attended classes once a week, having two consecutive classes. Both groups had a total of 45 hours of instruction per term. The TG had thirty meetings during the term, while the CG had fifteen meetings. There were 19 students in the TG and 15 students in the CG. The class material used by the students was a Cambridge book for Upper-Intermediate Levels (*Passages 1* coursebook and workbook, units 1 to 6, corresponding to half of the book).

Due to the positive results that students had obtained in the pilot study, the idea was to apply the same tasks and develop two others, totaling six tasks in the term for each group. The task-type would be the same as that of the four tasks that had already been developed, like task four (Appendix M).

In the third class (second week) students were presented with a listening test taken from *Clear Speech*[17]. The idea was to diagnose students on segmental and suprasegmental features and confirm the hypothesis that students would need more help with the latter at this level.   It came as a surprise, though, that students were not able to cope with pronunciation features like syllabification, word stress, and sentence recognition. Naturally, then, when it came to recognizing suprasegmental features in connected speech (at the sentence level), it became quite unbearable and frustrating for them.

In the fifth class, before drawing conclusions on their performance, students were asked to perform a second diagnostic task. This time a more contextualized diagnosis was carried out (see Appendix L). Students had to listen to an American woman giving her views of England and comparing life in England to life in the U.S. The task was divided into three parts. In the first part students had to listen for general information. In the second part they had to listen to specific parts and understand chunks in which sandhi-forms were present. In the third part they were supposed to complete the blanks before listening to the passage. They were being checked on their knowledge of grammar, and it was also an attempt to show students that it was important to be strategic and not devote much attention to words which had/have only one possibility of complement (e.g., Americans work a lot harder **than** you do). Once again results confirmed that students did not have the minimum speech perception level they were expected to have. They lacked strategic knowledge to work on listening tasks.

---

[17] A listening comprehension material by Judy B. Gilbert Published by Cambridge University Press.

3.2.2.2 Plan B

In order to help students cope with the lack of learning strategies on listening skills a new work plan had to be devised and the work on sandhi-forms had to be postponed. Half of the term (three first units of the book) was devoted to the work on strategies. Not until students were confidently dealing with strategies and listening skills did the work on sandhi-forms initiate.

The work on strategies was conducted in both (TG and CG) groups from the 6th class to the 18th class (Units 1 to 3- each unit containing two listening passages) using the listening passages present in the student's coursebook, six listening passages altogether. The work focused on the six strategies proposed by Rost (1994, cited in Nunan, 1999): predicting, inferring, monitoring, clarifying, responding and evaluating.

For the TG the work on sandhi-forms started in the 19th class with the instruction phase. Both groups were checked on listening tasks concerning sandhi-forms in the 20th class. In the 27th class (close to the end of the term) the TG had further instruction on sandhi-forms and in the 28th class both groups were checked on listening tasks concerning sandhi-forms. This task, which had already been used in the pilot phase, was designed similarly to the diagnostic task and it included the same three parts: General comprehension, grammar strategies in listening comprehension and perception of sandhi-forms. Although it would have been naive to expect a really different result when only two instruction classes had occurred, some improvement was expected which, apparently, did not occur. A more detailed explanation for this can be found in the next section, focussing only on Task 4 because of space constraints.

3.3 Analysis and discussion

Awareness raising in relation to listening strategies seemed to have become a routine for the students whenever a listening comprehension task was carried out. Towards the end of Unit 3, all students but one reported feeling more comfortable working on listening tasks. The only student who did not report this is a Spanish-speaker who, from the beginning, reported finding listening the most difficult skill to work with.

The results for both the pilot study and the first data collection were measured quantitatively; that is, only the correct answers were counted. One mark was given for each correct answer in each part. Table 3.2 shows the results for the *pilot study* in the two (TG and CG) groups in Task 4, the last task carried out in the term, and Table 3.3 shows the same, but for the *first data collection* group.

Table 3.2 Results obtained for Task 4 in the pilot study

Group	N	Part I	Part II	Part III
Total possible Score		*(3,0)*	*(4,0)*	*(5,0)*
TG	15	*M* (3.0)*	*M (3.57)*	*M (4.42)*
CG	12	*M (3.0)*	*M (3.33)*	*M (3.66)*

*M= Means

Table 3.3 Results obtained for Task 4 in the first data collection

Group	N	Part I	Part II	Part III
Total possible Score		*(3,0)*	*(4,0)*	*(5,0)*
TG	19	*M** (3.0)	*M* (3.20)	*M* (3.93)
CG	15	*M* (3.0)	*M* (3.08)	*M* (3.58)

*M= Means

It may be worth recalling that Part I refers to general listening comprehension questions; part II refers to questions focusing on unstressed words (mostly function words); and part III refers to questions focusing on sandhi-forms.

Comparing the results for the TG in both tables (Table 3.2 and Table 3.3), we see that results worsened significantly in Part III from the pilot study to the first data collection (*M*=4.42; *M*=3.93, respectively). If we consider that students in the pilot study had twice as many instruction tasks as students in the First data collection group, we may say that these numbers are a good indication that instruction has an impact on listening comprehension tasks over time. For the CG the results were lower in both situations (*M*= 3.66, *M*=3.58), signaling to the importance of both pronunciation instruction and strategic knowledge, when listening comprehension tasks are carried out.

It is interesting to note, though, that in Part I (general listening comprehension), both groups (TG and CG) achieved the maximum score in both conditions (pilot phase and first data collection). This indicates that work on sandhi-forms very probably outweighed

the work on pre-listening activities. That is, having worked on listening strategies for half of the term was enough for the CG from the first data collection to carry out general listening tasks successfully. However, it was not enough for this same group to obtain successful results in part III, where sandhi-forms were being evaluated.

In part II the results also worsened from the pilot study to the first data collection. This is not much of a surprise if we consider the fact that having no strategic knowledge to work on listening tasks, the group in the latter condition might also have lacked strategic knowledge to work on functions, which may explain the lower scores.

Although it is not the aim of this chapter to go into a deep discussion of the results of the first data collection, as a thorough discussion will be presented in Chapter 4 with the final data collection of this study, it is interesting to look at how students in the first data collection group perceived their performance in Task 4 (see Tables 3.4 and 3.5). The follow up questionnaire in Tables 4 and 5 were adapted from Gilbert (1995, pp. 108).

Table 3.4   Follow-up questionnaire   **Control Group**   (15 Ss)

Listening: learning different things	Helped	Made no difference	Had a negative interference
Type of speech:			
a. dialogue	4	7	3
b. topic	9	5	0
c. vocabulary	5	6	3
Clarity of speech:			
d. rate of speech	0	5	9
e. pauses	8	6	0
f. stress	4	9	1
g. assimilation of sounds	1	4	9
h. deletion of sounds	1	3	10

Table 3.5 Follow-up questionnaire   **Treatment Group**   (19 Ss)

Listening: learning different things	Helped	Made no difference	Had a negative interference
Type of speech:			
a. dialogue	2	9	8
b. topic	8	9	2
c. vocabulary	7	10	2
Clarity of speech:			
d. rate of speech	3	4	12
e. pauses	13	6	0
f. stress	7	9	3
g. assimilation of sounds	2	6	11
h. deletion of sounds	2	9	8
Pronunciation lesson			
Having had a pronunciation lesson, focusing on some of those aspects, before listening to the passage…	13	6	0

The category *type of speech* calls attention to the fact that for both groups vocabulary was not a constraint in the listening tasks. Although more positive in the TG than in the CG, generally it seems not to have been affecting listening comprehension negatively. As for the category *clarity of speech*, rate of speech still had a negative impact on both groups. Although only Task 4 is in evidence here, it was not much different when they were asked about the other tasks in the first data collection. The results of this feature are consistent with the results for both assimilation and omission of sounds (sandhi-forms) in the two groups. This shows that when not consistent, instruction might not cause a sense of achievement on student's perception. It is important to remind the reader here that although Task 4 was the last task, the first data collection group received only two

instruction classes, which is close to nothing when talking about something as complex as the work on the sounds of connected speech.

For the TG one question was added and, as contradictory as it may seem, students perceived positively the work on pronunciation. Probably the question was too vague and the researcher was referring specifically to the work on assimilation and deletion. The students may have understood the question to refer to anything they considered pronunciation.

Although other features in both Tables could be analyzed, as well as the results for the other tasks, the analysis in this section should be sufficient to demonstrate why another data collection proved necessary.

3.4 Conclusion

Due to the disappointing results presented above, the two research questions asked in the beginning of this chapter remained unanswered at this point. In order to provide firm evidence to support the hypotheses of this study, other tasks had to be designed. This time, though, with no space for pilot studies, as the material of the new institution where the new data collection would take place was different, as well as the students and some of their interests.

Empirical studies are susceptible to failures, and turning a blind eye to that does not contribute to the advance of science. Failures are part of the process of carrying out research, and there should be no shame in reporting them when they occur. Being able to investigate the reasons responsible for failures is equally important.

Having gone through this process, the researcher was able to reflect on the process of learning and, thus, develop more carefully designed tasks. Chapter 4, next, will show the step-by-step of the final data collection for this study.

CHAPTER 4

METHOD

This chapter aims at showing participants' profile and information about the method used in this study. The information is organized in the following sequence: a) profile of the participants; b) task-design; c) procedures; and d) instruments and tasks. The research questions meant to be answered through this data collection are the same as those shown in Chapter 1:

(1) Does instruction on sandhi-forms have any effect on the results of L2 listening comprehension tasks?

(2) Do results for the listening comprehension tasks improve over time during the instruction period?

(3) Are the results of listening comprehension questions similar to the results of metalanguage questions?

4.1 Participants

Thirty-eight students participated in this study. They were all Intermediate-level (intermediate 2) students of English at a language school in the state of São Paulo, Brazil. They belonged to two different groups, each of which had a-hundred-minute class twice a week. The groups were randomly assigned as Treatment group (TG) and Control Group

(CG). In the beginning of the study each group had 20 students. Due to the change of one student from the TG to a different group later in the term and, for statistical matters, the researcher decided to keep the same number of students, putting aside the data of one student at random from the CG, at the end of the study.

Through two different needs analysis questionnaires it was possible to obtain a profile of students from both groups. The first needs analysis questionnaire (Appendix B) presented the researcher with a broad spectrum of students' aims, interests, personal information (age, likes, dislikes), time they would invest studying the language and information alike. The second needs analysis questionnaire (Appendix C) focused on their attitude toward speech perception, and the information gathered guided the route to take on that matter.

4.1.1   *Participants and their profile: the first needs analysis questionnaire*

The first needs analysis questionnaire was answered by most of the students in the second week of class, when groups were more established, students less anxious about new teacher and (new) classmates, and rules had already been made clear to them on a two-way road: students' rights and duties and teacher's rights and duties. A couple of students who joined the groups later on, answered the questionnaire individually, in class, under the teacher's guidance. The information gathered through the first needs analysis questionnaire was compiled, as follows:

1)   Age range: Treatment Group (14-25 years-old); control Group (12-42 years-old). The age of the majority of the students, however, ranged from

14-22. Only one student was 42 and a minority of them were between 23-30 years old. Also only one student was 12 years old.

2) Years spent studying English: On average students from both groups had been studying English for 3 ½ years when this study began.

3) Reasons for studying the language: Among the reasons mentioned for studying English were job promotion, travelling abroad, using the Internet, and getting a job (in the future).

4) Students' perception of their English level: Most of the students in the TG perceived their speaking as being OK. They could manage a simple conversation in English, as opposed to the majority of the students in the CG, who mentioned speaking as not being OK. Listening was perceived as not being so good in both groups. As for reading and writing, the CG had a better perception of these two skills than did the TG.

5) Focus for the term: Speaking and listening were the two most common skills students were interested in improving in both groups. A few of them mentioned reading and writing.

6) Motivation: The most common answers for this question in the TG were *studying abroad* (majority), *finding a job, using the Internet,* and *taking a post-grad course*. For the CG the answer *necessary for the future* was the most common, followed by *speaking with and understanding foreigners* and *understanding films in English*.

7) Investment of time on their studies: Students from the CG seemed to be a little bit more committed to investing time in studying English extra class. About 2 hours compared to 1 ½ for the TG.

8) Important information for your teacher: When asked about one thing they wanted their teacher to know about them, a few students in the TG mentioned not being willing to speak in front of everybody. Not many classes were needed until the four of them identified themselves as being quite shy. In the CG, a few students mentioned enjoying working on materials that had native speakers of English (they meant listening materials) in them. The majority of students in the TG mentioned *conversation* and *correction on pronunciation* as being something they would like to work on in class. For the same question the CG answered *films, songs, videos, tapes, and CDs* – all of those 'spoken' by native speakers of English.

9) Favourite activities in class: Activities focusing on conversation and pronunciation were the most mentioned by students in the TG. In the CG all sorts of audio material (with native speakers) were mentioned, followed by correction on speaking.

10) Expectations: Concerning expectations in the English classes, the majority of students in the TG mentioned *speaking better English by the end the term*. The CG, however, had mixed opinions. About half of the group mentioned *speaking better English* (some of them highlighting pronunciation), and the other half mentioned *improving listening and speaking* by the end of the term.

11) Extra-class work: The last question in this needs analysis investigated the contact with English outside the classroom. All students in both groups (no exception) mentioned the Internet. The reasons for using the Internet

varied (chat sites, research, job search, keeping in touch with long-distance friends who were not Brazilian, 'dating', visits to sites of their favourite bands, etc). The second most common contact with the language outside classroom was through songs and films and, to a lesser extent, audio material of their coursebook, and books in general.

Gathering information about the groups was essential for a good planning of the term. Overall, the two groups had similar needs and interests. It was important to see, though, that the range of interests across groups was smaller than the range of interests between groups. Although individual differences would show here and there, there was a good number of common interests, which is quite helpful and desired when groups are this big.

Understanding more about students' expectations was vital to guide them to what they would need in order to achieve their goals for the term. As speaking came out as one of the skills they most wanted to improve, making students aware of the importance of listening to improve speaking was a first important step of this discussion.

4.1.2 Participants and listening skills: the second needs analysis questionnaire

The second needs analysis questionnaire (Appendix C) was also applied in the second week of class, in the class that followed the first questionnaire to be more precise. The purpose of this questionnaire was to check whether there was need for instruction on sandhi-forms within L2 listening comprehension tasks for these groups, as there had been for the groups with which the first data collection took place (see chapter 3). The

information gathered through the second needs analysis questionnaire was compiled as follows:

1) Degree of difficulty assigned to each skill: Listening to audio CDs was rated by the majority of students in the TG as being either the most difficult or the second most difficult skill to learn. Writing was another skill rated as the most difficult, and listening to (watching) videotapes and CD-ROMs, the easiest. For the CG listening to audio CDs was considered, by the majority, the second most difficult skill to learn; writing being the one regarded as the most difficult. There was not only one skill rated as the easiest skill. But reading and listening to (watching) videotapes and CD-ROMs were skills rated as easiest.

2) Speaking in class: While in the TG most of the students reported positive attitudes toward this activity, in the CG the responses were more negative. Most of the CG students feel that speaking among themselves in class makes them feel uncomfortable and bored.

3) Feelings towards audio listening for task accomplishment: In the TG the majority of students responded that *listening is difficult due to speakers always speaking too fast*. The second most voted answer was *it depends on the speaker*. The majority of students in the CG gave the same response as the majority in the TG. For this group, the second most frequent answer was *having a feeling of panic because listening passages are hard to understand*. These feelings were the same found in the first data collection (chapter 3); that is, students most of the time ignore task requirements and focus on the listening passage itself. This occurs mostly because tasks in the material do not pose the challenge students at this level need.

4) What makes listening passages difficult: TG students considered *speech rate* as the feature that makes listening passages difficult to understand. CG students rendered two items as responsible for the difficulty of listening passages – *unfamiliarity with the topic*, and *speech rate*.

5) Justification for answers in question one. The information to be reported here concerns listening to audio CDs only. Basically the answers confirm what students said in number 4. For the TG the difficulty posed by audio CDs is due to speech rate, sandhi-forms (although this term was not used as it had not been presented to them yet), and listening to audio as opposed to watching videos or CD-ROMs. For the CG the difficulty in listening passages also resides in the fact that speakers speak too fast, listening to audio being harder than watching videos and CD-ROMs, and sandhi forms. But this group also pointed to memory issues (sometimes they would understand the information but could not remember it all at the end), and to accent (British being more difficult to understand and Americans 'changing sounds' more frequently).

This questionnaire was shown to students in PowerPoint format. Handouts containing the questions and the letters for the alternatives were handed out to students, but they did not have access to written sentences as alternatives. That was done in an attempt to avoid students changing their answers influenced by the question that would follow. Also to have more chances of having their authentic answers. On their papers, question number 5 did not appear. This was also an attempt to avoid students answering anything at all just to have an easy way to justify the answer. So question 5 was only shown in PowerPoint. Although speaking was not the focus of the questionnaire, one question was devoted to

speaking in order to *distract* students from object of the investigation, which was their listening comprehension skills.

Overall, the data collected through this needs analysis pointed to the need of instruction on sandhi-forms in L2 listening comprehension tasks, and also pointed to the need of working on students' general listening skills. Furthermore, some perception/beliefs students had in relation to L2 listening comprehension (native speakers speak faster; it's easier to understand a non-native speaker; British English is more difficult) had to be further examined and discussed with students.

4.1.3 Feedback on second needs analysis questionnaire

In the third week of class the results of the questionnaires had been compiled and students received group feedback. In order to facilitate the discussion on the feedback about this questionnaire, students carried out a listening task (see Appendix D), which was the same for both groups (TG and CG). None of the groups had had any training or instruction that would help them carry out the task at this point. The aim of this task was to introduce the concept of sandhi-forms to students and, through this, discuss the statement *native speakers speak fast (er)*. As the results for this listening passage were checked, comparisons between sandhi-forms in L1/L2 were welcomed. Results for this listening task were compiled; however, they were not included in the statistical data. They were just meant to inform how the groups would deal with a sandhi-form listening comprehension task before the instruction phase would start. But above all, as previously mentioned, this task aimed at checking the validity of comments made by students in the results for the second needs analysis questionnaire.

The other statements (*it's easier to understand non-native speakers*, and *British English is more difficult than American English*) that had come up in the results for the s*econd needs analysis* were also discussed, and others (importance of English in the world, places worldwide where English is a native language - beyond American and British English, how non-native speakers of English can understand and communicate in the language, students' attitudes towards learning the language, who the speakers are when they, students, are the listeners; and who the listeners are when they are the speakers) were added to the discussion. This discussion was of paramount importance for students' awareness of what is involved in learning a language, and for their commitment to the course and to this study. All things considered, it is possible to say that students' attitudes in both groups were quite positive in relation to the learning of English.

4.2 Task design

In designing tasks that would check students listening comprehension on sandhi-forms, the researcher bore in mind the following principles: (a) tasks should have a purpose that would resemble a real-life situation; (b) tasks should provide the right level of challenge: neither so difficult as to frustrate students, nor so easy as to underestimate their cognitive capacity; (c) tasks should be locally (as opposed to centrally) produced[18], whenever possible; (d) task design should consider one type of measurement that could be used throughout the study.

---

[18] Prabhu (1988) defines centrally-produced materials as those produced for mass use.

Departing from that, the five tasks had the following format: For the TG, part I of each of the five tasks focused on the instruction of sandhi-forms; while for the CG, part I of each of the five tasks focused on pre-listening work, schemata building. Part II focused on the Listening comprehension of sandhi-forms and it was the same for both TG and CG.

4.2.1   *Tasks for instruction on sandhi-forms*

Only the Treatment Group (TG) had instruction on sandhi-forms, as already mentioned. Contrary to the Control Group (CG), the TG did not work on organizing the ideas (in a formal way) around the topic of the text they would listen to. Instead, they worked on the perception of sounds (Part I of each task-TG); word boundary sandhi-forms, more specifically, that would be present in the listening passage they would have. This way, results would be able to show whether instructing students on sandhi-forms has the same effect of working on pre-listening tasks (normally the kind of task proposed by the book) when discrete items of listening are to be checked. Thus, tasks for sandhi-forms instruction were organized in the following way:

Task 1 (Appendix E): This task introduced students to the idea of a word uttered on its own and words (pairs of words) uttered together. It was meant to help students attend to the sounds that changed and understand why/where they changed. It also aimed at giving an overview of sandhi-forms and at helping students perceive the changes caused by sandhi-forms and their effect on speech rate. The instruction lasted about thirty minutes. This instruction task (Part I) was adapted from *Pronunciation Tasks* (1993), and the speaker for this listening part had a British accent.

Task 2 (Appendix F): This task focused on some specific sounds that change, when together, producing new sounds (assimilation), and also focused on sounds that are not pronounced (deletion) when at word boundary. These two categories were produced inside bars / /. In the *guideline for changes*, students would have the sound before the change, then an arrow (➡), and then either the new sound corresponding to the change, or the symbol (∅), which would represent the sound before the arrow as not being pronounced. Instead of pairs of words, as in Task 1, now students had a dialogue to work on. The dialogue was part of a listening passage taken from *Pronunciation Tasks* (1993), from which Task 2 (Part I) was developed. Speakers for this passage (a man and a woman) had features of both American and British English in their speech.

Task 3 (Appendix G): This task focused on presenting students with some other occurrences of assimilation and omission, and introduced the feature of reduction of obvious sounds, as in the chunk *at**a** party,* where the underlined sound is reduced to a schwa /ə/. It also aimed at getting students to understand why/where these features occurred, thus providing them with the opportunity of having declarative knowledge as a tool for the learning process. These pronunciation features (assimilation, deletion, reduction) were present in a dialogue developed by the researcher. The questions for the dialogue were recorded by a proficient non-native speaker of English, and the answers (where the features occurred) were recorded by a native speaker of American English.

Task 4 (Appendix H): This task aimed at reviewing the features presented in Task 3 (reduction, deletion, and assimilation), and adding another feature (contraction of words) quite frequent in connected speech. Students were first encouraged to predict where/which links would take place in the listening passage they would listen to. Only then would they

be allowed to listen to the whole conversation and check their predictions. Students were encouraged to read their sentences aloud in their groups in order to make their decisions with more confidence. The element of competition posed by the context of the situation (a speaking contest) seems to have motivated students to carry out the task. This task was adapted from *Speaking Clearly* (1990) and the speaker asking the questions was British.

Task 5 (Appendix I): This task aimed at checking how students perceived those features of connected speech they had previously studied (Tasks 1 to 4), in the speech of three different speakers (a native speaker of American English, a non-native Asian speaker, and another non-native speaker). By asking students to do that, the researcher wanted students to reflect on the beliefs that (a) it is always easier to understand non-native speakers because they speak slowly, (b) only native speakers serve as good models for English speaking. In this listening passage the native speaker was the easiest to understand. Although it was extremely hard to understand one of the non-native speakers (an Asian woman) due to failures in several pronunciation features (connected speech being one of them), the other non-native speaker could convey the message quite well and was a positive model of a non-native speaker. When faced with the written text for the passage they had just listened to (part I- B), on average students reported not knowing only a couple of words. That was to check the interference of unknown lexis with listening comprehension at this level. This listening task was adapted from *Teaching Pronunciation*, 1996. The task also provided students with a table of some rules on sandhi-forms compiled by the researcher in an attempt to make them aware of common environments that call for sandhi-forms. Last but not least, this task provided the opportunity for students to listen to a classmate reading the same listening passage they had heard, and give him/her feedback concerning connected speech.

Throughout the five instruction tasks students were encouraged to find comparisons for those same sandhi-forms in their L1. They reported having profited from the comparison, and most of them also reported having enjoyed the instruction lessons.

4.2.2 Tasks checking listening comprehension

There were five tasks designed for the purpose of checking listening comprehension. They were the same for both Treatment (TG) and Control Group (CG). Four out of the five tasks designed used the listening passages and audio material from the students' coursebook; one task used the listening passage and audio material from students' workbook. The listening passage for Tasks 1 and 5 had native (NS) and non-native speakers (NNS) in them. The listening passage for Task 3 had only a NNS in it, and the listening passage for Tasks 2 and 4 had NSs only. The coursebook and workbook units corresponding to each task were coursebook Unit 8 (task 1); coursebook Unit 9 (task 2); workbook Unit 9 (task 3); Coursebook Unit 10 (tasks 4 and 5).

4.2.2.1 Task Pattern

The tasks were designed in such a way that they would follow a pattern to facilitate measurement later on. Students had to fill in a blank space using three words. The words were words that contained at least one type of sandhi-form at a word boundary. Students were aware of the fact that they always had to fill in the blank spaces with three words. This was the same from Task 1 up to Task 5, and the results for these parts were keyed in under Q1 (a,b); Q2 (a,b); Q3 (a,b); Q4 (a,b); Q5 (a,b); Q6 (a,b) in the table for Results (Appendices E to I) for each student, each group and each task. Q stands for question.

As Tasks 1 and 2 were the beginning of the listening comprehension check, items *a* and *b* of these tasks evaluated listening comprehension only. From Task 3 on, item *a* of each question continued to evaluate listening comprehension, while items *b* of each question evaluated the *process* involved in the listening comprehension of sandhi-forms; that is, students had to decide what kind of sandhi-form was present in that item (assimilation, deletion, reduction, etc). There was always a guideline available in each of these tasks (Tasks 3, 4 and 5) for student consultation. All students (TG and CG) had access to the guideline in their handout. However, it is important to recall that TG students had already attended to those kinds of sandhi-forms during the instruction phase. CG students had a brief training on sandhi-forms before carrying out the task; however, they had had no previous instruction on sandhi-forms.

Task-design took into account the importance of context to justify the insertion of words in a blank space. Those contexts intended to meet two task requirements: a) bring the task as close as possible to a real-life situation; b) focus on meaning before form (Nunan, 1999).

4.3 Procedures

As stated before, students carried out five tasks checking their performance on the understanding of sandhi-forms within listening comprehension. The tasks on sandhi-forms were first carried out in the 8th week of class, right after their mid-term test (a reason for that is explained in 4.3.4), and every two weeks after that until the end of the term (Task 1: 8th week; Task 2: 10th week; Task 3: 12th week; Task 4: 14th week; Task 5: 16th week). Both groups (TG and CG) carried out the same tasks, which are labelled as *Part II* for

Tasks 1, 3, 4 and 5; and labelled as *Part II* and *Part III* for Task 2 (Appendix F). The listening passages that served as basis for task-design were extracted from both the student's book[19] and the workbook, and the main reason for this was an attempt to have listening passages which had already been developed by professionals in the field of language teaching, and which were supposed to be appropriate for the proficiency level. Another reason is the fact that they were within the topic of the units, as lack of familiarity could cause a negative interference with the results.

The groups also took a pre and a post-test. The pre-test was applied in the 7th week of the course (mid-term test) and the post-test was applied in the last day of class (final test). Chapter 5 will provide more information about the pre and post-tests, as well as the results obtained from them.

4.3.1 Treatment Group (TG)

The instruction phase for the TG started in the 8th week of class and followed the two-week schedule described in 4.3. Students in this group had instruction on sandhi-forms in the beginning of their hundred-minute class on those same days in which they would carry out the listening comprehension tasks. The instruction itself would take up about 30 minutes of the class. After that students would have another forty-minutes of work following the syllabus of the course. About thirty minutes towards the end of the class, students would be invited to work on the listening task checking sandhi-forms. This interval was meant to avoid immediate testing effects (Anderson, 1995). TG students had at least 150 minutes of instruction on sandhi-forms by the end of this study.

---

[19] Inside Out Intermediate (Student`s book and Workbook) by Sue Kay & Vaughan Jones. Macmillan Heinemann, 2004.

4.3.2 Control Group (CG)

The CG, as previously mentioned, also carried out the same five listening comprehension tasks, in the same two-week interval schedule. However, CG students were not instructed on sandhi-forms. In the classes in which these students would be checked for listening comprehension on sandhi-forms, they were first invited to work on the course syllabus for about one hour. After that, about forty minutes towards the end of the class, these students would work on a pre-listening task.

The pre-listening tasks would last about 15 minutes and they focused on developing students' schemata[20]. Right after this, students would work on the listening comprehension task (Part II of each task), which was the same for both CG and TG. As these students had not been instructed on sandhi-forms, there was no need for an interval between the pre-listening task and the listening comprehension task to avoid testing effect. Much to the contrary, having an interval between the pre-listening task and the listening task might have been awkward.

4.3.3   Application of the listening comprehension tasks

As measurement would occur in Part II of each task, the researcher kept a standard in the procedures in order not to favour one group or the other. The steps participants should follow before carrying out each task were the following:

- Listen to x (number or name of speakers) talking about y (topic of conversation).

- Have a look at your handout before listening starts.

---

[20] here interchangeably used as background information, that is, "information which is needed for the listener to understand new information" (Richards, Platt & Platt, 1992).

- Insert three words in each blank space (parts *a* and *b* for Task 1, and only part *a* for the other tasks).

- Choose the correct item (s) for Part *b* (use the guidelines for help) that explain the occurrences in Part a (for Tasks 3, 4 and 5).

- Write down *only* what you actually hear. *Do not* insert words you have *not* heard, just to fill in the blanks.

- You will hear each item twice and there will be a pause after each sentence is uttered.

- Listening will start now. Any questions?

After having played the audio CD for the second time, the handouts were immediately collected and feedback on that task was given to students in the following class. The handouts, though, were kept with the researcher and returned to students only on the last day of class, in an attempt to avoid students *rehearsing* for the following task or worrying about marks.

4.3.4 Mid-term test (pre-test)

There were two main reasons for starting the training after the mid-term test. One of them was to have some time to work with students of the two groups on listening skills in terms of strategies, task-type, affective filter (Khrashen, 1985), and familiarity with the speaker/accent; items responsible for the failure in the pilot data collection (Chapter 3). The other reason was to use the listening part of the mid-term test as a pre-test (see Chapter 5), since it was the official listening test of the institution, measuring, in a standardized

way, L2 listening comprehension abilities of Intermediate-two level students, and also because all students would have to take this test anyway.

4.4   Instruments and tasks

The five listening comprehension tasks contained six questions each (Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4, Q5, Q6). As this part was the same for both TG and CG, it is important to say that these questions were within Part II of each task (see Apendices E to I). The questions were divided into *a* and *b*. Three points were assigned for each of the parts (*a* and *b*), totalling 6 points per question. Therefore, a student obtaining the maximum number of points in a task would have 36 points altogether, that is, 6 questions times 6 points. Considering the group, the maximum number of points in each part (*a* or *b*), would be 57 points. That is, 19 students times 3 (maximum) points for each student equals 57 points.

Part *a* from each task was an attempt to check the listening comprehension where sandhi-forms (assimilation and deletion, mostly) are present. Part *b* (From task 3 on) checked the declarative knowledge students would have of sandhi-forms. The reasons why students were checked on their declarative knowledge from Task 3 onwards was (a) to provide them with some time to get used to the tasks first and, (b) to introduce the new phonological concepts to them gradually. Thus, students started being checked on their declarative knowledge in Task 3, and that continued through Tasks 4 and 5. For Tasks 1 and 2, though, parts *a* and *b* were the same; that is, both checked sandhi-forms within listening comprehension.

Although students were encouraged not to guess when they were not sure, there is no guarantee that they actually did not. Therefore, students might sometimes not have been sure of what exactly was uttered by the speaker (Part a), but they might have perceived the

phonological process (which here meant the type of sandhi-form) involved. When that was that case, students would leave Part *a* incomplete, but might specify, in Part *b*, the process involved. Of course the other way around is also likely to have occurred: students would know what to complete, but would not perceive the phonological process taking place.

4.4.1 Part a

Part *a* of all tasks (1 to 5) was equal concerning the task requirement. Students had to complete each question by writing down the three missing words. Spelling mistakes were not marked down. For each correct word, students would get one point. The sandhi-forms being tested here varied, but they all occurred at word-boundary and were common types of either assimilation or deletion.

Although students from the CG did not receive instruction on sandhi-forms, the questions were part of the same topic they had worked on in the pre-listening phase, so they also had good chances of perceiving words by activating their schemata. Also, with the assignment of one point for each correct word, chances were that these students would also score points and would not get frustrated.

4.4.2   Part b

Part *b*, as mentioned in 4.4, had a different organization. This part was an attempt to have students move gradually from *what* (declarative knowledge) sandhi-forms were like, to *how* (procedural knowledge)/*where* sandhi-forms occur, in an attempt to activate the form-function principle of a task (Nunan, 1999). Part *b* of the tasks were grouped like this: Tasks 1 and 2 checked listening comprehension; and Tasks 3, 4 and 5 checked how

participants would explain the sandhi-forms occurring in Part *a* of the same tasks. Thus, the measurement for Part *b* of each task was organized in a particular way for each task.

Task 1: In this task scores were either 0, 1, 2 or 3, due to the fact that each correct word inserted was worth one point.

Task 2: In this task scores were either 0 or 3, due to the fact that they had to choose from two alternatives, the one they considered correct.

Task 3: In this task scores were either 0, 1.5 or 3, due to the fact that some of the answers required two explanations, and if the participant chose only one he would get half (1.5) of the total mark (3.0).

Task 4: In this task scores were either 0 or 3, due to the fact that only one answer was the correct justification.

Task 5: In this task scores were either 0, 1.5 or 3, due to the fact that participants would have to inform their impression of the speech sounds heard (either *quite natural* or *quite strange*) and explain the sandhi-form suggested for/found in them.

All the results were keyed into tables (Appendices E to I) and analysed statistically. The next chapter provides the analysis and discussion of the results obtained.

CHAPTER 5

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Chapter five provides us with a meticulous look at the results shown through the statistical analysis. This analysis allows us to examine where and why results were (not) significant. Therefore, the research questions will be revisited and a discussion on the results will be presented. Constant references to the tasks (Appendices E to I) will be made in order to both help the reader recall them, and show the results obtained with them. This chapter is structured around (a) the presentation of the statistical results for each research question; (b) discussion of the results within each research question; (c) discussion on pre and post-tests, and (d) general conclusion of the chapter.

5.1 Results and discussion for the first research question

The first, and main, research question *Does instruction on sandhi-forms have any effect on the results of L2 listening comprehension tasks?* led to the following hypotheses:

c) Instruction on sandhi-forms improves L2 listening comprehension.

d) Instruction on sandhi-forms outweighs pre-listening tasks at this level (intermediate) when listening comprehension tasks are not (over) simplified.

e) Instruction on sandhi-forms will put to the test students' belief that *understanding native speakers (NS)[21] is more difficult than understanding non-native speakers (NNS)* in the context of audio listening comprehension tasks.

With the purpose of answering the first question, part *a* of each task (1 to 5) was designed in a way that it would allow evaluation of students' success of sandhi-forms in listening comprehension tasks in the treatment group (TG) and in the control group (CG). A Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to check for differences in Means (*M*) and differences in the form of distribution of two samples. It showed a significant difference in the results obtained overall for part *a* in the five tasks by the two groups: $D = 0.21$, $p < 0.001^*$ (Table 5.1). In this test the valid number (*N*=570) corresponds to 19 participants times 6 questions (only part *a*), times 5 tasks, which equals 570. These results support the hypothesis that instruction on sandhi-forms would contribute more to the results of these listening comprehension tasks (*TG M*=2.89) than would the pre-listening tasks (*CG M*=2.67). Also, more homogeneity was found in the results for the TG (*SD*=0.36), than for the CG (*SD*=0.53), which shows that the TG presented more stability in dealing with listening comprehension tasks when sandhi-forms were present, that is, with natural speech.

Through the results obtained, it is possible to say that the first hypothesis was *partially* confirmed, as the improvement was not only in the TG, but also in the

---

[21] Although there is an ongoing discussion in the literature about who the native and non-native speakers are, it is beyond the scope of this work to look at this issue. Thus, the NSs here are the North-American and British speakers in the audio material in students' coursebook.

CG.   The same results reveal that when checked on listening comprehension dealing with features of natural speech (sandhi-forms), students benefitted more from instruction on sandhi-forms (Celce-Murcia et al, 1996; Gilbert, 1987; Wong, 1987) than from pre-listening tasks, thus supporting the second hypothesis.

Table 5.1 Statistics for the listening comprehension scores comparing *part a* of all tasks (1 to 5) between TG and CG.

Group	N	M	SD
TG	570	2.89	0.36
CG	570	2.67	0.53

$D = 0.21$, $p < 0.001$*

Another statistical analysis was done comparing the results for tasks 2 and 4, in which the speakers were native speakers, with tasks 3 and 5, in which the speakers were non-native speakers. The valid number for this analysis ($N=152$) corresponds to 8 questions times 19 students, which equals 152 (see Table 5.2).

The results, which were submitted to the Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistical test, partially corroborate the third hypothesis. That is, understanding native speakers was still more difficult for those who did not have instruction on sandhi-forms ($M=2.66$), than for those who had been instructed on these forms ($M=2.88$). A significant difference in the mean values (M) was found when comparing results in the CG for tasks with native speakers ($M=2.66$) with those with non-native speakers ($M=2.89$). $D= 0.000$, $p < 0.01$*. The difference is much smaller for native and non-native listening comprehension tasks in the TG ($M=2.88$; $M=2.98$, respectively), which explains why results obtained were non-

significant (D= 0.01, p > 0.10). It is also worth looking at the numbers for standard deviation (*SD*) in the two groups. Although the numbers for *SD* are higher for tasks having native-speakers (TG⇒*SD*=0.40; CG⇒*SD*⇒0.57) than for tasks having non-native speakers (TG⇒*SD*=0.24; CG⇒*SD*⇒0.33), the difference is greater for the CG than for the TG, showing that, for the former, the difficulties in understanding the non-native speakers were more unstable and, for the latter, more uniform.

.

Table 5.2 Statistics for the listening comprehension scores comparing *part a* in Questions 1,2, 3, 4 for Tasks 2 and 4 together (NS), and for Tasks 3 and 5 together (NNS) between TG and CG.

Group	N	M (2 and 4)	M (3 and 5)	SD (2 and 4)	SD (3 and 5)
TG	152	2.88	2.98	0.40	0.24
CG	152	**2.66**	**2.89**	0.57	0.33

TG: D= 0.01, p > 0.10; CG: D= 0.000, p < 0.01*

All things considered, we may say that these results point to the need for instruction on sandhi-forms, especially when the listening comprehension tasks have native speakers in them. It is important to recall the importance of Information Processing Theory (MacLaughlin, 1987; Celce-Murcia et al., 1996), and the Linguistic Universals (Prator & Robinett's, 1972; Celce-Murcia et al., 1996) of sandhi-forms here.

Having provided a justification for the need of instruction, thus answering the first research question, we now move on to the second research question of this study.

5.2   Results and discussion for the second research question

The second research question *Do results for the listening comprehension tasks improve over time during the instruction period?* was meant to find out whether there was gradual improvement in the results from the first to the last task, thus supporting the need for instruction on a *regular basis* rather than *sporadically*. Gilbert (1987) and Wong (1987), among other researchers, support the idea of systematic instruction, as opposed sporadic instruction. The hypotheses here were the following:

a) Results in the TG (and not in the CG) will gradually improve from the first to the last task, demonstrating the need for instruction *on a regular basis*.

b) Familiarity with the task may help students from both groups improve over time. However, students in the TG are expected to improve more than those in the CG.

A Kruskal-Wallis statistical test was applied in order to check for ordinal variables (sum of ranks) in more than two samples. It showed significance for improvement in both TG and CG groups. The results are, respectively H (4, n = 570) = 43.29, p < 0.001*; H (4, n= 570) = 97,90, p < 0.01*. In this test, 570 corresponds to the valid number. The valid number is the total of 114 (6 questions of part *a* times 19 students) times 5 tasks. This test, however, would not tell where the differences were: if in every task (Task 1 compared to Task 2, Task 2 compared to Task 3, and successively) or in some of them. In order to locate the differences, a post hoc *t*-test was done for both groups, and the results are shown in Tables 5.3 and 5.4.

Table 5.3 Statistics for part *a* of the listening comprehension**,** comparing all tasks (1 to 5) in the **TG.**

Tasks	N		t-value	p-level	df	M	M	SD	SD
T1 x T2	114	114	-0.45	0.65	226	2.78 (T1)	2.81 (T2)	0.42 (T1)	0.46 (T2)
T1 x T3	114	114	-5.63	**0.0000**	226	2.78 (T1)	3.00 (T3)	0.42 (T1)	0.00 (T3)
T1 x T4	114	114	-3.04	**0.003**	226	2.78 (T1)	2.93 (T4)	0.42 (T1)	0.32 (T4)
T1 x T5	114	114	-2.86	**0.0045**	226	2.78 (T1)	2.93 (T5)	0.42 (T1)	0.37 (T5)
T2 x T3	114	114	-4.49	**0.0000**	226	2.81 (T2)	3.00 (T3)	0.46 (T2)	0.00 (T3)
T2 x T4	114	114	-2.35	0.02	226	2.81 (T2)	2.93 (T4)	0.46 (T2)	0.32 (T4)
T2 x T5	114	114	-2.23	0.03	226	2.81 (T2)	2.93 (T5)	0.46 (T2)	0.37 (T5)
T3 x T4	114	114	2.35	0.02	226	3.00 (T3)	2.93 (T4)	0.00 (T3)	0.32 (T4)
T3 x T5	114	114	2.03	0.043	226	3.00 (T3)	2.93 (T5)	0.00 (T3)	0.37 (T5)
T4 x T5	114	114	-0.00	1.00	226	2.93 (T4)	2.93 (T5)	0.32 (T4)	0.37 (T5)

Significant results: T1xT3$\Rightarrow$ t= -5.63, *df*= 226, p < 0.001*; T1xT4$\Rightarrow$ t= -3.04, *df*= 226, p= 0.003*; T1xT5$\Rightarrow$ t= -2.86, *df*= 226, p= 0.0045*; T2xT3$\Rightarrow$ t= -4.49, *df*= 226, p < 0.001*.

Table 5.4 Statistics for part *a* of the listening comprehension**,** comparing all tasks (1 to 5) in the **CG.**

Tasks	N		t-value	p-level	df	M	M	SD	SD
T1 x T2	114	114	-4.37	**0.0000**	226	2.34 (T1)	2.67 (T2)	0.53 (T1)	0.59 (T2)
T1 x T3	114	114	-12.53	**0.000**	226	2.34 (T1)	2.98 (T3)	0.53 (T1)	0.13 (T3)
T1 x T4	114	114	-4.78	**0.000**	226	2.34 (T1)	2.68 (T4)	0.53 (T1)	0.52 (T4)
T1 x T5	114	114	-4.57	**0.000**	226	2.34 (T1)	2.67 (T5)	0.53 (T1)	0.54 (T5)
T2 x T3	114	114	-5.58	**0.000**	226	2.67 (T2)	2.98 (T3)	0.59 (T2)	0.13 (T3)
T2 x T4	114	114	-0.12	0.91	226	2.67 (T2)	2.68 (T4)	0.59 (T2)	0.52 (T4)
T2 x T5	114	114	-0.000	1.00	226	2.67 (T2)	2.67 (T5)	0.59 (T2)	0.54 (T5)
T3 x T4	114	114	-6.07	**0.000**	226	2.98 (T3)	2.68 (T4)	0.13 (T3)	0.52 (T4)
T3 x T5	114	114	6.03	**0.000**	226	2.98 (T3)	2.67 (T5)	0.13 (T3)	0.54 (T5)
T4 x T5	114	114	0.12	0.90	226	2.68 (T4)	2.67 (T5)	0.52 (T4)	0.54 (T5)

Significant results: T1xT2$\Rightarrow$ t= -4.37, *df*= 226, p < 0.001*; T1xT3$\Rightarrow$ t= -12.53, df= 226, p < 0.001*; T1xT4$\Rightarrow$ t= -4.78, *df*= 226, p < 0.001*; T1xT5$\Rightarrow$ t= -4.57, *df*= 226, p < 0.001*; T2xT3$\Rightarrow$ t= -5.58, *df*= 226, p < 0.001*; T3xT4$\Rightarrow$ t= -6.07, *df*= 226, p < 0.001*; T3xT5$\Rightarrow$ t= 6.03, *df*= 226, p < 0.001*;

Comparing the results for both groups, one can notice that there was improvement from Task 1 to Task 5 (**TG**: T1xT5⇒ t= -2.86, *df*= 226, p= 0.0045*; **CG**: T1xT5⇒ t= -4.57, *df*= 226, p < 0.001*), but this improvement did not follow a linear progress. We will now look at two of the outcomes that were contrary to the expectations:

1) Lack of linearity in the results: It was expected that as instruction advanced, TG results would improve. It is important to mention that we are considering results comparing tasks within the TG, but we are not comparing TG and CG at this moment. As can be seen in Table 5.3, the TG did improve a few times, but not throughout the instruction phase. One explanation for this is the ceiling effect caused by Task 3, which yielded a perfect score of 3.0 for the TG and almost perfect (2.98) for the CG. Although more will be said about Task 3 in items 5.3 and 5.4, the results for this task (**TG**: *M*= 3.0; **CG**: *M*= 2.98), give evidence that the task was quite easy for both groups, thus interfering with the general results in terms of linearity. Another reason for the lack of linear improvement may lie in the level of difficulty posed by the sandhi-forms in each task: less demanding in the beginning of the instruction phase, and more complex when students reached task 5. Although Task 3 was an exception, this exception was not in the level of difficulty of the sandhi-forms, but more probably in the speaker himself; a Slovenian actor (see 5.4).

2) Significant results for the CG. According to Hypothesis *a*, it was expected that the CG would not obtain significance in the results across tasks. However, the ceiling effect in Task 3 and familiarity with the task can be rendered as mostly responsible for these unexpected results. Table 5.4 (*p-levels* in bold) shows that

more than one of the results showed significance, which goes against what was expected.

An attentive look at the means (*M*) for both TG and CG (see Table 5.5) allows us to perceive that the results found for the TG are always better than those found for the CG, which is enough to say that regular instruction, although not the only factor, is one important means to obtain better L2 listening comprehension in tasks where sandhi-forms are checked. Hypothesis *a*, therefore, was partially supported.

Table 5.5 Statistics for the listening comprehension scores comparing *part a* in each Task (1 to 5), separately, between TG and CG.

Task	N TG CG	p-level	M TG	M CG	SD TG	SD CG
T1	**114 114**	**p < .001**	**2.78**	**2.34**	**0.42**	**0.53**
T2	114 114	p > .10	2.81	2.67	0.46	0.59
T3	114 114	p > .10	3.00	2.98	0.00	0.13
T4	**114 114**	**p < .005**	**2.93**	**2.68**	**0.32**	**0.52**
T5	**114 114**	**p < .005**	**2.93**	**2.67**	**0.37**	**0.54**

Significant results $\Rightarrow$ T1: D = 0.41, p < 0.001*; T4: D = 0.25, p < 0.005*; T5: D = 0.25, p < 0.005*. Non-significant results $\Rightarrow$ T2: D = 0.11, p > 0.10; T3: D = 0.02, p > 0.10.

As for hypothesis b, concerning task familiarity, it is reasonable to say that it may have positively influenced improvement in the CG, which is not to say that it had a negative influence upon the TG. The CG starts with *M*=2.34 (T1), and the results jump to *M*= 2.67 (T2). They maintain this average for T4 (*M*= 2.68) and T5 (*M*= 2.67). Not having had any instruction, the good results are likely to have come from becoming acquainted with the task type. The TG, though, obtained good results already from the first task

(TG⟹*M*=2.78; CG⟹ *M*=2.34), which were much superior to those for the CG. Therefore, it is not difficult to see why results from T1 xT2 in the TG (t=-0.45, *df*=226, p = 0.65) were not significant compared to the same results in the CG (t= -4.37, *df*= 226, p < 0.001*). Bearing in mind the results for the first task, it becomes clearer that, quantitatively speaking, more significant between-task results were found for the **CG** (T1xT2⟹ t= -4.37, *df*= 226, p < 0.001*; T1xT3⟹ t= -12.53, *df*= 226, p < 0.001*; T1xT4⟹ t= -4.78, *df*= 226, p < 0.001*; T1xT5⟹ t= -4.57, *df*= 226, p < 0.001*; T2xT3⟹ t= -5.58, *df*= 226, p < 0.001*; T3xT4⟹ t= -6.07, *df*= 226, p < 0.001*; T3xT5⟹ t= 6.03, *df*= 226, p < 0.001*); than for the **TG** (T1xT3⟹ t= -5.63, *df*= 226, p < 0.001*; T1xT4⟹ t= -3.04, *df*= 226, p= 0.003*; T1xT5⟹ t= -2.86, *df*= 226, p= 0.0045*; T2xT3⟹ t= -4.49, *df*= 226, p < 0.001*).

Note, however, that the results between T3 x T4 in the CG obtained significance in the opposite direction, that is, there was a considerable decrease (T3 *M*= 2.98; T4 *M*=2.68). This did not occur in the TG, where the values (T3 *M*= 3.00; T4 *M*= 2.93) represent only a slight decrease, not reaching significance. Summing up, we may say that if familiarity with the task was responsible for some improvement in the results of the CG (lowest: 2.34; highest: 2.68, excluding Task 3), this improvement still did not bring them to the ideal score (3.0). With instruction, on the other hand, the students in the TG did come very close to the ideal score (*lowest: 2.78; highest: 2.93,* excluding Task 3) in the last tasks. Thus, the results suggest that carrying out one type of listening comprehension task several times (five tasks in this study) did not guarantee an outcome as successful as the one obtained when sandhi instruction was added.

In spite of the overall positive results, the lack of linear progress for the TG, and lack of statistically significant improvement from each task to the next do not allow for a categorically affirmative answer to the second research question (*Do results for the listening comprehension tasks improve over time during the instruction period?)*. Thus, this question remains to be answered by future studies in the area, as the results found here are not sufficient to provide it with either an affirmative or a negative response. Although it is very likely that the ceiling effect was the major cause for the lack of significance, more studies will be needed in order to answer this question with confidence. We will now move to item 5.3, next, which presents a discussion for the third, and last, research question.

5.3   Results and discussion for the third research question

We shall here recall the third and last research question of this study: *Are the results of listening comprehension questions similar to the results of metalanguage questions*?

The hypotheses for this research question were the following:

a)   Listening comprehension questions (part *a* of Tasks 3, 4, 5 together) will be easier than metalanguage (part *b* of the same tasks together) for the CG. For the TG the results will not be significant, that is, students who received instruction on sandhi-forms, thus dealing with metalanguage during instruction, should be able to deal with both parts equally.

b)   When comparing results for Tasks 3, 4 and 5, separately, in the TG and in the CG, the following is expected: TG $\Rightarrow M$ of part *a* is similar to M of part *b*, and similar to M of parts *a+b* (together). That is, questions on listening comprehension

or metalanguage will not influence the group that received instruction. CG $\Rightarrow$ M of part a > M of part b. M of parts $a+b$ (together) < M of part a. That is, questions on listening comprehension or metalanguage will influence the group that received no instruction.

Up until now we have measured listening comprehension alone. Thus, only part a (Tasks1 to 5) was considered. Results obtained by statistical tests (Tables 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5) show answers for the research questions previously asked. However, from Task 3 on, a new component (metalanguage) was included in the tasks. Oxford (1990) advocates for the teaching of metalanguage as part of strategic learning. Metalanguage corresponds to part b of Tasks 3, 4 and 5. We will now look at the results of the comparison of the TG and CG in the combined scores of listening comprehension and metalanguage for Tasks 3, 4 and 5, since Tasks 1 and 2 included only listening comprehension. The results in Tables 5.6 and 5.7 support the third research question.

A Wilcoxon test was applied in an attempt to confirm the first hypothesis here. This test assumes that we have ordinal variables. For this test N (=342) corresponds to 6 questions, times 3 tasks, times 19 students. The results (see Table 5.6) showed significance for both TG and CG, partially confirming the first hypothesis. That is, when comparing part a to part b in Tasks 3, 4 and 5 (together), the TG also showed a better result for part a (Z= 2.35, p = 0.02), which was a result expected only for the CG. This shows that despite having had more opportunities to get acquainted with metalanguage during the instruction period, students in the TG would need still more opportunities to work on English sandhi in order to obtain results on metalanguage that would be closer to the ones they obtained for

listening comprehension alone. As expected, the results for the CG (Z= 7.67, p < 0.001) were significant.

Table 5.6 Comparison of parts *a* (listening comprehension) and *b* (metalanguage) in Tasks 3, 4 and 5 (together) between the TG and the CG.

Group	N	p-level	T	Z
TG	342	p < 0.019	31.50000	2.352
CG	342	p < 0.000	1098.000	7.669

Significant result (higher *M* results for part "a" in all tasks): **TG** 3-4-5 **a** & TG 3-4-5 **b** ⇒ Z= 2.35, p = 0.02; **CG** 3-4-5 **a** & CG 3-4-5 **b** ⇒ Z= 7.67, p < 0.001.

Therefore, it is fair to say that for both groups (TG and CG) perceiving sandhi-forms in listening comprehension tasks was less demanding than choosing the category those sandhi-forms belonged to.

In order to test the second hypothesis here, other tests were applied (see Tables 5.7 and 5.8) and the results partially confirmed hypothesis b. A justification for that is provided next.

Table 5.7 Comparison of parts *a* (listening comprehension) and *b* (metalanguage) together in Tasks 3, 4 and 5 between TG and CG.

Task	N (TG)	N(CG)	p-level	M (TG)	M (CG)	SD (TG)	SD (CG)
T3	228	228	p < .001	2.961	2.320	0.279	1.252
T4	228	228	p < .005	2.925	2.627	0.408	0.827
T5	228	228	p < .001	2.919	2.537	0.391	0.659

Significant result (higher *M* results for part "a" in all tasks): T3$\Rightarrow$ D=0,22, p < 0.001*;

T4$\Rightarrow$ D=0,18, p < 0.005*; T5$\Rightarrow$ D=0,30, p < 0.001*.

When parts *a* and *b* of Tasks 3, 4 and 5 were put together to be compared in both TG and CG, significant results were yielded (see Table 5.7). In this test, *N* (=228) corresponds to 12 questions (6 from part *a* + 6 from part *b*) times 19 students. Although significant results were expected for the CG, the fact that they were also significant for the TG goes against what was expected. These results are another support for the previous hypothesis, that is, listening comprehension questions outweigh metalanguage questions even when instruction is given. In this test, Tasks 3, 4 and 5 were analysed separately in order to see whether any of them would yield a result different from what was found in Table 5.6. However, that was not the case here either.

In order to gather more data as to either confirm or reject the second hypothesis, another test comparing the means (*M*) of TG and CG, considering part *b* only, of Tasks 3, 4 and 5 was applied. It was found (see Table 5.8) that one of the results in part *b* for the CG was drastically inferior (Task 3) to that of part *a* (refer to Table 5.9) in the same task. That is most likely due to the ceiling effect caused by this task. Although not as drastic, the other results in part *b* for the CG were also lower than part *a*. Therefore, participants who had short-term training (Anderson, 1995) on metalanguage concerning sandhi-forms (CG), but did not have instruction, found it difficult to carry out part *b* of the tasks. Despite the fact that lower results were expected for the CG, it came as a surprise that they were so much lower than part *a*.

Table 5.8 Comparison of part *b* between TG and CG in Tasks 3, 4 and 5.

Task	N (TG)	N(CG)	p-level	M (TG)	M (CG)	SD (TG)	SD (CG)
T3	114	114	$p < .001$	2.921	1.658	0.391	1.498
T4	114	114	$p > .10$	2.921	2.579	0.482	1.047
T5	114	114	$p < .001$	2.908	2.408	0.413	0.736

Results: T3⟹ D= 0.44, p< 0.001*; T4⟹ D= 0.11, p > 0.10; T5⟹ D= 0.34, p< 0.001*.

Table 5.9 Compilation of the *M* results for Tasks 3, 4 and 5 in TG and CG for part a (alone), part b (alone) and parts a+b (together).

Task	M (TG) Part *a*	M (CG) Part *a*	M (TG) Part *b*	M (CG) Part *b*	M (TG) Parts *a+b*	M (CG) Parts *a+b*
T3	3.00	2.98	2.921	1.658	2.961	2.320
T4	2.93	2.68	2.921	2.579	2.925	2.627
T5	2.93	2.67	2.908	2.408	2.919	2.537

In Hypothesis b it is expected that the TG would show similar values (*M*) for part *a* part *b*, and parts *a+b* together. In Table 5.9 we can see that that is true for Tasks 4 and 5, but a bit different for Task 3, which is not totally surprising as Task 3 is the task that led to ceiling effects. For Tasks 4 and 5, though, we can say that the results for the three tests (part *a* alone; part *b* alone; parts *a+b* together) reveal similarity. As for the CG, it was expected that values (*M*) for part *a* would be better than those for part *b*, and also better than those for parts *a+b* (together). The numbers in Table 5.9 show that this was totally confirmed, completely supporting Hypothesis b.

Although more tasks would be necessary to answer this last research question with

confidence, we should say that the results obtained so far point to an influence of types of question (listening comprehension and metalanguage) in the results. When participants received instruction on sandhi-forms, the influence was not significant; when they did not, the influence was quite significant with a more positive result for listening comprehension, and a more negative result for metalanguage.

5.4   The ceiling effect in Task 3

It was expected that as students received instruction, their results for listening comprehension would improve over time. When it came to Task 3, however, not only did the results improve (perfect score for TG, 3.0; and almost perfect for the CG; 2.98), but they also caused a ceiling effect, interfering with the statistical results for the other tasks. This could be explained by the following:

(a) Speaker: The speaker for this task was a Slovenian actor who, apparently, spoke quite slowly. In order to check the speech rate of this passage, the number of words uttered (398) was divided by the total time in which they were uttered (2'35" or 155') and multiplied by 60 (number of seconds for a minute) to see what his wpm (words per minute) was. The result was 154 wpm, which falls into the category of *moderately slow*, according to Rivers (1981, cited in Richards, 1983). The majority of the speakers in the other listening passages presented an average of 174 wpm upwards. Therefore, this slow speech rate may have contributed to the good results obtained with this task, thus causing the ceiling effect. Even those participants in the CG, who had not received any instruction on sandhi-forms were able to get a good score here. Also, the

number of pauses added to the feeling of a slow speech rate (Prator & Robinett, 1972; Anderson and Lynch, 1995; among others).

(b) Level of sandhi-forms: As Task 3 was the first task in which students would be checked for both listening comprehension on sandhi-forms and metalanguage, the kind of sandhi-forms appearing in this task were not too challenging, which might have also added to the good results, and the ceiling effect.

(c) Material: the listening passage for this task was extracted from the students' workbook. In that material it was part of a Listening and Reading session, which might have been the reason for the choice of a speaker with a slower speech rate. Even though the new task designed to go with this listening passage was more challenging than the Reading and Listening task in their workbook, it was still not challenging enough due to the speaker's rate of speech, another fact that may be rendered responsible for the ceiling effect.

Future studies dealing with task-design in listening comprehension should, then, attend to the importance of the speech rate in those tasks. As was shown in 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3, the fact that one task caused a ceiling effect interfered directly with the results of all the other tasks. Had that problem been anticipated, the results would probably have been different.

5.5 Pre-test and Post-test

In the 7th week of their regular English course, the 38 participants (19 from the TG and 19 from the CG) of this study took a mid-term test and were checked for listening comprehension, reading comprehension, vocabulary and grammar in use. Although the

results for both speech production (SP) and perception (SPer) are shown (see Table 5.10), the focus here is on speech perception, and *not* speech production. As speech perception normally causes speech production to improve, and because the results for speech production were available in the pre and post-tests, the researcher decided to include them here just for speculation. It is important to emphasize again, though, that speech production is not the scope of this work.

Up to this point (pre-test) both groups had had the same kind of lessons on listening comprehension (pre-listening tasks) preparing them to carry out the listening tasks proposed by the course material they were using. The results for the listening test (Sper 1-TG and CG- Table 5.10) were used as a tool to measure participants' listening comprehension level before the instruction period started. Being part of the Mid-term test proposed by the institution, therefore carefully prepared (see Appendix A), the listening comprehension test in the mid-term exam was thought to be a good pre-test measure for this study.

	TG				CG			
	SP1	**SP2**	**SPer1**	**SPer2**	**SP1**	**SP2**	**Sper1**	**Sper2**
Subject 1	6	7	9	9.5	6	7	5	8
Subject 2	5	5.5	8	7	8	7	6.5	7.5
Subject 3	6.5	7	8.5	9.5	6	6.5	6	7
Subject 4	5.5	5.5	8.5	9.5	8	10	6	7.5
Subject 5	7	8	9	9.5	6	5.5	8	8
Subject 6	6	8.5	9	6.5	7.5	6	8	9
Subject 7	7.5	7.5	7.5	6	6.5	6.5	5	5
Subject 8	7	7.5	8	7.5	7	10	5.5	7.5
Subject 9	5	6.5	7	9.5	6	5	6	8
Subject 10	8	7.5	9	9	8.5	9	7	9
Subject 11	5.5	6	7.5	9	7.5	9	8	5.5
Subject 12	6	7	7.5	8.5	7.5	7.5	9.5	8
Subject 13	6.5	6.5	9	8	6	6.5	3	7
Subject 14	7	7.5	9	7.5	7	8.5	7.5	6
Subject 15	6.5	7	8	8.5	6	7	8	7.5
Subject 16	6.5	6	8.5	9	5	5.5	7.5	6.5
Subject 17	5.5	7	7.5	10	6	6	6.5	9
Subject 18	6	7	8	8	6.5	8	7.5	9.5
Subject 19	7.5	7	10	9.5	6.5	5	9.5	7
Means	**6.3**	**6.9**	**8.3**	**8.5**	**6.7**	**7.1**	**6.8**	**7.5**

Table 5.10 Results for the pre and post-test for both TG and CG.

	Speech Production 1 (SP1)		Speech Perception 1 (SPer1)
	Speech Production 2 (SP2)		Speech Perception 2 (SPer2)

As can be seen under the columns SPer1 (for both TG an GG) in Table 5.10, the means for TG and CG are 8.3 and 6.8 respectively. Thus, the TG had achieved a considerably better result than the CG for listening comprehension, measured through the institution's mid-term test, when the instruction phase started. It is important to observe that both groups made some improvement at the end of the experiment, again considering the results for the listening comprehension test (final test or post-test) designed by the institution. However, as the CG had more room to grow due to its poorer performance in the Mid-term listening test, there is the impression they learned more. Newell & Rosenbloom (1981) compare learning to amount of practice and state the following:

> " The power relationship between performance (measured in terms of response time and a number of other measures) and amount of practice is a ubiquitous phenomenon in learning. (...) This result implies that learning never stops, but that, as we practice, we get smaller and smaller benefits. The fact that almost all learning functions are power functions has been called the power law of learning.
> *Newell & Rosenbloom* (1981, cited in Anderson, 1995)

Statistical data below will give us a more precise interpretation of the results, which showed significance ($\alpha = 0,05$) for the factor *instruction*. Given the nature of the problem and considering the correlation of data for Speech perception and speech production for the same subject, a MANOVA test was used having the subjects as experimental units. It tested the extent to which instruction on sandhi-forms (condition 1 vs. condition 2) impacted on participants' speech perception and speech production in the TG, considering SP and SPer as co-dependent variables. Participants in the CG did not have instruction on sandhi-forms as the TG did; however, they continued to work on pre-listening tasks before carrying out the listening comprehension tasks.

When considering the co-dependent variables together, the result for the TG is the following: $F_{2,17} = 5.121$; $p < 0.02$ for the factor *instruction*, that is, instruction is significant for $\alpha = 0.05$. Considering that the means (*M*) and the standard deviations (*SD*) for each column above are: **SP1**: *M*=6.3 (*SD*=0.9), **SP2**: *M*=6.9 (*SD*=0.8), **SPer1**: *M*=8.3 (*SD*=0.8), **SPer2**: *M*=8.5 (*SD*=1.1).

When considering each co-dependent variable separately, the results found for the TG are: **SP**: $F_{1,18} = 10,78$; $p < 0,005$; **SPer**: non-significant. That is, there was significant improvement in speech production, but there was no significant improvement in speech perception, contrary to what was expected.

The corresponding results for the CG are: $F_{2,17} = 2,57$; $p < 0,11$ for the factor instruction, that is, the training is non-significant, which confirms the results found above.

A closer look at the Mid-Term and Final tests (Appendix A) allows us to observe the following:

- In the final test 446 words were uttered in 2'32", as opposed to 406 words uttered in the same amount of time at the Mid-term. Thus, a lower speech rate was observed in the Mid-term.

- Type of speech for the final test was a *dialogue*; therefore, there was turn taking in the conversation, making it more difficult for the listener to follow and respond to the exercises at the same time. In the mid-term, however, the type of speech was *monologue*, so the listener would focus on the voice of only one speaker, and that might have been easier.

- The tasks included in the final test demanded more from students' working memory capacity, since they had to deal with six statements to be organized according to the sequence they appeared in the listening passage, plus eight other statements to be checked as being true or false, compared to a total of 9 statements in the Mid-term to be checked for True or False, with correction of the False statements.

From that we may reach the following conclusions:

a) The post-test was not a good test for the TG, but a more appropriate measure for the CG, which visibly benefited from it. Having had instruction on pronunciation items, participants of the TG would have profited more from a post-test checking discrete items of listening comprehension (sandhi-forms here). That was never true with the post-test, which required a lot from participants' working memory and general listening comprehension skills.

b) Despite the fact that the CG improved more than the TG from Mid-term to Final test, we have to remember that their scores were considerably lower than those from the TG when the instruction phase started. This is to point out that the CG had more need of improvement than the TG. While the TG had instruction on sandhi-forms, the CG had pre-listening work on schemata building, which is exactly what they would need for the final test. Still, they did not do better than the TG in the post-test when we compare the means (CG= 7,5; TG= 8,5); but they certainly obtained greater improvement from the initial to the final part of the experiment. It might be fair to say that the kind of post-test applied favored the kind of listening practice

carried out by the CG, but not the kind of instruction (sandhi-forms) given to the TG.

c) Despite the mismatch between the type of post-test (final test) and the type of instruction for the TG (sandhi-forms), they still had some improvement in relation to the pre-test (Mid-term). Although this result might not be significant when perception alone is considered, when put together with the results for speech production it was found to be significant.

d) Although it was not the scope of this work to test students for speech production, the statistical data showed a significant result for the TG when instruction was checked for both (speech perception and speech production) together. Therefore, we may risk saying that although speech production was not the focus of this study, the instruction on sandhi-forms for listening comprehension (speech perception) may have caused good results for speech production too.

Finally, the statistical results for the pre and post-test allow the researcher to be confident in saying that a specific kind of post-test would have to be designed in order to obtain new results that may add to the confirmation of the main hypothesis of this study. That is, instruction on sandhi-forms has some effect on the results of L2 listening comprehension tasks.

5.6 Conclusion

By thoroughly discussing each research question, it is possible to say that (a) results point to more benefits than not concerning instruction on sandhi-forms within listening comprehension tasks; (b) intermediate level students in this study benefited more from instruction on sandhi-forms than from work on pre-listening tasks when they were evaluated on listening comprehension with tasks that were not (over) simplified; (c) students who had instruction on sandhi-forms obtained more successful results in listening comprehension tasks when the speaker was a native-speaker, than students who did not have the same instruction; (d) the limited number of tasks, the reduced amount of time and the ceiling effect caused by Task 3 prevented us from finding out whether or not the results of listening comprehension tasks improve consistently over time with instruction, however results signal to improvement when systematic instruction is given; (e) the type of questions does influence the results of listening comprehension tasks, metalanguage questions being, for this study, more challenging than sandhi-forms listening comprehension questions; and (f) pre and post tests should allow for measurement of success with sandhi forms of both TG and CG, which was not the case in this study, as the pre and post tests here always tested general listening comprehension, thus benefiting the

CG, but never tested the specific work on sandhi-forms, which prevented us from comparing pre and post measures in the TG.

Having analysed the effects of instruction on sandhi-forms in listening comprehension tasks, we now move to chapter 6, where final remarks will be made.

CHAPTER 6

FINAL REMARKS

6.1 Conclusions

The present study aimed at showing whether instruction on sandhi-forms would affect L2 listening comprehension. Findings in this study showed that, mostly, instruction benefited listening comprehension (Jenkins, 2004; Celce-Murcia et al., 1996; Gilbert, 1987; Wong, 1987) where sandhi-forms occurred.

Bearing in mind the study of Henrichsen (1984) on the effect of sandhi-variation on the comprehensibility of English input, which provided results that guided this study, and Van Patten's (1990) study concerning attention to form, which to a lesser extent also guided the study conducted here, it is possible to say that the findings obtained by this study add to the findings presented by both Henrichsen's and Van Patten's research. It is important to call the reader's attention, though, to the fact that this study *adds* to those; however, it would be risky to say that it corroborates those studies, as this was not a faithful replication of either of them.

Although context of the situation was part of this study, but lacked in Henrichsen's study (in her study sentences were de-contextualized), it does not seem to have facilitated students' output, as in putting more attention to forms (sandhi-forms in this case) they were distracted from meaning, which was also a finding in Van Patten's (1990) and Lucena's (1998) research. Neither of them, however, focused on sandhi-forms.

More about the extent of these conclusions is found next in the pedagogical implications, and suggestions for future research sections.

6.2 Pedagogical Implications

Due to the reduced number of tasks carried out within a short period of time in this study, results obtained led to the support of some hypotheses, and partial confirmation of others. No hypotheses were completely invalidated, though. Overall the results signalled benefits when there was instruction on sandhi. Hence, for the context of language teaching this research offers some implications.

When teaching intermediate-level students, teachers should (a) question whether listening comprehension tasks in the course material are not (over) simplified (Nunan,1999; Anderson & Lynch, 1995); (b) *teach* listening skills, instead of *testing* them only (Almeida Filho & El-Dash, 2002; Anderson & Lynch, 1995; Helgersen, 2003; among others) ; (c) make sure that listening comprehension tests really test listening comprehension, rather than memory capacity (Call, 1985; Richards, 1993,1994); (d) introduce pronunciation teaching, especially sandhi-forms, as part of the L2 language curriculum, at the perception level first as a form of input and, later, as part of speech production (Celce-Murcia et al., 1996; Murphy, 2003, Jenkins, 2004; among others); (e) include, in placement tests, some questions related to the use of sandhi; (f) expose students to a wide variety of proficient native and non-native speakers of EFL (Jenkins, 2004; Seidlhofer, 2004, among others); (g) make sure students are able to deal with basic listening strategies (Oxford, 1990; Anderson & Lynch, 1995; Ellis, 1997; Nunan, 1999) when pronunciation instruction initiates.

Language schools should provide teachers with tools that give them confidence to work on pronunciation with their students (Wong, 1987; Celce-Murcia et al. 1996; Jenkins, 2004, among others). Lastly, and equally important, material designers should include tasks on sandhi-forms in EFL coursebooks and teacher's books.

This research highlighted the important role played by listening comprehension in SLA. Rather than recipes, this study sought to generate insights for SLA teachers, so that they may provide students with as many opportunities of remarkable experiences as possible. Thus, together, they can pave the way for desired successful learning.

6.3 Limitations of the Study and Suggestions for Further Research

This study was constrained by four major limitations, which were the following: (1) limited amount of time devoted to instruction on sandhi; (2) reduced number of tasks; (3) lack of time to pilot the tasks before using them; and (4) lack of variation in the type of listening, as only audio listening was used.

Despite such a limited amount of time devoted to instruction on sandhi forms (about 150 minutes altogether in this study), signs of improvement appeared in students listening comprehension outcomes. The results of a reliable diagnostic task aiming at work on listening comprehension strategies, obtained in the first weeks of work, might inform the teacher that the work on instruction was ready to start. As failures had occurred during the first data collection due to participants not being apt to work on listening strategies, the researcher did not want to risk having the same failure again in this data collection. Hence, the great amount of time invested on listening strategies (half of the term), when the instruction phase started. This is not to say that working on strategies is not relevant. Much to the contrary, many researchers (Gilbert, 1987; Ellis, 1997; Nunan, 1999; Fortkamp,

2002, among others) state the importance of strategic work. However, as we are dealing with Intermediate students who had been studying English for about three years in a language school that values serious work, we may say that they had been provided with (at least) basic strategic knowledge. Thus, the instruction phase could have started earlier.

Although for statistical data five was a sufficient number of tasks, more tasks might have had a positive influence on this study, as they might have minimized the ceiling effect caused by Task 3. For students' motivation (according to informal feedback given by them), more tasks on sandhi would have been welcome. That is, by the time they started getting more familiar with the process of sandhi, the instruction phase had finished.

Pilot studies are important to inform the direction to be taken. This was the case with the two pilot studies carried out before the data collection. Although the first data collection failed, the reasons for that did not lie in the type of tasks, which had been piloted previously, but rather in the fact that participants had been misplaced regarding proficiency. The ceiling effect caused by Task 3, for instance, might have been anticipated in a pilot study. Due to lack of time, though, the tasks for the real data collection in this study were not piloted. However, that is not all bad news. Considering that on a daily basis teachers develop and use tasks with students without previously piloting them, mostly due to lack of time, what is important is that they are able to reflect on the reasons why failures occur, when they do, and either improve the same task for a future use, or take the reasons for these failures into account when developing other tasks.

As for types of listening used in this study (audio listening only), again time constraints prevented the researcher from developing other tasks with different listening materials, such as CD-ROMs and videotapes, for instance. It would be interesting to look at visual listening comprehension tasks and compare them to audio. El-Dash's (1993) is an

interesting study on listening comprehension in which visuals were used, although the focus is not on listening comprehension of sandhi-forms. This may be a suggestion for future research, though.

Further research might, then, depart from the items mentioned above as limitations of the study, and replicate this study bearing them in mind. Crossing the existing data taking into account (a) different age groups, (c) intensive or immersion courses, and (c) more advanced levels would be of relevance to the area too. In this study, there was no investigation of whether one particular type of sandhi (assimilation, deletion, reduction or linking) affected the results more than others, which would be of interest for both L1 and L2, as this might inform whether students have a better perception of sandhi-forms that also exist in their L1. Although for this study the focus was perception, it would be interesting to see to what extent the perception of sandhi forms affects production, which might corroborate, or not, existing research that has found correlation between perception and production (Koerich, 2002). This might be a challenging study to be carried out, and a study that, in my view, would contribute to a great extent to the area of SLA.

Given the amount of suggestions for future research, hopefully this study has provided encouragement and inspiration for new researchers in the ever-growing field of L2 pronunciation.

REFERENCES

Almeida Filho, J. C., & El-Dash, L. G. (2002). Comprensão de linguagem oral no ensino de Língua Estrangeira. *Horizontes de Lingüística Aplicada 1,*19-37.

Anderson, A. & Lynch, T. (1995). *Listening*. Oxford University Press.

Anderson, J.R. (1995). *Learning and memory: An integrated approach*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Avery, P., Ehrlich, S. (1994). *Teaching American English Pronunciation*. Oxford University Press.

Baptista, Barbara O. (2001). Frequent pronunciation errors of Brazilian learners of English: In Fortkamp, M. B. M. & Xavier, R. P.(Orgs) *EFL teaching and learning in Brazil: Theory and practice* (pp. 223-230). Florianópolis: Insular.

Baptista, Barbara O. (2000). The learning and teaching of pronunciation in Brazil: Linking research and practice. *Speak Out! Newsletter of the IATEFL Pronunciation Special Interest Group*, 25, 12-19.

Baptista, Barbara O. (2000). A pesquisa na interfonologia e o ensino da pronúncia: Procurando a interface. In M.B.M. Fortkamp & L.M.B. Tomitch (Eds.). *Aspectos da lingüística aplicada: Estudos em homenagem ao Professor Hilário Inácio Bohn* (pp. 93-113). Florianópolis: Insular.

Baptista, Barbara O. & Silva Filho, Jair L. A. (1997). The influence of markedness and syllable contact on the production of English final consonants by EFL learners. In J. Leather & A. James (Eds.). *Acquisition of Second-language Speech* (pp. 26-34). Klagenfurt: Univeristy of Klagenfurt.

Bisol, L. (2000). Sândi externo: O processo e a variação. In M. Kato (Org.). *Gramática do Português falado*. (pp. 55-96). Editora Unicamp.

Breen, M. P, Christopher, C., & Waters, A. (1998). Produção de materiais comunicativos: Alguns princípios básicos. *Trabalhos em Lingüística Aplicada, 32,* 39-52.

Brown, H. D. (1994).*Teaching by principles*. Prentice Hall Regents.

Call, M. E. (1985). Auditory short-term memory, listening comprehension, and the input hypothesis. *TESOL Quarterly*, *19* (4), 765-781.

Castro. S. T. R. (1996). As teorias de aquisição/Aprendizagem de 2ª. Língua/ Língua estrangeira: Implicações para a sala de aula. *Contexturas, 3,* 39-46.

Celce-Murcia,M., Brinton, D.M. & Goodwin, J.M. (1996). *Teaching pronunciation*: *A Reference for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clark, J., & Yallop, C. (1995). *An Introduction to phonetics and phonology*. Blackwell Publishers.

Crystal, D. (1988). *Dicionário de Lingüística e Fonética*. Jorge Zahar Editor.

Crystal, D. (1995). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. Cambridge University Press.

Dalton, C., & Sedlhofer, B. (1994). Connected speech. In *Language Teaching. A scheme for Teacher Pronunciation Education*. (pp. 25-31). Oxford University Press.

Dalton, C., & Smit, U. (1995). Motivation in EFL pronunciation learning: A progress report. *New Sounds*, 321-330.

Derwing, T. M., & Rossiter, M. J. (2002). ESL learners' perceptions of their pronunciation needs and strategies. *System 30*, 155-166.

Derwing, T. M., Carbonaro, M., & Munro, M. (2000). Does popular speech recognition software work with ESL speech? *TESOL Quarterly, 34* (3), 592-602.

El-Dash, L. (1993). *Compreensão auditiva em lingua estrangeira: Efeito de visuais e atitudes.* Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, IEL. Universidade Estadual de Campinas. Campinas, SP.

Ellis, R. (1997). *Second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press.

Escudero, P. (2002). The perception of English vowel contrasts: Acoustic cue reliance in the development of new contrasts. In A. James & Leather (Eds.)*, New Sounds 2000: Preceedings of the Fourth International Symposium of the Acquisition of Second-Language Speech (University of Amsterdam, September 2000)*. (pp.122-131). Klagenfurt: University of Klagenfurt.

Fortkamp, M. B. M. (2002). Estratégias de Aprendizagem de Línguas Estrangeiras. In M. J. D. Costa, M. E. Zipser, M. E. Zanatta & A. Mendes (Org). *Línguas: Ensino e ações*. (pp. 233-248). Florianópolis.

Giegerich, J. Heinz (1992). *English Phonology: an introduction*. Cambridge University Press.

Gilbert, J. (1987). Pronunciation and Listening comprehension. In Morley, J. (Ed.). *Current Perspectives on Pronunciation*. (pp.33-39). TESOL, Washington, D.C.

Gilbert, J. (1993). *Clear speech. Pronunciation and Listening Comprehension in North American English*. Cambridge University Press.

Gilbert, J. (1994). Intonation: A Navigation Guide for the Listener. In Morley, J. (Ed). *Pronunciation Pedagogy and Theory: New views, new directions*. (pp.36-48) TESOL.

Gilbert, J. B., & Rogerson, P. (1990). *Speaking Clearly*. Cambridge University Press.

Goodwin, J. (2001). Teaching pronunciation. In Celce-Murcia (Org). *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign language* (3rd. ed.). (pp. 117-137). Heinle & Heinle.

Gorsuch, J. (2001). Testing textbook theories and tests: The case of suprasegmentals in a pronunciation textbook. *System,* 29, 119-136.

Gurevich, N. (2001). A critique of markedness-based theories in phonology. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences, 31* (2), 89-114.

Helgesen, M. (2003). Listening. In D. Nunan (Ed.). *Practical English Language Teaching*. (pp. 23-46). Mac Graw Hill.

Henrichsen, L. E. (1984). Sandhi-variation: A filter of input for learners of ESL. *Language Learning. A journal of applied linguistics 34* (3), 103-126.

Hewings, M. (1993). *Pronunciation Tasks*. Cambridge University Press.

Jenkins, J. (2002). A sociolinguistic based, empirically researched pronunciation syllabus for English as an internationl language. *Applied linguistics 23* (1), 83-103.

Jenkins, J. (2004). Research in teaching pronunciation and intonation. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics 24*, 109-125.

Jenner, B. (1995). The phonology of international English. *New Sounds*, 154-157.

Jones, R.H. (1997). Beyond 'listen and repeat': pronunciation teaching materials and theories of second language acquisition. *System 25*, 103-112.

Keys, K. J. (2002). Transfer processes in L2 phonological acquisition and normative criteria: data from a Brazilian study. *Horizontes de Lingüística Aplicada 1*, 45-61.

Kachru, B. B., & Nelson, C.L. (1995). World Englishes. In McKay, S. L. & Hornberger, N. H (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 71-102). CUP.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. London: Pergamon.

Koerich, R. D. (2002). Ensinar Pronúncia? In M. J. D. Costa, M. E. Zipser, M. E. Zanatta & A. Mendes (Org). *Línguas: Ensino e ações.* (pp. 233-248). Florianópolis.

Koerich, R. D. (2002). *Perception and Production of word-final vowel epenthesis by brazilian EFL students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina.

Ladefoged, P. (2001). *A course in phonetics*. Fourth edition. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Leather, J., & James, A. (1996). Second language speech. In *Handbook of second language acquisition*. (pp. 269-316).

Lucena, M. I. P. (1998). *Processing input: An investigation into Brazilian EFL students*. Unpublished master's thesis, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianopolis, SC.

MacLaughlin, B. (1987). *Theories of Second Language Learning*. London: Edward Arnold.

Major, R., Fitzmaurice, S., Bunta, F., & Balasubramaian, C. (2002). The effects of Nonnative accents on listening comprehension: implications for ESL assessment. *TESOL Quarterly*, (2), 173-190.

Major, R. C. (1988). Balancing form and function. *IRAL, 26* (2), 81-100.

Morley, J. (1987). *Current Perspectives on Pronunciation: Practices anchored in theory*. (Eds.) TESOL, Inc.

Morley, J. (1994). *Pronunciation Pedagogy and Theory: New Views, New Directions*. (Eds) TESOL, Inc.

Murphy, J. (2003). Pronunciation. In *Practical English Language Teaching*. Nunan. D. (Ed.). (pp. 111-128). Mac Graw Hill.

Nunan, D. (1999). *Second language teaching & learning*. Heinle & Heinle publishers.

Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies*. Newbury House Publishers.

Lightbown, P. M. & Spada, N. *How languages are learned*. Oxford University Press.

Pennington, M.C. & Richards, J.C. (1996). Pronunciation revisited. *TESOL Quarterly 20* (2), 207-225.

Pennington, M. C. (1997). Phonology in language teaching: Essentials of theory and practice. In *Beyond Methods*. Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Hartford, B. (Eds). (pp. 67-87). The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

Pinker, S. (1994). *The language instinct*. Harper Perennial.

Prator, C.H. & Robinett, B.W. (1972). *Manual of American English Pronunciation*. Holt EFL/ESL Advanced. Fourth Edition.

Richards, J. C. (1984). *Error Analysis*. (Ed). Longman.

Richards, J., Platt, J. and Platt, H. (1992). *Dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. Longman.

Richards, J.C. (1993). Listening comprhension: Approach, design, procedure. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17 (2), 219-39.

Richards, J. C. (1994). *The context of language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. S. (1995). *Approaches and methods in language teaching.* Cambridge University Press.

Savignon, S. J. (1992). Current Directions in Foreign-language teaching. In Grabe, W., & Kaplan, R. B. (eds). *Introduction to applied linguistics*. (p.p 109-122). Addison-Wesley publishing Company.

Schockey, L. (1995). Perpception of reduced forms by native and non-native speakers of English. *New Sounds,* 314-320.

Seidlhofer, B. (2004). Research perspectives on teaching English as a Língua Franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics 24*, 209-239.

Seidlhofer, B. (2005). English as a lingua franca. In *Oxford Learners's Advanced Dictionary*. R92.

Stevick, E. W. (1976). *Memory, meaning & method.* Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

Titone, R. (1983). *Psicolingüística aplicada*. Summus editorial.

Tudor, I. (1996). *Learner-centredness as language education.* Cambridge University Press.

Ur, P. (1984). *Teaching Listening Comprehension*. Cambridge University Press.

Van Patten, B. (1990). Attending to form and input: An experiment in consciousness. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*,*12*, 287-301.

Van Patten, B. & Cadierno, T. (1993). Input processing and second language acquisition: A role for instruction. *The Modern Language Journal, 77*, 45-57.

Vigotski, L. S. (1998). *A formação social da mente*. Martins Fontes.

Wong, R. (1987). Learner Variables and Prepronunciation Considerations in Teaching Pronunciation. In Morley, J. (Ed). *Current Perspectives on Pronunciation*. (pp. 12-28) TESOL.

Zsiga, E. C.(2003). Articulatory timing in a second language. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 25,* 399-432.

APPENDIX A
Pre-test
Listening comprehension test
Mid-Term
Part I
1. Listen to Iain talking about three jobs he had when he was a student. Circle the jobs he did from those given below.

Place 1: an insurance company/an old people's home/ a construction project.
Place 2: an ice-rink/an ice parlour/ a bar.
Place 3: a post office/ a tax office/ a taxi office.

Part II
Now listen to the passage again, mark the sentences True or False and **correct the false ones.**

Place 1
a. (   ) It was called the '85 Project' because there were 85 people involved.
_____

b. (   ) If no one replied to the company's letters after two years, the company kept the money.
_____

c. (   ) Ian felt that the ' 85 project' was a very good thing to be involved in.
_____

Place 2
d. (   ) Working there was enjoyable
_____
Part II
2. Listen again and number the topics in the order they are mentioned. There is one extra topic which you do not need to use.
a. (   ) the worst thing about working nights.
b. (   ) Advice for people who work nights.
c. (   ) How working nights can affect your body.
d. (   ) The time she starts and finishes work.
e. (   ) How many hours she sleeps.
f. (   ) Main problems of working nights.

3.Mark the sentences true (T) or false (F)

e. (   ) Most of the people who worked there were young people
_____

f. (   ) The money got wet because the workers dropped it into the sink.
_____
_____

Place 3
g. (   ) It takes a short time to get anything organized.
_____
_____
h. (   ) the filing system is chaotic
_____
_____
i. (   ) you can't get your money back very quickly
_____
_____

Post-test
Listening comprehension test   Final Test
Part I

1. Listen to Esther, a nurse, talking about working nights. In her opinion, what is the worst thing about working nights? Choose the correct alternative.

a. if you work nights you tend to work more hours than usual. (   )
b. If you work nights you don't get enough sleep because you have to do things in the morning. (   )

a. (   ) She is on night duty for 5 consecutive weeks.
b. (   ) She starts work at 10 p.m.
c. (   ) She usually goes to bed at 8 p.m.
d. (   ) She finds it really difficult to sleep.
e. (   ) The worst time to stay awake is between 4:30 and 6 a.m.
f. (   ) She feels that she has got older more quickly because she works nights.
g. (   ) Because of her working hours, she always does her things in the morning.
h. (   ) Because of her job, her friends never invite her for lunch.

APPENDIX B
First needs analysis questionnaire

<u>Sharing information</u>

My name is _____ and I'm _____ **(1)** years old. I've been

studying English for **(2)** _____ years and I find it **(3)**_____.

At the moment my English is **(4)**_____. I

would like to improve **(5)** _____ _____because

(6)_____.

In order to cope with my difficulties I will count on my teacher's help and I'll also be committed to

investing **(7)** _____ hour (s) a week studying English.

One thing I would like my English teacher to know about me is

(8)_____.

In class I would be interested in having
(9)_____
_____.

By the end of this term I expect
(10)_____
_____.

My contact with the language outside the classroom is through
(11)_____
_____.

Results for the first needs analysis questionnaire

	TREATMENT GROUP	CONTROL GROUP
Number of Ss	19	19
Question 1	Ages ranging from 14 to 25	Ages ranging from 12 to 42 (most 18-20)
Question 2	10= 3 1/2 years 7 = 4 years 2= 3 years	8= 3 ½ years 8= 4 years 3= 3 years
Question 3	17 = important for the future/use the internet 2 = important to get a job 10 = important to travel abroad	15= very important for the future/use the internet/ travel abroad 2= important to get a job 2= very difficult to learn
Question 4	6= I can survive if the conversation is basic. 2 = listening and writing are not good. 8= speaking is ok. I can survive. Listening is not so good. 3 = poor	5= it needs to get better. Still cannot understand much. 8= reading is ok, but speaking and listening are not. 3= not good. I can't understand what people say. For the internet is ok. 3= My English is bad because I mix it with German when I speak.
Question 5	17 = speaking and listening 1 = speaking an writing 1= reading and listening	5= listening and reading 12= listening and speaking 2= speaking and writing
Question 6	12= I want to go abroad to study 2= Use the internet better 2= Take a post-grad course abroad 2= find a good job 1= become an international musician	9= it is necessary for the future 3= understand films in English without reading the subtitles 4= speak and understand foreigners 3= to study and live abroad (student exchange).
Question 7	2= ½ h 1= 4h 10 = 1 h 6= 2 h	8= 1 h 7= 2h 4= 4h
Question 8	3= I like having music in class 2= I don't like homework. 7= I like 'dynamic' classes 4= I don't like to speak in front of everybody 2= It would be better if the homework was assigned for the weekends. 1= I love the e@campus	4= I like materials w/ native speakers speaking 5= I do not have much time extra class to study 3= speaking is essential in class; the rest can be done at home. 2= It's good if you can correct the homework in class 1= I HATE writing compositions
Question 9	9= conversation and correction on pronunciation 3= to learn pronunciation 4= study grammar 2= the teacher to play the listening 3 times 1= correct homework and check writings	5= correction when I speak 7= films, songs, videos, tapes, CDs (all with native speakers) 1= listen to the teacher speaking only English 1= have breaks every class 3= study grammar 2= not to speak in front of everybody
Question 10	15= to speak English better 2= to read my papers faster 1= to listen and pronounce better 1= to be able to correct my grammar mistakes	8= to speak better English (better pronunciation) 9= to improve my listening and speaking 1= write better reports 1= read texts without looking words up in the dictionary all the time
Question 11	11= songs and films 1= native speakers in my university class, songs and films 5=listening from the book, songs and films 2= computer games, CD ROMs 19= internet	9= songs and films 2 = studying at home with friends 3= material I use at home (tapes, CD ROMs, etc) 5= readings texts for the university course 19= internet

APPENDIX C
Second needs analysis questionnaire

1. Rate the skills below from easy/-ier (1) to (more) difficult (5)
   a. ☐ reading
   b. ☐ speaking
   c. ☐ listening to audio CDs
   d. ☐ listening to video tapes/CD-ROMS
   e. ☐ writing

2. How do you feel when you have a speaking activity in class in small groups with your classmates?
   a. ☐ good because you learn with them
   b. ☐ a waste of time because nobody knows anything
   c. ☐ good because everybody listens to everybody in the group, ask questions to clarify information and expand on the conversation
   d. ☐ a mixed feeling between having fun and learning, and wasting time
   e. ☐ uncomfortable because only you talk and the rest of the group couldn't care less
   f. ☐ people don't listen to you because they don't think your English is good.
   g. ☐ bored because you don't want to listen to the others because you don't think their English is good
   h. ☐ you don't mind because you speak only when the teacher comes near your group, because he/she is the only person you want to pay attention to what you're saying

3. How do you feel when you have to listen to an audio CD in class to work on a task?
   a. ☐ I generally feel at easy with it.
   b. ☐ I panic because I find listening passages hard to understand.
   c. ☐ it depends on the speaker. If it is a foreign speaker, it's easy, but if it's a native speaker, it is more difficult.
   d. ☐ Mostly I find it difficult because they speak too fast. It's very hard to follow.

4. The occasions when you considered a listening passage difficult, that was due to:
   a. ☐ speech rate
   b. ☐ type of speech (mologue__,dialogue__,conversation among several people_)
   c. ☐ unfamiliarity with the speaker
   d. ☐ unfamiliarity with the topic (British__,American ___,Irish ___, others____)
   e. ☐ most of the words were unknown
   f. ☐ words were familiar, but they sounded very different in a 'fast' conversation.

5. Justify your answers (1) and (5) in question 1 (one):
   _____
   _____

Results for the second needs analysis questionnaire

QUESTIONS	ALTERNATIVES	TG	CG
1. Rate the skills below from easy/-ier (1), to (more) difficult (5)	a. Reading b. Speaking c. Listening to audio Cds d. Listening to video tapes/CD-ROMs e. Writing	6 Ss= d (1); b (2); a (3); c (4); e (5) 3 Ss = b (1); d (2); c (3); a (4); e (5) 1 St= e (1); a (2); d (3); c (4); b (5) 2 Ss= d (1); a (2); b (3); c (4); e (5) 3 Ss= d (1); e (2); a (3); c (4); b (5) 4 Ss= d (1); a (2); e (3); b (4); c (5)	3 Ss= d (1); b (2); a (3); e (4); c (5) 5 Ss = a (1); d (2); c (3); b (4); e (5) 2 Ss= e (1); a (2); d (3); b (4); c (5) 4 Ss= e (1); d (2); a (3); c (4); b (5) 4 Ss= d (1); b (2); a (3); c (4); e (5) 1 St= b (1); d (2); c (3); a (4); e (5)
2. How do you feel when you have a speaking activity in class in small groups with your classmates?	a. Good because you learn w/ them b. A waste of time because nobody knows anything c. Good because everybody listens to everybody in the group, ask questions to clarify and expand on the conversation d. A mixed feeling between having fun and learning, and wasting time e. Uncomfortable because only you talk and the rest of the group couldn't care less f. People don't listen to you because they don't think your English is good. g. Bored because you don't want to listen to the others because you don't think their English is good h. You don't mind because you speak only when the teacher comes near your group, because he/she is the only person you want to pay attention to what you're saying	= 5 = 2 = 6 = 1 = 1 = 0 = 1 = 3	= 0 = 2 = 3 = 3 = 4 = 3 = 4 = 0
3. How do you feel when you have to listen to an audio CD in class to work on a task?	a. I generally feel at easy with it. b. I panic because I find listening passages hard to understand c. It depends on the speaker. If it is a foreign speaker, it's easy, but if it's a native speaker, it's more difficult. d. Mostly I find it difficult because they speak too fast. It's very hard to follow.	= 3 = 3 = 5 = 8	= 2 = 5 = 3 = 9

4. The occasions when you considered a listening passage difficult, that was due to:	a. Speech rate	= 8	= 5
	b. Type of speech (monologue__, dialogue ___, conversation among several people ___)	= 0	= 0
	c. Unfamiliarity with the speaker (British___, American__, Irish ___, others ____)	= 2	= 3
	d. Unfamiliarity with the topic	= 3	= 6
	e. Most of the words were unknown	= 0	= 0
	f. Words were familiar, but they sounded very different in a 'fast' conversation.	= 6	= 5
5. Justify your answers (1) and (5) in question 1 (one)		d (1) = it's easy (obvious) when we see because then it's easier to understand; When you don't know the vocabulary, they repeat and you see, so you understand; they speak fast, but you can see their 'lips moving', then you understand e (1) = you see the model and you just substitute the parts with your own ideas and you can add/change some words b (1) = you start to speak and your friends help when you forget words; you mime or give a name (e.g.: Nike) e (5) It's difficult to create and it's boring; you have to pay attention to grammar, correct words, paragraphs, etc.; the models help, but we have to do it different from the model. b (5) = If it is in group, it's ok, but in front of everybody I make lots of mistakes and I don't find the words; it is hard not to pause a lot when we don't know a word; if we don't know a word we have to explain, explain, explain...it's tiring, but when we know the vocabulary it's easy. It's hard when we don't	a (1) if the text is in your area of study, you know the vocabulary and it's easy; many words are similar to Portuguese; b (1) you study a topic and then you can talk about it because you know how other people talked about it d (1) it's easy when we see because then it's easier to understand; you know what's happening because you can see the actions and you associate with the sentences/vocabulary. e (1) = you see the model and the teacher gives the sequence that should be included in the writing. Similar to Portuguese (reports, letters, etc). e (1) I don't write in Portuguese, why should I write in English; it's a waste of time because there are always mistakes to be corrected; it's never good; it's done at home and there is

| | | know the pronunciation, because then the person doesn't understand
c (5)=
Sometimes we understand the topic, but not the exact words; it's too fast most of the time; it's very hard because we have to listen more than 2 times to understand it, but the teacher plays 2 times; sometimes you know the word, but the speaker speaks very differently, so you don't understand; it's too fast and they don't 'breath' when they speak; it's easier to listen to the teacher, but in the test it's difficult to listen to the people in the audio CD. | nobody to help me at home; I use 'help' for vocabulary, but the help is not for all the composition, so we should write in class.
 b (5) =We should speak only with the teacher, not with students because the teacher understands, the students don't.
It's important to know more vocabulary and pronunciation to be a good speaker.
c (5)=
It's very fast; I never remember the information when the listening is over; it's hard to remember too much information; it's hard because it's fast and we don't see the person; all the words are 'different' in the listening. When we see the words, we know, but when we listen to the CD, we don't know; sometimes British is more difficult because they don't pronounce the words completely, but Americans change the pronunciation of the words more. |

APPENDIX D

Intro: sandhi-forms
Name:_____

You are going to listen to five sentences presenting five different situations. Four of them are statements (S) and one is a question (Q). Choose **a** or **b** as the alternative that best completes each of them. You will hear them twice. There will be a pause after each time you hear the sentences. After the second time, use this moment of 'pause' to put a tick (√**)** beside the number corresponding to how sure you are of your answer. Use the guideline below for that.
The teacher will do the example with you before the listening starts.

Guideline   **1.** Completely sure
                    2.   Quite sure
                    3.   Not really sure
                    4.   Not sure at all

Example   S: ~~Call her at ten.~~   (Important: you won't see the written form in the
                         Exercises below)

          a) Which colour?   **1**√_ **2**__ **3**__ **4** __
          b) What time?   √

Now you have 1 (one) minute to go through all the alternatives before the listening starts.
S= statement   Q= question

   1. Q:_____?
       a. yes, very easy.   ___   **1**__ **2**__ **3** __ **4**__
       b. yes, very busy   ___

   2. S:_____.
       a. telling it now?   ___   **1**__ **2**__ **3** __ **4**__
       b. why tell him?   ___

   3. S: _____.
       a. Could it?   ___   **1**__ **2**__ **3** __ **4**__
       b. Cut off?   ___

   4. S: _____.
       a. better a giver than a taker, right? ___   **1**__ **2**__ **3** __ **4**__
       b. Why her?   ___

   5. S: _____.
       a. Too late because I already have. ___   **1**__ **2**__ **3** __ **4**__
       b. So ... why be happy?   ___

THIS TASK WAS ADAPTED FROM *SPEAKING CLEARLY* BY ROGERSON & GILBERT, CUP (1990, PP. 44).

THE *GUIDELINE* WAS borrowed from EL-DASH (1993).

Results for Intro sandhi-forms

	TG (19)	CG (19)
Sentences uttered	Number of Ss who answered correctly	Number of Ss who answered correctly
1. Is he busy this afternoon? b. Yes, very busy.	13	14
2. You ought to tell him about it. b. Why tell him?	14	15
3. It could've been someone else. a. Could it?	16	16

4. Give her the report you've
     Written.
     b. Why her?
	15	16

5. You shouldn't 've said so.
     a. Too late because I already
        have.
	17	14

Possible misunderstandings:

1. Easy biz this afternoon?
2. You're telling about it.
3. It cut off being...
4. Giver in the report you've written.
5. You shouldn't be sad, so...

APPENDIX E

Task 1 - TG

Part I

A. Pairwork. Pair up with one of your classmates. First pronounce the words in column A and then the words in column B. Check your doubts with your classmate or your teacher.

A	B	C
1. last 8. around 2. quite 9. dead 3. went 10. loud 4. met 11. television 5. most 12. ten 6. red 13. brown 7. old 14. seven 15. broken	1. Monday 8. Britain 2. boring 9. bird 3. back 10. bang 4. Bob 11. programme 5. people 12. pounds 6. bicycle 13. bag 7. man 14. million 15. mirror	

THIS TASK WAS ADAPTED FROM *PRONUNCIATION TASKS* BY MARTIN HEWINGS (1993), CUP.

B. Pairwork. Now take turns with your classmate pronouncing the words together in the way they are presented. E.g: A1 with B1 (last Monday); A2 and B2 (quite boring), etc. Write down the ones you had more difficulty with pronouncing.

C. Listening. You will now listen to the same pairs of words uttered by a native speaker of English. Was there much difference between his way of connecting those words and yours? ☐ yes ☐ no

D. Noticing. Listen to him one more time. Tick (√) what you notice when he connects the words.

<u>**1**</u>   <u>**2**</u>   <u>**3**</u>   <u>**4**</u>

☐ sounds are changed ☐ speech rate changes ☐ easier to understand   ☐ speech is more natural

☐ no changes in sounds ☐ same speech rate   ☐ more difficult to understand ☐ speech is not so natural

Part II

While you were abroad you made a few friends. These friends decided to get together and send you a tape-recorded letter telling you about new friends they have made since you were gone. Some parts of the recordings are not so good and you want to write them an e-mail in order to check a few things with them.

1. Sue
   a. Did you say "We _____university" ?
   b. Did you say "we've been friends_____students"?

2. Juan
   a. Did you say "We _____with our studying as well"?
   b. Did you say " It was just _____'till it was time to come back home"?

3. Elisa
   a. Did you say " _____India, just after university"?
   b. Did you say " We didn't get on too well _____bumping into each other"?

4. Enrico
   a. Did you say "... particularly music. _____see as many bands as we can"?
   b. Did you say " We, er, don't get go travel as much as _____"?

5. Sindy
   a. Did you say " _____each other for a few years now"?
   b. Did you say "...go to pubs or to friends' houses and _____hang out"?

6. Hans
   a. Did you say "on the same corridor _____"?
   b. Did you say "We got on from _____"?

Task 1 - CG
Part I
Before you listen to each of the six speakers, tick (√) the boxes (a-c) answering the questions according to what is true for you.

a. Do you have friends you made while you were traveling?
☐ yes   ☐ no

b. What made you become friend with this person/these people?
☐ common interests (music, food, places, cinema, etc)   ☐ same age
☐ same language   ☐ same kind of family
☐ same gender   ☐ others_____

c. How often do you keep in touch with this friend?
☐ always   ☐ occasionally   ☐ never
☐ sometimes   ☐ hardly ever

d. Get together with a classmate and tell him/her about this person you have met. Use the information in *b* and *c* to talk about him/her. (5' each)

e. Did your classmate ask you questions to know more about that person you met?
☐ yes   ☐ no
If so, write down a couple of questions he/she asked. Use the lines below for that.
_____
_____

Part II
While you were abroad you made a few friends. These friends decided to get together and send you a tape-recorded letter telling you about new friends they have made since you were gone. Some parts of the recordings are not so good and you want to write them an e-mail in order to check a few things with them.

1. Sue
    a. Did you say "We _____university"?
    b. Did you say "we've been friends_____students"?

2. Juan
    a. Did you say "We _____with our studying as well"?
    b. Did you say "It was just _____'till it was time to come back home"?

3. Elisa
    a. Did you say " _____India, just after university"?
    b. Did you say, " We didn't get on too well _____bumping into each other"?

4. Enrico
    a. Did you say "... particularly music. _____ see as many bands as we can"?
    b. Did you say " We, er, don't get go travel as much as _____"?

5. Sindy
    a. Did you say " _____each other for a few years now"?
    b. Did you say "...go to pubs or to friends' houses and _____hang out"?

6. Hans
    a. Did you say "on the same corridor _____"?
    b. Did you say "We got on from _____"?

TASK 1:   RESULTS - COURSEBOOK UNIT 8 SCRIPT 32

Task 1	Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		Q5		Q6		total

TG	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	
S1	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	**34**
S2	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	**33**
S3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S4	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	2	**32**
S5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	**35**
S6	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	2	**31**
S7	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	3	1	3	3	**30**
S8	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	**33**
S9	2	3	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	**32**
S10	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S11	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	**33**
S12	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	1	2	3	**30**
S13	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	**35**
S14	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	**33**
S15	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	2	**31**
S16	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**34**
S17	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**34**
S18	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S19	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	**34**
TOTAL	**54**	**49**	**43**	**57**	**56**	**52**	**56**	**49**	**57**	**53**	**51**	**52**	

CG	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	
S1	3	2	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	**29**
S2	2	2	2	3	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	1	**26**
S3	2	2	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	**28**
S4	2	3	2	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	**29**
S5	2	3	2	3	2	2	3	2	3	3	2	2	**29**
S6	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	**30**
S7	1	2	2	3	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	1	**21**
S8	2	2	2	3	2	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	**27**
S9	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	2	**31**
S10	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	**30**
S11	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	1	**27**
S12	3	2	2	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	**29**
S13	1	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	1	**26**
S14	3	2	3	3	2	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	**30**
S15	3	2	2	3	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	**29**
S16	2	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	**29**
S17	2	2	2	3	2	2	3	2	3	2	2	3	**28**
S18	2	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	**30**
S19	1	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	2	**26**
TOTAL	**42**	**45**	**42**	**57**	**41**	**42**	**53**	**44**	**47**	**42**	**42**	**37**	

APPENDIX F

Task 2 - TG

Part I

A. Pair work. Work with a classmate. Read the conversation between Alan and Sue (below). Decide where sounds (at word boundary) connect, and which changes come with that. Task 1: Underline (_) the sounds that connect; task 2: decide the kinds of change that occur (see guideline below).

Alan: Do you know it's Phil's birthday on Thursday?

Sue: I'd forgotten all about it.

Alan: I suppose we should buy him a present.

Sue: And we really ought to have a party for him.

Alan: Well, what can we get him?

Sue: It depends how much we want to pay.

Alan: If we pay about £10 we could get him something really nice.

Sue: What about a new umbrella. He's got that old blue one, but it's all broken. He should throw it away.

Alan: That's a great idea. And it won't be too expensive. And what about a party?

Sue: Well, we could invite a few friends around here. How about Thursday evening?

Alan: We could, but I know he's got an interview on Friday, and he might want to get ready for that.

Sue: Well, let's wait till the weekend. Anyway, more people will be free on Saturday.

Alan: Ok. I'll buy the present, and you arrange the party.

Sue: fine.

THIS CONVERSATION WAS EXTRACTED FROM *PRONUNCIATION TASKS* BY MARTIN HEWINGS FROM CUP (UNIT 40, PP. 115)

Guideline for changes

1. /t/ ➡/r/   5. /t/ ➡/tʃ/

2. /y/ ➡ /dʒ/   6. /u:/➡ /ə/

3. /t/ ➡ Ø   7. /r/ ➡ Ø

4. /h/➡ Ø   8. /ə/ ➡ Ø   9. Others_____

B. Individual work. Work on your own. Now listen to the conversation and check your answers. The listening passage will be played twice. There will be a pause after each sentence is uttered, so that you have time to check your answers. Use the lines below to write down the changes found. Specify if they are changes of type 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 or 9. Use the parentheses to write the numbers.

(   )_____   (   ) _____

(   )_____   (   ) _____

(   )_____   (   ) _____

(   )_____   (   ) _____

(   )_____   (   ) _____

(   )_____   (   ) _____

(   )_____   (   ) _____

(   )_____   (   ) _____

(   )_____   (   ) _____

(   )_____   (   ) _____

Task 2 - CG

Part I

Before you listen to a conversation between two friends (Mara and Ella), answer the questions below. Then, get together with a classmate and check whether you have common answers.

1) Think of a couple of occasions in which you talked somebody into doing something for you.
   _____
   _____
   _____

2) Who was the person you 'persuaded' to do what you wanted in each of the occasions?
   _____
   _____
   _____

3) Why did you choose that particular person?
   _____
   _____
   _____

4) Was the outcome what you expected it to be?
   ☐ yes   ☐ no

5) Will/would you choose the same person/people next time? Why (not)?

_____
_____
_____

TASK 2   **TG/ CG**
Part II

Mara's father (Phil) suspects that she and her friend Ella are up to something. He tries to eavesdrop their conversation. As they realize it, they start speaking lower. Due to that, they can't understand each other, so they keep asking *what?* all the time for clarification. Fill in the blanks below with parts of the speech that either Mara or Ella missed (scene 3).

1. Ella: Anyway, how....
   Mara: ...how what?
   Ella: How _____?

2. Mara: ...on the phone yesterday...
   Ella: ...on the phone yesterday, and what?
   Mara: _____.

3. Mara: if...
   Ella: if what?
   Mara: if _____.

4. Mara: ...he couldn't wait to...
   Ella: ...wait to what?
   Mara: ...wait to _____.

5. Mara: We can...
   Ella: We can what?
   Mara: We can _____ come traveling with us.

6. Ella: I see...
   Mara: ...see what?
   Ella: I see _____.

✂---
TG/ CG

Part III
Phil could hardly understand what Mara and Ella were saying. Listen again and tick (√) the box corresponding to the possible misunderstanding he had due to sounds being connected. Think of misunderstandings you may have in your own language when the sounds are connected.

1. a.☐ Anyway, Hawdy knows.   b. ☐ Anyway, how will you know?

2. a.☐ …he answered …   b. ☐ …he, Esther…

3. a.☐ they'd laughed   b. ☐ David laughed.

4. a.☐ be in alarm   b. ☐ …be in the army

5. a.☐ black mail income   b. ☐ Black & Male Co.

6. a.☐ …war, you mean?   b. ☐… watch, you mean?

TOTAL	57	54	51	54	53	45	54	48	46	54	57	51	

TASK 2: RESULTS – COURSEBOOK UNIT 9 SCRIPT 35

Task 2	Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		Q5		Q6		total

S15	3	0	3	3	2	0	3	3	2	0	3	0	**22**
S16	3	3	1	0	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	0	**25**
S17	3	3	3	3	3	0	3	0	2	0	3	3	**26**
S18	3	3	3	0	3	0	3	3	2	0	3	3	**26**
S19	3	3	3	3	2	0	2	3	2	0	3	3	**27**
TOTAL	57	45	49	39	46	21	50	39	45	30	57	39	

APPENDIX G

Task 3 -TG   Part I

I. Consider the following situation: you are living in an English speaking country and you applied for an acting position at your college. A friend of yours, who is a proficient speaker of English, has recorded a CD to help you with a few sounds, predicting a few questions you might be asked about during your interview. Listen to sentences below and repeat them:

   a. When were you first introduced to acting?
     It was in 1999 in a school in Brazil.
   b. Was it a drama class?
     Yes, **it was**. And later on I joined a drama school. The best drama school in the city, in fact.
   c. Which roles have you played so far?
     I was a walk-on actor in the Brazilian version of The Beauty and the Beast; and I had some appearances in a few Brazilian soaps. One of them showed here last year. It's called "Celebrities". **Did you** watch it?
   d. You wrote here in your résumé that you also did some singing. How about dancing?
     I forgot to mention it, but I **did that** as well. Before I came to this country, actually.
   e. You also say here that you know how to juggle. Is that right?
     Well, I **used to** have juggling classes as part of my drama lessons some time ago. But I haven't practiced it since then.
   f. Ok. Let me cross this item here: "Juggling: ☒ **used to**."
   g. How far from this office are you?
     J**ust around** the corner!
   h. Oh, really? So, can you come for a second interview tomorrow? Uhm... **around ten**? Certainly!
   i. Oh, and I forgot to say that tomorrow you'll be interviewed by John **and Clarice**.
   j. I'm sorry. **John and...**?   Clarice? All right. Thank you.

II. Now listen again and compare the sounds. Say which of the expressions in bold you think is connected in speech. Then use the box beside it to write down the number corresponding to the type of connected speech you hear.
   1. reduction of the vowel sound
   2. omission of a sound at word boundary
   3. a new sound is heard when these two words connect
   4. this is an obvious word there, so it is reduced.

     a. ☐ b. ☐   ☐

     c. ☐ d. ☐   ☐

     e. ☐ f. ☐   ☐

     g. ☐ h. ☐   ☐

     i. ☐ j. ☐   ☐

Task 3 - CG

Part I

I.   Look at a few jobs listed below. Tick (√) the ones you may consider taking if you move to an English speaking country to stay a couple of years. Use the blank lines for other possibilities.

☐ babysitting   ☐ cleaning   ☐ acting

☐ teaching Portuguese ☐ busking   ☐ waitressing

☐ _____ ☐ _____ ☐ _____

II.   **Group work**. Get together with two other classmates. Check if your choices were similar. and discuss:

a) the requirements of each job considering you are a foreigner.

b) differences there might be for people with/without experience

c) difficulties you might face in the beginning.

d) possible wages

III.   **Group work**. Choose one of the jobs which was a common choice in your group and think of some counseling you would give to a person considering taking it for a couple of years in a foreign country. Present it to the whole group.

TASK 3   **TG / CG**
Part II

Marko (an Slovenian actor) was invited to give an interview about his career to an American TV channel. He decides to get help from a professional in the Language Teaching field in order to do well on the interview. Bearing in mind **the links** that make speech sound more natural, suggest improvements whenever necessary and write down what he says in the blank spaces below. Use the guidelines for help. Check the example before you start.

   Guidelines   (1)   Good! No suggestions
                        (2)   Reduce/weaken the vowel sound at word boundary.
                        (3)   Delete the last sound in this word when at word boundary.
                        (4)   Two sounds should change in order to produce a new sound at word boundary.
                        (5)   This is an obvious 'grammatical' word there, so reduce it.
                        (6)   Contract the words (e.g.: I have= I've; cannot= can't, etc).

Example: I've been here **for some time.**   **suggestion:** (1)
                           a   **b**   **c**
          People say I'm **a good actor**.   **suggestion:** a= (2); b/c (3)
                        a   **b**   **c**

<u>**Consider:**</u>
a = **the** linking process between what comes **before (a)** and **(a) itself.**
a/b= the linking process **between (a)** and **(b)**
b/c= the linking process **between (b)** and **(c)**

🎞   **The listening will start. You have one minute to go through the questions below. The listening will be played twice. There will be a pause between the end of Marko's answer and the following question. You should always use three words to complete Part _a_.**

    1. How long have you been an actor, Marko?
        a.   ".... my English wasn't very good, and _____to find a job".
        b. Suggestion: _____
        _____.

    2. What's the difference?
        a.   ".... you may have a line or _____, but...".
        b. Suggestion: _____
        _____.

    3. What kind of roles do you get?
        a. "...just someone hanging around on the street or _____".
        b. Suggestion: _____
        _____.

    4. Is it well paid?
        a.   "...but you can make _____times more...".
        b. Suggestion: _____
        _____.

    5. What are you up to at the moment?
        a. "...that's one of the soaps over here. Do you _____ the States?"
        b. Suggestion: _____

TG	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	
S1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S6	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S7	3	1,5	3	3	3	0	3	3	3	3	3	3	**31,5**
S8	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S9	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S10	Q1	3	Q2	3	Q3	3	Q4	3	Q5	3	Q6	3	**36**
S11	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S12	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1,5	3	3	**34,5**
S13	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S14	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S15	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S16	3	1,5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**34,5**
S17	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S18	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S19	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1,5	3	3	3	3	**34,5**
TOTAL	**57**	**54**	**57**	**57**	**57**	**54**	**57**	**55,5**	**57**	**55,5**	**57**	**57**	

TASK 3:   RESULTS -   WORKBOOK UNIT 9 SCRIPT 17

APPENDIX H

Task 4 - TG

Part I

   A. Group work. You're going to take part in *The British Council Public Speaking Contest.* This year a new item will be introduced in the event. Participants will have to listen to questions of a radio interview and immediately reply to them. The winner gets a return ticket to England and all the expenses paid for 2 weeks, plus £ 5,000. You're one of the 50 participants and you'll have to practice your listening skills to do well.

   Before you listen to one of the interviews, predict parts of the speech that will probably be connected. **Each group in the classroom will be responsible for ONE question (1-5) of the interview.**
Use the guidelines below for help.

   (1) There is a reduction in the vowel sound at word boundary (e.g. it's **a**bout you).
   (2) There is omission of the first/last sound in this word when at word boundary
         (e.g. kin**d** man; show **h**er;).
  (3) These two sounds should change in order to produce a new sound at word boundary
    (e.g. doe**s y**our; di**d y**ou; be**t y**ou liked it).
   (4) This is an obvious 'grammatical' word there, so reduce it (Sorry, I used **to** watch it).
   (5) Contract the words (e.g.: I am= **I'm**; I will= **I'll**)

Δ 1   Will any of you come back to France when you've gone back and finished your studies?
       a   b c d   e   f   g h   i   j   k l   m n o   p   q

■   _____

Δ 2 Would you like to come and work here on a permanent basis?
      a   b c d e   f   g   h i j   k   l

■   _____

Δ 3   How about the language? Has your French come on a lot since you've been here?
      a   b   c   d   e   f   g   h i j k l   m n o p

■   _____

Δ 4   You're all pretty fluent now, aren't you?
      a b c d   e   f   g   h

   _____

Δ 5 Do you think France is an easier place to live than Britain
    a b   c   d   e f g   h   i j k   l
    (I'll ask the Brits first and then theAmericans) at the moment? I mean, do you think it's...

   _____

ADAPTED FROM *SPEAKING CLEARLY* BY ROGERSON, P. & GILBERT, J. (1990). CUP.

   B. Now listen to the whole conversation and check your predictions.

   C. **Present your part to the whole group. Explain the reasons for your findings.**

Task 4 – CG

<u>Part I</u>

  A. Pair work. Work with a classmate. Read the questionnaire aloud to your friend and put a tick (✓) in the first box that corresponds to his/her answer. Then put a tick in the second box that corresponds to your answer. When you finish compare the answers.

Example: You have to attend a meeting that is scheduled to start at nine o'clock. Do you arrive...
  a) exactly on time?   ☐ ☑
  b) ten minutes early?   ☑ ☐
  c) Anything up to ten minutes late? ☐ ☐

<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>
2.You've arranged to meet a friend in the centre of town. How long do you wait if your friend is late?	4. You have to do a job that is difficult or unpleasant. Do you...

a) Five minutes.   ☐ ☐
  b) Fifteen minutes. ☐ ☐
  c) Half an hour or more ☐ ☐
	a) accept that you have to do it and do it straightway so that you can forget about it? ☐ ☐
	b) put if off to another day? ☐ ☐
	c) leave it until the last minute? because you need to feel the adrenalin rush produced by stress? ☐ ☐

3.You're at home working on an important piece of work that has to be finished for tomorrow when a friend calls by unexpectedly. Do you...	5. In your opinion, a hard-working person works...
a) invite the friend in and hope he won't stay too long? ☐ ☐ b) invite the friend in but tell him that you haven't got	a) eight hours a day. ☐ ☐ b) eight to ten hours a day ☐ ☐

TASK 4   TG/CG
Part II

A. 📷 Listen to an American radio programme recorded by a friend of yours. In this programme Paul Roesch is interviewing Roberta Wilson. Write (in the box below) the number of questions he asks her during the interview.

┌─────────────────────────┐
│   │
│   │
│   │
│   │
└─────────────────────────┘

B. Your friend could not understand parts of the interview. As she is going to spend two months in the United States, she needs to improve her listening skills before she leaves. Help her by filling in the blanks below (1-6) with the words she missed. Then write a number beside '*reason*' to help your friend understand the links in the parts of speech she was not able to understand. Use the guidelines below to help you.

Guidelines   (1) There is a reduction in the vowel sound at word boundary (e.g. in **a** minute).
                  (2) There is omission of the first/last sound in this word when at word boundary
                       (e.g. wha**t k**ind; tell **h**im).
                  (3) These two sounds should change in order to produce a new sound at word boundary
                       (e.g. she'**s   y**our; a**t y**our; wha**t i**s =USA).
                  (4) This is an obvious 'grammatical' word there, so reduce it (Sorry, I have **to** go/want
                       to=**wanna**).
                  (5) Contract the words (e.g.: I had= **I'd**; I would= **I'd**; she has=**she's**; she is=**she's**).

📷   The listening will start. This time you'll only listen to parts of the listening passage. The listening will always start with the word in 'a' from numbers 1-6. You have one minute to go through the questions below. The listening will be played twice. There will be a pause after each blank space so that you have time to fill it in.
                    R= Roberta   **P=** Paul
        1. P: What exactly do time management consultants do?
           a.   R: "Well, Paul, it's all about helping people organize their
                 work_____way".
           b.   Reason:

           _____.

TASK 4:   RESULTS -   COURSEBOOK UNIT 10 SCRIPT 36

Task 4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	total

TG	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	
S1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S6	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S7	2	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	1	0	3	3	**28**
S8	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S9	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S10	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S11	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S12	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S13	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S14	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S15	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S16	3	3	1	0	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**31**
S17	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S18	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S19	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	0	3	3	**32**
TOTAL	**56**	**57**	**54**	**54**	**55**	**57**	**57**	**57**	**54**	**51**	**57**	**57**	

CG	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	
S1	2	0	3	3	2	3	3	3	1	3	3	3	**29**
S2	3	3	2	0	2	0	3	3	3	3	3	3	**28**
S3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**35**
S4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	**35**
S5	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	0	3	3	**31**
S6	2	0	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**31**
S7	2	3	1	0	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	**28**
S8	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	0	3	3	**33**
S9	3	3	2	3	2	0	3	3	2	0	3	3	**27**
S10	2	0	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**32**
S11	2	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	1	0	3	3	**28**
S12	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**35**
S13	3	0	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**33**
S14	3	3	2	0	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	**31**
S15	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S16	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	**34**
S17	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	0	3	3	**30**
S18	3	3	2	0	2	0	3	3	2	3	3	3	**27**
S19	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
TOTAL	**51**	**45**	**48**	**45**	**47**	**48**	**57**	**57**	**45**	**42**	**57**	**57**	

APPENDIX I

Task 5 - TG
Part I
   A. Listen to a man giving instructions for something. Decide what the instructions are for.
   _____
   In your opinion his speech is: ☐ easy to understand ☐ average ☐ hard to understand
   Now listen to a young lady giving the same instructions.

c= consonant   v= vowel
When the word is like this: **you link it like this :**
1. ends in c+c and next word begins with v   **sent o**ff →sen/t off
                                                                                            ↻

2. ends in c and next word begins with vowel   sto**p i**t
                                                                                            ↻

3. ends in /iy/ /ey/ /ay/ /oy/+ vowel = /y/ glide   se**e a** show; st**ay o**ut; **lie o**n your back; enj**oy i**t
                                                                          ↻   ↻   ↻   ↻

4. /uw/ /ow/ /aw/ + vowel = /w/ glide   Thr**ough i**t; bl**ow o**ut; h**ow i**s he?
                                                                          ↻   ↻   ↻

5. stop + another stop = first stop not released or aspirated   ho**t d**ay; col**d j**uice
stop + affricate   ↻   ↻

6. identical consonants = consonant is lenghened/elongated   sto**p p**ushing; star**t t**yping
                                                                                        ↻   ↻

Task 4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6

Task 5 – CG

Part I

   A. **Individual work**. List a few office jobs that you find interesting.

   _____   _____
   _____   _____
   _____   _____

dress code	eating and drinking in the office	smoking
breaks	working hours	dating

Part II   **TG/CG**

A. 📟 Listen to three people talking about their companies. Tick (✓) NS if you think the person is a *native speaker* of English, or **NNS** if you think the person is a *non-native speaker* of English. Then, write the name of the country you think the person comes from. If you think the person is a **NNS**, circle a number in the parenthesis corresponding to how good you think his/her English is in terms of connected speech (1= not so good; 2= reasonably good; 3= very good).

Office 1 ☐ NS   ☐ NNS   _____   (1 - 2 - 3)
Office 2 ☐ NS   ☐ NNS   _____   (1- 2 -3)
Office 3 ☐ NS   ☐ NNS   _____   (1- 2 -3)

B. 📟   The listening will be played again. This time you'll listen to *parts* of the same passages. They will

Bearing in mind **connected speech** (CS):
- put a tick (✓) in one of the two boxes in part *b* [☑ CS sounds (quite) natural here
  ☑ CS sounds (a bit) strange here]
- use the line in part *b* to write the number (see guideline) that corresponds to the CS found/suggested

Pay attention to the place (between a/b or b/c) where the CS should be analysed.

Guideline
(1) There is a reduction in the vowel sound at word boundary (e.g. give it <u>to h</u>im).
(2) There is deletion of the the first/last sound in this word when at word boundary (e.g.tell **h**im; I can**'t b**ea**r t**he...).
(3) These two sounds should change in order to produce a new sound at word boundary (e.g. min**d y**ou)
(4) This is an obvious 'grammatical' word there, so reduce it (e.g.:They ought **to** apologize).
(5) When at word boundary these words *just* link (e.g.fin**d o**ut; shor**t t**rip; blu**e a**rt; bi**g c**hance; a**t e**ight =USA)

TASK 5 - RESULTS - COURSEBOOK UNIT 10 TAPESCRIPT

Task 5	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	TOTAL

APPENDIX J
TASK 1:   COURSEBOOK UNIT 8 - SCRIPT 32

TG	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	
S1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S6	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S7	3	1,5	3	1,5	3	3	0	0	1	1,5	3	3	**23,5**
S8	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S9	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S10	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S11	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	**35**
S12	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S13	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S14	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S15	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S16	3	1,5	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	1,5	3	3	**32**
S17	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S18	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	**35**
S19	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
TOTAL	57	54	57	55,5	57	57	54	54	52	54	57	57	

CG	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	
S1	3	1,5	3	3	3	3	2	1,5	2	1,5	3	3	**29,5**
S2	3	3	3	1,5	3	3	2	1,5	2	1,5	2	1,5	**27**
S3	3	3	3	3	3	1,5	3	3	2	1,5	3	3	**32**
S4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1,5	3	3	**34,5**
S5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1,5	1	1,5	3	3	**31**
S6	3	1,5	3	3	3	3	2	1,5	2	1,5	3	3	**29,5**
S7	2	1,5	3	3	2	3	1	1,5	1	1,5	2	1,5	**23**
S8	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1,5	2	1,5	3	3	**32**
S9	2	1,5	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	1,5	2	1,5	**28,5**
S10	2	1,5	3	3	3	3	3	1,5	2	1,5	3	3	**29,5**
S11	3	3	3	3	2	1,5	3	3	2	1,5	2	1,5	**28,5**
S12	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
S13	3	1,5	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	1,5	3	3	**31**
S14	3	3	2	1,5	3	1,5	3	3	2	1,5	3	3	**29,5**
S15	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	**35**
S16	3	1,5	3	3	3	3	2	1,5	1	1,5	3	3	**28,5**
S17	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	1,5	2	1,5	**31**
S18	3	1,5	2	1,5	3	1,5	3	1,5	2	1,5	3	3	**26,5**
S19	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	**36**
TOTAL	54	45	55	52,5	54	51	57	43,5	45	33	52	49,5	

NS= Native speaker   NNS= Non-native speaker

Speaker	Script	Length	Words
Sue NS	We met at the university. We both studied music actually and I suppose we hit it off straightaway. Afterwards, I went away traveling for a year or so and we lost touch for a while, but really we've been friends since we were students. We see each other, say, three of four times a week I guess. We're both very outgoing and energetic, which I suppose is why we get on so well in the band...	0:25''	76
Juan NNS	It was an amazing coincidence, really. Not only to meet like that, but to get on so well and have so much in common. We helped each other with our studying as well. And there was no time at all to feel homesick or anything. From the moment we got on the plane we had lots to talk about. And when we finished, we had a brilliant time seeing the place and, well, it was just one big party 'till it was time to come back home. I wish we could see each other more often these days.	0:35''	98
Elisa NS	It was in India, just after university. I'd been there for a few months at the time. At first, we didn't get on too well, but we kept bumping into each other, as you do when you're traveling, so we, um, well, we ended up traveling together. We found we had similar interests... you know, we like the same music and like going to gigs, and we had similar outlooks and so on. I suppose we've been friends for about, well, three or four years now.	25''	86
Enrico NNS	We've got similar interests, particularly music. We like to see as many bands as we can. We like going out a lot. We, er, don't get to travel as much as we used to, but we're planning to go back to Asia together for a few weeks next year. That's where we met in the first place actually, about four years ago.	20''	62
Sindy NNS	We've known each other for a few years now and we still get on well, most of the time, anyway! We see each other a lot. Of course we're together twice a week when the band rehearses and we often go to pubs or to friends' houses and just, sort of, hang out and chat really. Yeah, we both love a good party!	0:25''	63
Hans NNS	We first met in the, er, airport actually. We just bumped into each other at the check-in. It turned out we were both going to the same place to study and we ended up living in rooms on the same corridor in the hall. It was pretty amazing really! We got on from the word go. It just happened naturally, you know, two people away from home and all that. We did almost everything together and then when the course was over we traveled around the country for a month or so, before coming home. Now, I guess we only see each other three or four times a year or so.	0:36	111

TASK 2:   COURSEBOOK UNIT 9 SCRIPT 35

SOAP

Pacific Heights. Scene 3   **171 words**   **Length: 60''**

M (= Mara); E (= Ella)
M: I think I know where Charlie is.
E: Where?
M: He's gone to see Clare. I'm sure there's something going on.
E: Oh, between Charlie and Clare?
M: Yes.
E: But Clare's married to Uncle Dave.
M: So? Lots of married people have affairs.
E: Well, I don't think it's right. Anyway, how **do you know**?
M: Well, I heard him talking to her on the phone yesterday. **He asked her** if Dave **had left** for America and then he said he couldn't wait to **be in her** arms again!
E: Oh, what a creep. Poor Becky.
M:Oh, don't worry; she'll get over it. But listen, I've got an idea.
E: If it's about Charlie coming traveling with us, forget it. He's already said he doesn't want to.
M: Yes, but if we catch him with Clare, we can **blackmail him to** come traveling with us.
E: Oh, yes. I see **what you mean**. But don't you think we should tell Becky about him and Clare?
M: No, stupid. If we tell her, we won't be able to blackmail him. Come on; let's make a plan.

TASK 3:   WORKBOOK UNIT 9 SCRIPT 17

SOAP
Number of words = 398   Length= 2'35"

How long have you been an actor, Marko?

Only about three years. I came to London about three years ago because my wife is English. When I first arrived, my English wasn't very good, and it was difficult to find a job. Then, someone suggested I become an actor.

But how could you be an actor without good English?

At the beginning, I was just a background artist- it was only later that I got to be a walk-on actor.

What's the difference?

Well, background artists don't say anything. You just see them walking past or standing around at a party or something like that. As a walk –on, the camera may zoom in on you and you may have a line or two to say.

What kind of roles do you get?

I might be just someone hanging around on the street or at a party, but they tend to cast me as a businessman! If only! I'm a party guest in the new James Bond film. And I was a soldier in *Saving Private Ryan*. And if I have a speaking part, they make me into a Russian – a gangster usually! – because of my rugged good looks, or more probably my accent – there aren't many Slovenian characters!

Is it well paid?

It all depends. It starts at about £80 a day, but you can make three or four times more if you get through a difficult casting.

What are you up to at the moment?

Uhm... tomorrow I'll be filming an episode of East Enders – that's one of the soaps over here. Do you get it in the States? I'll be playing – guess what? – a businessman from a multinational corporation who gets mugged in the street. And then, on Friday, I'll be playing a party guest in an episode of Emmerdale. Have you heard of it? I must admit I've never watched it myself, but I suspect it's a load of rubbish!

Anything else?

Yes, there's a lot of work at the moment. By the end of the month, I'll have done maybe eight or nine days of shooting. But I think my English is quite good now, and I'll be looking for some other kind of work next month. I've had enough of sitting around all day waiting to be called for my walk-on. It's not the most exciting work in the world!

TASK 4: COURSEBOOK UNIT 10 SCRIPT 36

TIME	Number of words: 661	Length: 4'03''

(PR= Paul Roesch; RW= Roberta Wilson)

PR:…that was Sonny Best with *Midnight in Vermont*. Now, do you make the best of your time? In the studio today we've got Roberta Wilson, who's a time management consultant. Good morning, Roberta.

RW: Good morning, Paul.

PR: Roberta, what exactly do time management consultants do?

RW: Well, Paul, it's all about helping people to organize their work in an effective way: maximum efficiency; minimum stress.

PR: Hah, sounds like something I need. Er, who are your clients?

RW: Uhm, mainly business people, but I've also worked with politicians, civil servants and university lecturers.

PR: Um, quite a range, then. And what sort of things helps people to organize their time? I suppose punctuality is important?

RW: Um, yes and no. It's easier to finish a meeting on time if it starts on time. But in international contexts, you do have to be aware of cultural differences.

PR: For example?

RW: Well, in Britain big formal meetings usually start on time, but less formal meetings often begin a few minutes late. In Germany, on the other hand, people expect all meetings to begin on time. In some countries, er, for example in Latin America, there's a more… relaxed attitude. So, you do have to adapt to circumstances.

PR: When in Rome…

RW: Er, to some extent, yes.

PR: Um, it sounds like even if you manage your own time very well, you still can't control what other people do.

RW: Well, you can set limits. If you're meeting a friend who always arrives late, you can say, 'well, I'm going to wait for 15 minutes. If they aren't there by then, I'll leave'.

PR: Hmm. I've got one friend who's always late. I don't think I'd ever se her if I did that.

RW: Hah, but people who are always late are the ones you need to set limits with. If they know that you won't wait, then, perhaps they'll make an effort.

PR: Isn't that rather harsh?

RW: No, not really. Someone who constantly turns up late is putting a low value on your time. Let them know you've got other things to do. And I'm not suggesting you do that with everyone – just the persistent latecomers. Though, again, different cultures do have different viewpoints on what constitutes serious lateness.

PR: What about interruptions? I often come in to the studio with something important I need to do. Then the phone rings or someone comes to see me…Before I know it, the day's over and I haven't done what I planned.

RW: Um, you need to defend your time. If you're working on something important on someone drops in to see you, get your diary out. Politely tell them you're busy and make n appointment for another time. If it isn't important anyway, they'll just go away. If it is, they'll make an appointment and you can deal with it properly.

PR: That sounds practical.

RW: Um, again, you do have to be careful. In some cultures, particularly Latin ones, this technique can upset people. But here in the United States, almost no-one will be offended.

PR: Hmm. So, does everything depend on Culture?

RW: No. Attitudes to time are one of the big differences between cultures. But how you organize your own work is up to you. And there are lots of techniques here. For example, imagine you've got two important things to do. One of them is pleasant, and the other isn't. Always try to do the unpleasant task first. That way, the pleasant task is a reward for finishing. If you do it the other way round, you'll tend to slow down the pleasant task because you don't want to do the unpleasant one.

PR: Hah, hah. I'll remember that. Finally, what for you, is a hard-working person?

RW: Oh, I'm not very interested in hard-working people. You can spend twelve hours a day at the office without doing very much. I'm interested in productive – and happy – people.

PR: And on that note, I have to say we've run out of time. Thank you Roberta and over to Jasmine Dahar with the news…

TASK 5 : COURSEBOOK UNIT 10 SCRIPT 39
NNS= Non-native speaker; NS= Native speaker

	Script	Number of words/ Length
1 NNS Male	We're supposed to star work at nine, but I often come in later because I have to take my children o school first, but then I stay a bit later. Of course, if I've got an early meeting or if I've got to be in court first thing in the morning, my wife has to take the kids to school. We're supposed to work a 40-hour week, but I think most people actually work more than that. We're supposed to dress smartly, particularly if we have contact with clients, so I always wear a suit and tie to work. Female lawyers aren't allowed to wear trousers or even dark tights. They have to wear knee-length skirts – no minis. The secretaries can wear tailored trousers, but no jeans. A weekly dress-down day has been introduced recently – it's an idea from America, where everybody comes into work in casual dress on a Friday. Personally, I have no desire to come into work wearing jeans and a T-shirt. I like to make a difference between work and home, and I can wear casual clothes at home. I think people should dress smartly for work – it gives a good impression. Smoking, eating and drinking are strictly forbidden in the office. There's a non-smoking cafeteria downstairs, and smokers have to go outside. Personally, I think smoking ought to be banned in all public places.	230 words 1'24''
2 NNS Male	As you can see, it's a really busy office and we have to work long hours. Everybody works different hours because people are coming in an out all the time. We can have a drink at our desks but we're not allowed to bring food into the offices. There's a canteen downstairs. We're supposed to have a break every two hours, but when you're working to a deadline, you can't afford to take time for a break. Sometimes I work right through my lunch hour – it's mad really. In fact, you have to be mad to work here. Hah. We're not supposed to smoke in the office but some of the reporters and journalists do when they're working late. You know they've been smoking because the place smells horrible in the morning. As far as dress is concerned, it depends. The editors and senior staff dress smartly. I think our senior editor has two suits and about twenty identical striped shirts because I've never seen him wearing anything else. The younger men are a bit more fashion-conscious and they don't have to wear suits. The women can wear trousers or skirts, but we can't wear jeans. Smart-casual clothes are OK.	200 words 1'07''
3 NS Female	As you can imagine, people who work here are pretty fashion-conscious. They can wear whatever they like, but people usually choose to dress smartly for work. They're the sort of people who enjoy dressing up and they're quite competitive. Most people wear black – it's a bit like wearing a uniform, really! Um, black polo-neck pullovers, black bootleg trousers, black leather jackets and books – that's just the girls. Hah. The men tend to be more imaginative with their colors. They wear nice brightly colored shirts…and then color their hair to match! Personally, I go for a more elegant look – suits and high heels. Unfortunately, most of the young models who come to the agency are smokers – but they're not allowed to smoke in the building. In fact, they can't smoke anywhere near the building. It gives such a bad impression when you see people smoking in the entrance. The agency is open from ten o'clock in the morning, but the staff arrive any time after eight. They have to work a nice-hour day, but the starting and finishing times are flexible. Coffee is available whenever you want it, but food isn't allowed in the office. Nobody here eats anyway!	203 words 1'20''

APPENDIX K

ANSWERS FOR PART II OF TASKS **1** AND **2**

TASK 1 – PART II (answers)

Question 1
   a. Did you say "we **met at the** university"?
   b. Did you say " we've been friends **since we were** students"?

Question 2
   a. Did you say " We **helped each other** with our studying as well"?
   b. Did you say " It was just **one big party** 'till it was time to come back home"?

Question 3
   a. Did you say " **It was in** India, just after university"?
   b. Did you say " We didn't get on too well **but we kept** bumping into each other"?

Question 4
   a. Did you say " ... particulary music. **We like to** see as many bands as we can"?
   b. Did you say " We, er , don't get to travel as much as **we used to**"?

Question 5
   a. Did you say " **We've known** each other for a few years now"?
   b. Did you say " ...go to pubs or friends' houses and , **just, sort of**, hang out"?

Question 6
   a. Did you say " ...on the same corridor **in the hall**"?
   b. Did you say " We got on from **the word go**"?

TASK 2 – PART II (answers)

QUESTIONS FOR PART II	**QUESTIONS FOR PART III**

1. Ella: Anyway, how....
Mara: ...how what?
Ella: How **do you know** ?
	1. a. ☑ Anyway, Hawe 'n Jee know.
	    b. ☐ Anyway, how will you
	       know?

2. Mara: ...on the phone yesterday... Ella: ...on the phone yesterday, and what? Mara: **He asked her...**	2. a. ☐ …he answered… b. ☑… he, Esther…
3. Mara: if... Ella: if what? Mara: if **Dave had left**...	3 a. ☐ They'd laughed. b. ☑ David laughed.
4. Mara: ...he couldn't wait to... Ella: ...wait to what? Mara: ...wait to **be in her** ...	4. a. ☑ be in alarm b. ☐ …be in the army
5. Mara: We can ... Ella: We can what? Mara: We can **blackmail him to** come travelling with us.	5. a. ☑ black mail income b. ☐ Black & Male Co.
6. Ella: I see... Mara: ...see what? Ella: I see **what you mean**	6. a. ☐ …war, you mean? b. ☑… watch, you mean?

ANSWERS FOR PART II OF TASKS **3** AND **4**

TASK 3 – PART II (answers)
Answers:
1.   a. "....my English wasn't very good, and **it was difficult** to find a job".
                                                  a b   c

    b.   Suggestion: a/b= (3)

2.   a. "....you may have a line or **two to say**".
                                    a   b c

    b. Suggestion: a/b= (2)/(5)
3.   a. "...just someone hanging around on the street or **at a party**, but...".
                                                           a b   c

    b. Suggestion: (1)
4.   a. "...but you can make **three or four** times more...".
                                         a   b c

    b. Suggestion: b/c= (3)/ (5)
5.   a. ...that's one of the soaps over here. Do you **get it in** the States?"
                                                 a   b c

    b. Suggestion: a/b= (1); b/c=(1)

6.   a. "...yes, there is a lot of work **at the moment**".
                                       a   b   c

    b. Suggestion: a/b= (3)

TASK 4 – PART II (answers)
Answers:
1. P: What exactly do time management consultants do?
    b. R: "Well, Paul, it's all about helping people organize their work **in an effective** way".
    b. Reason: (1).
2. P: For example?
    a. R: "....There's a more relaxed attitude. So you do have to **adapt to circumstances**".
    b. Reason: (4).
3. R. Well you can set limits.
    a. P: ...I've got one friend who's always late. I don't think **I'd ever** see her if ...".
    b. Reason: (5).
4. P: What about interruptions?
    a. P:"...Before I know it, the day's over and I haven't done **what I planned**".
    b. Reason: (3).
5. R: Um, you need to defend your time.
    a. R: "...If you're working on something important and someone **drops in to** see you...".
    b. Reason: (3).
6. R: No. Attitudes to time are one of the big differences between cultures.
    a. R"...you'll tend to slow down the pleasant task because you **don't want to** do the unpleasant...".
    b. Reason: (4).

ANSWERS FOR PART II OF TASK **5**

TASK 5 – PART II (answers)

Office 1

    a. " ....particularly if we have contact with clients, so I **always wear a** s**uit**...".

    b. ☐ connected speech sounds (quite) natural here/ ☑ connected speech sounds (a bit) strange here

      b/c= (2)

2

    a. "...a difference between work and home, and I **can wear casual** c**lothes**...".

    b. ☑ connected speech sounds (quite) natural here/ ☐ connected speech sounds (a bit) strange here

    b/c= (2)

Office 2

    3

    a. "...and we have to work long hours. Everybody **works different hours** b**ecause** ".

    b. ☑ connected speech sounds (quite) natural here/ ☐ connected speech sounds (a bit) strange here

      b/c= (5)

    4

    a. "...seen him wearing anything else. The younger **men are a** b**it**...".

    b. ☐ connected speech sounds (quite) natural here/ ☑ connected speech sounds (a bit) strange here

    b/c=(2)

Office 3

    5

    a. "...nice brightly coloured shirts...and then colour their **hair to match**".

    b. ☑ connected speech sounds (quite) natural here/☐ connected speech sounds (a bit) strange here

    a/b= (5)

    6

    a."...available whenever you want it, but **food isn't a** ...".

    b.☑ connected speech sounds (quite) natural here/☐ connected speech sounds (a bit) strange here

    a/b= (2)

APPENDIX L

You're going to work on a listening passage. Listen to an American woman talking about her experience living in the U.K. Listen and answer the questions below. Part III, should be completed before you listen to the tape. You are going to listen to the passage twice.

PART I

1. What was the biggest difference between the U.S. and England, according to Terry?

_____

2. What does it mean to make a friend in England?
    _____
    _____
    _____

3. How does Terry's impressions of living in England compare to her impressions of living in the U.S.?
    _____
    _____
    _____

PART II
Complete these sentences uttered by Terry.
   1. You know, when I first came I couldn't understand why
    …………………………………………………………………………from people.

   2. And I thought: …………………..? …………………………….…..?

   3. Here you ……………………….. to reach the supermarket by 5:30.

PART III

Try to complete the gaps below **before listening to the tape**.

1. We start conversations …… the people in the street, in the subway.

2. One thing I'….. learned. It's funny now, but it wasn't at the time.

3. Americans work a lot harder…… you do.

Tapescript

Terry, an American lady, living in the U.K.
Number of words: 557 words
Interviewer: So, Terry, you've been in this country for quite a long time, what differences do you notice between the two countries?

    Terry: Uhm… obviously the biggest difference is the people. The average Englishman is cold and not very open. In the States it's very different. We start conversations with people in the street, in the subway. We're a lot more enthusiastic and spontaneous than people here

Interviewer: Uhm…

Terry: You know, when I first came I couldn't understand why I was getting so little reaction from people. But now I see that they thought I was overpowering and that I was trying to be too friendly too soon.

Interviewer: But tell me, does the Englishman improve as you get to know him?

Terry: Oh, yes!!!

Interviewer: Oh, good!

Terry: Once you have made a friend, it's a friend for life. But it takes a very long time. I'll tell you something that I think is very important. An Englishman in America is respected. Everyone wants to talk to him. We are inquisitive. We love his accent in this country. An American, though, in England, is thought to be a little inferior because of his behavior in this language.   One thing I've learned … It's funny now, but it wasn't at the time. I couldn't understand why when I was talking to someone he would move away… you know, move backwards. And I thought: Do I smell? Am I boring him ? The reason was, you see, Americans stand closer when they are talking. Again, English people like a certain distance.

Interviewer: Uhm… it's true.   What about your impressions of living here? How does that compare with the States?

Terry: Well… uhm…. I think life is a lot easier in the States. It's easier to make money. And it's easier to spend it. Shops are open all the time over there. Here you gotta race to reach the supermarket by 5:30. Generally, though, I find life more inefficient here. If you need an electrician it takes days to get one. He doesn't do the job very well. The system is so old that he can't get the parts to repair and he doesn't care. This leads to another very important point: Americans work a lot harder than you do. To the English their private lives are important, their holidays are important, their gardens are important, their animals are important. But an American wouldn't admit that.

Interviewer: Uhm….

Terry: For us, our work is the most important thing in our lives. You know, holidays seem to be longer here. People make the most ridiculous excuses not to go to work. 'My dog has got a cold' I heard the other day.

Interviewer: Oh, Come on.

Terry: Yeah… You have tea breaks to get longer and longer. In that respect we're quite like the Japanese. Our jobs come first. But there are all sorts of services to make life easier around our jobs.

Interviewer: Well, I'd say that you have a pretty negative opinion of England.

Terry: You would think so from this interview, wouldn't you?

Interviewer: Yes!

Terry: No. In fact I really love it here. I go home once a year and really look forward to coming back here. Uhm… this is my home now. I find life, uhm… safer, more relaxed and much more enjoyable. Maybe I've gotten into the English habits. England doesn't
have the dramatic beauty of the States, but oh, it is very pretty and charming in a way I find comforting.

FOLLOW-UP: DIAGNOSTIC TASK   **Pilot Study/First data collection**

Listening Passage

1. How would you rate this listening passage, generally speaking? Tick (✓) the box that best fits your answer.

☐ quite easy   ☐ quite difficult
☐ average   ☐ extremely difficult

2. Justify your answer
_____
_____
_____
_____

3. How would you rate this listening passage *in relation to the questionnaire* you were supposed to answer? Tick (✓) the box that best fits your answer.

☐ quite easy   ☐ quite difficult   ☐ other _____
☐ average   ☐ extremely difficult

4. Justify your answer
_____
_____
_____
_____

5. Which questions were you **NOT** able to answer?

6. When you looked at the tapescript to check the answers, what did you find out about the
    questions not answered? Tick (✓) the box (es) that best express your thoughts on that.
☐ a . I needed to understand more vocabulary to answer the question (s).
☐ b. I did not understand the question (s) because I did not know the grammar in there.
☐ c. The way they pronounced words/sentences made it difficult
                 1 . ☐ the sound of some words
                 2. ☐ the way the words were put together
☐ d. The questions were difficult
☐ e. The questions did not focus on the general idea, but on specific details.
☐ f. The woman spoke too fast.
☐ g. Some words varied a lot from written to spoken form uttered by the speaker.

First Data Collection	TREATMENT GROUP 19	CONTROL GROUP 15
Question 1 How would you rate this listening passage, generally speaking?	☐ quite easy **1** ☐ quite difficult **9** ☐ average **8** ☐ extremely difficult **1** ☐ other _____	☐ quite easy **1** ☐ quite difficult **6** ☐ average **6** ☐ extremely difficult **2** ☐ other _____
Question 2 Justify your answer	It's impossible to understand Too fast I need to listen to if four or five times to understand. Just twice was impossible. I was answering one question and the lady in the tape was already talking about the next question.	The woman speaks too fast. I can't understand. Too long. I got lost all the time. Even when I had the tapescript. The woman puts all the words together. It gave me the impression it was another word.
Question 3 How would you rate this listening passage *in relation to the questionnaire* you were supposed to answer?	☐ quite easy **1** ☐ quite difficult **10** ☐ average **7** ☐ extremely difficult **1** ☐ other _____	☐ quite easy **1** ☐ quite difficult **8** ☐ average **5** ☐ extremely difficult **1** ☐ other _____
Question 4 Justify your answer	The questions were difficult to be understood The questions were difficult. Completing the blanks was impossible. The last part was impossible before the listening. I could not fill in the blanks there.	**Too much information to be completed.** The woman speaks too fat and I could not follow. It's possible to guess some things.
Question 5 Which questions were you **NOT** able to answer?	1. **5** 2. 5 3. **7** 4 . **a) 12 b) 11 c) 9** 5. **a) 8 b) 7 c) 6**	1. **2** 2. **1** 3. **3** 4 . a) **8** b) **7** c) **8** 5. a) **6** b) **2** c) **3**
Question 6 When you looked at the tapescript to check the answers, what did you find out about the questions not answered?	☐ a . I needed to understand more vocabulary to answer the question (s). **1** ☐ b. I did not understand the question because I did not know the grammar in there 1 ☐ c. The way they pronounced words/sentences made it difficult 1 . ☐ the sound of some words **13** 2 . ☐ the way the words were put together **16** ☐ d. The questions were difficult **10** ☐ e. The questions did not focus on the general idea, but on specific details **8** ☐ e. the lady spoke too fast. **16** ☐ f. Some words varied a lot from written to spoken form **10**	☐ a . I needed to understand more vocabulary to answer the question (s). **2** ☐ b. I did not understand the question because I did not know the grammar in there 0 ☐ c. The way they pronounced words/sentences made it difficult 1. ☐ the sound of some words **11** ☐ the way the words were put together **12** ☐ d. The questions were difficult **6** ☐ e. The questions did not focus on the general idea, but on specific details. **6** ☐ f. The woman spoke too fast. **9** ☐ g. Some words varied a lot from written to spoken form **6**

APPENDIX M

PASSAGES 1- UNIT 6   **Listening comprehension -Task 4**

Interpersonal communication

Part I - Listen to Tony and find out:

   a. Why he is disappointed _____
   b. Which possibility he could still consider _____
   c. What he intends to do for the future _____

Part II - Now try to complete the blank spaces below before you listen to the passage for the second time.

   ➢ Like I said, I_____ still got a job until the end of the month
   ➢ Well, you know my job _____ the design studio?
   ➢ Tony, I _____ so sorry.
   ➢ Depending _____the outcome of the interviews,…

PART III - Listen to the passage for the second time. Check your answers for part II and complete the blank spaces below.

   ➢ a. Why the _____ face Tony?
   ➢ b. That means as of April thirtieth, _____.
   ➢ c. Yeah, well _____bad news.
   ➢ d.Two other employees _____jobs last month.
   ➢ e. _____in May.

Follow-up questionnaire

Control Group　　　　(15 Ss)

Listen to the passage for the third time. Have your tapescript with you. Complete the questionnaire below.

Listening: learning different things	Helped	made no difference	had a negative interference
Type of speech:			
a. dialogue	4	7	3
b. topic	9	5	0
c. vocabulary	5	6	3
d. rate of speech	0	5	9
Clarity of speech:			
e. pauses	8	6	0
f. stress	4	9	1
g. assimilation of sounds	1	4	9
h. omission of sounds	1	3	10

Treatment Group　　　　(19 Ss)

Now that you have checked your answers, fill in the table below.

Listening: learning different things	Helped	Made no difference	had a negative interference
Type of speech:			
a. dialogue	2	9	8
b. not having had group discussion before	0	11	8
c. subject	8	9	2
d. vocabulary	7	10	2
e. rate of speech	3	4	12
Clarity of speech:			
f. pauses	13	6	0
g. stress	7	9	3
h. assimilation of sounds	2	6	11
i. omission of sounds	2	9	8
Pronunciation lesson			
Having had a pronunciation lesson, focusing on some of those aspects, before listening to the passage…	13	6	0

PASSAGES 1: UNIT 6   **TG   (Instruction – Task four)**   **Pilot study/first data collection**

I. Look at the examples of assimilation on the left and match them to the correspondent kind of assimilation on the right.

1. You liked your job, **didn't you**?   (   ) assimilation of a nasal sound.
2. If I need a new job, I **can go** to a job agency.   (   ) high frequency phrases
3. I **want to** leave my job because I'm not well-paid. (   ) palatalization

II. Now go to Unit 6 in your *Passages 1* book and find at least one example of each type of assimilation above.

_____
_____
_____

III. Pair work. Work with a partner and come up with one example of your own for each of the three types of assimilation above.

_____
_____
_____

IV. What's the common pronunciation feature happening below? Use the part in bold to help you. Reading the examples aloud might help you find the answer.
PART A
    a.   **what a** good 'advisor' you are!
    b.   They are always **cutting** classes.
    c.   **Get out of** here.

_____

PART B
    a. The staplers **cost two** dollars in here.
    b. **That top** looks good on you.
    c. **At ten** he's always checking his e-mails.

_____

Now find one example of each (Part A and Part B). You may refer to Unit 6 of your *Passages 1* book for help.

_____
_____
_____

Tapescript
Number of words: 212
Length: 1'12"

Woman: Why the long face, Tony?
Tony: Oh, I just got some bad news today.
Woman: What happened?
Tony: Well, you know my job at the design studio?
Woman: yes.
Tony: Well...
Woman: Oh, no!
Tony: Oh, yes. Today the boss called me into his office and toldme they had to lay me off indefinitely. That means as of April thirtieth, I'm out of work.
Woman : Oh!
Tony: No more job.
Woman: Tony, I'm so sorry. You really liked working there.
Tony: Yeah, well, it's not all bad news. There's still a small chance that the company will call me back in the summer if the work picks up. You never know what'll happen. They may still need me then.
Woman: Oh, this is so sudden, isn't it?
Tony: Well, sort of. Two other employees lost their jobs last month, and I had a feeling I might be the next one in line. You know, I've only been working there ten months, so I don't have any seniority. If they're going to lay someone off, it's always going to be the newer employee first.
Woman: What are you going to do?
Tony: Like I said, I've still got a job until the end of the month. Starting in May, I plan to sendo ut resumes and go on some interviews. Depending on the outcome of the interviews...