

The role of storytelling in the development of pronunciation of Brazilian learners of English as a foreign language

By

Claudio Rezende Lucarevski
B.A., Gama Filho University, Brazil, 1990
M.A., Lancaster University, England, 1996

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in the Department of Linguistics

© Claudio Rezende Lucarevski, 2018
University of Victoria

All rights reserved. This dissertation may not be reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy or other means, without the permission of the author.

Supervisory Committee

The role of storytelling in the development of pronunciation of Brazilian learners of English as a foreign language

by

Claudio Rezende Lucarevski
B.A., Gama Filho University, Brazil, 1990
M.A., Lancaster University, England, 1996

Supervisory Committee

Dr. Hossein Nassaji (Department of linguistics)
Supervisor

Dr. Li-Shih Huang (Department of linguistics)
Departmental Member

Dr. Suzanne Urbanczyk (Department of linguistics)
Departmental Member

Dr. Ulf Schuetze (Departments of Germanic and Slavic Studies)
Outside Member

Abstract

Supervisory Committee

Dr. Hossein Nassaji (Department of linguistics)

Supervisor

Dr. Li-Shih Huang (Department of linguistics)

Departmental Member

Dr. Suzanne Urbanczyk (Department of linguistics)

Departmental Member

Dr. Ulf Schuetze (Departments of Germanic and Slavic Studies)

Outside Member

A number of studies in the literature claim that storytelling is a powerful tool in the development of receptive (i.e., Reading and Listening) and productive (i.e., Speaking and Writing) language skills, including pronunciation (e.g., Atta-Alla, 2011; Mottalabi & Pourgharib, 2013; Zare-Behatash, Saed and Sajjadi, 2016). Furthermore, there are studies that suggest that storytelling is even more effective than traditional teaching methods (e.g., Hsu, 2010; Li & Seehouse, 2010; Zare-Behatash, Saed and Sajjadi, 2016). The problem, however, is that those studies generally lack specific information about how storytelling improves pronunciation and what aspects are enhanced, for instance.

This study aims to fill such a gap in the literature by investigating the effect(s) of storytelling on the development of the pronunciation of Brazilian beginner learners of English as a foreign language (EFL) who are 15 years of age and older, through a focus on specific segmental (i.e., /ɪ/; /i/ and /ð/; /θ/) and suprasegmental (i.e., word stress) features that are considered difficult for Brazilian learners of English to pronounce intelligibly (i.e., Baptista, 2001; Cruz, 2003; Reis, 2006). Additionally, it aims to investigate how storytelling activities compare in effectiveness to textbook activities in the development of pronunciation, since textbook activities are widely used pedagogical tools in English classes in Brazil and generally considered to be effective in the development of language skills (e.g., Consolo, 1990; Xavier & Urio, 2006). Last, the study examines Brazilian learners' perceptions about the usefulness and relevance of the storytelling/textbook activities they were exposed to in improving their pronunciation.

Data were collected at a private school in Brazil three times a week, in 12, 25-minute sessions. A total of 86 learners participated in the study and were randomly divided into three different groups (i.e., experimental, $n=28$; comparison, $n=29$; and control, $n=29$). The experimental group performed storytelling activities and the comparison group performed textbook activities. The control group received no treatment. Quantitative and qualitative analyses were conducted to examine the data gathered from pre-tests, post-tests and questionnaires.

The findings of the statistical analyses showed significant differences in the participants' performance in the perception and production pre-tests/post-tests, suggesting that storytelling and textbook activities played an effective role in the pronunciation improvement of the participants. In addition, findings showed that storytelling and textbook activities had a similar effect on pronunciation. The findings of the quantitative and qualitative questionnaires showed that, in general, participants in the experimental (i.e., storytelling) and comparison (i.e., textbook) groups similarly enjoyed performing their respective activities, although they were not much sure about their usefulness and relevance for the improvement of their English pronunciation.

This study offers various contributions in the investigation of the effect of storytelling on pronunciation improvement. In addition to addressing the lack of specific information in previous studies on the relationship between storytelling and pronunciation development, it also contributes to the field by showing teachers that L2 pronunciation development may be impacted by a number of factors at individual, psychological, sociocultural and sociocognitive levels, to mention a few. Moreover, it suggests that the implicit approach examined in the study did not seem to play an effective role in the development of learners' pronunciation. Instead, an inductive approach that involves exposing learners to target sounds through the use of enhanced input, for instance, could potentially increase the effectiveness of pronunciation improvement through storytelling.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Supervisory Committee.....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Table of Contents.....	v
List of Tables.....	viii
Acknowledgments.....	x
Dedication.....	xi
Preamble.....	xii
CHAPTER ONE - INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Background and Purpose of the Study.....	1
1.2 Significance of this Study.....	3
1.3 Dissertation Outline.....	3
CHAPTER TWO – LITERATURE REVIEW.....	5
2.1 Storytelling: Definition, Types and Formats.....	5
2.1.1 The meaning of storytelling.....	5
2.1.2 Story types and their effect on pronunciation.....	7
2.2 Pronunciation Learning Models.....	9
2.3 What do We Know about the Role of Storytelling in the Development of L2 Skills?.....	14
2.3.1 Storytelling and the development of speaking skills and pronunciation.....	14
2.3.1.1 <i>Studies on BP speakers’ English pronunciation difficulties</i>	20
2.3.2 Storytelling and listening comprehension.....	31
2.3.3 Storytelling as a motivating tool.....	34
2.3.4 Storytelling as a tool to provide comprehensible input and facilitate language skills development.....	37
2.3.5 The effectiveness of storytelling: Some conclusions.....	40
2.4 Rationale for the Current Study.....	41
2.5 Research Questions.....	42
CHAPTER THREE – RESEARCH METHODS.....	43
3.1 The Methods.....	43
3.2 The Participants.....	43
3.2.1 The recruitment process.....	43
3.2.2 The participants’ background.....	47
3.3 Data Collection Procedures.....	49
3.3.1 The procedures for the experimental and comparison groups.....	50

3.3.1.1	<i>The activities performed by the experimental group.....</i>	52
3.3.1.2	<i>The activities performed by the comparison group.....</i>	52
3.3.2	Testing.....	55
3.3.2.1	<i>Pre-tests.....</i>	55
3.3.2.2	<i>Post-tests.....</i>	55
3.3.2.3	<i>The scoring of the perception (i.e., pre-tests and post-tests 1A/B and 2).....</i>	56
3.3.2.4	<i>Reliability of the tests.....</i>	57
3.3.2.5	<i>The scoring of production in the classroom sessions....</i>	58
3.3.3	The questionnaires.....	59
3.3.3.1	<i>The attitude questionnaires.....</i>	59
3.3.3.2	<i>The evaluation questionnaire.....</i>	60
3.4	The Statistical Tests	61
CHAPTER FOUR – ANALYSES AND RESULTS: QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE DATA.....		63
4.1	Impact of the Treatments in Pronunciation Perception and Production....	63
4.1.1	Results	63
4.1.1.1	<i>Perception tests.....</i>	63
4.1.1.2	<i>Production tests.....</i>	66
4.1.1.3	<i>Concluding remarks about the participants’ pronunciation performance.....</i>	69
4.2	The Participants’ Views about the Relevance and Usefulness of Storytelling/Textbook Activities in Enhancing Pronunciation.....	70
4.2.1	The attitude questionnaires.....	70
4.2.2	The evaluation questionnaire.....	73
CHAPTER FIVE – DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS.....		79
5.1	Research Question 1: What is the Effect of Storytelling on the Accuracy of Pronunciation Perception and Production of Segmental (i.e., /r/;/i/ and /θ/; /ð/) and Suprasegmental (i.e., syllable stress) Features by Brazilian Learners of English?.....	79
5.2	Research Question 2: How do Storytelling Activities Compare to EFL/ESL Textbook Activities in their Effectiveness?.....	80
5.3	The Participants’ Performance in the Perception and Production Tests....	83
5.4	Research Question 3: What is the Brazilian learners’ Perception about the Usefulness and Relevance of Storytelling Activities as Compared to Textbook Activities for the Improvement of the Targeted Features?.....	84
5.5	Conclusions.....	88
5.6	Pedagogical Implications.....	89
5.7	Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research.....	90
5.8	Contributions.....	95
REFERENCES.....		97

APPENDIX A: The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages - CEFR band descriptors.....	115
APPENDIX B: The Oral and Written Placement Tests and the Teacher's Guidelines for Marking Purposes.....	116
APPENDIX C: The Background Questionnaire.....	135
APPENDIX D: The Storytelling Activities.....	137
APPENDIX E: The Textbook Activities.....	146
APPENDIX F: The Pre-tests and Post-tests Taken by All the Participants.....	147
APPENDIX G: The Evaluation Questionnaire for the Experimental and Comparison Group.....	153
APPENDIX H: The Participants' Individual Scores in the Perception and Production Pre-tests/Post-tests.....	155
APPENDIX I: The Participants' Consent Form Approved by the Ethics Committee of the University of Victoria.....	162
APPENDIX J: Proof of Application to Ethics in Brazil.....	165
APPENDIX K: The Participants' Consent form, Approved by the Ethics Committee of the University of Taubaté, SP, Brazil.....	166
APPENDIX L: Letter of Permission to Collect Data from the Brazilian School.....	168

List of Tables

Table 1 <i>Written test scores and provisional proficiency level placement.....</i>	45
Table 2 <i>Band descriptors for the oral test and criteria for defining the participants' level.....</i>	46
Table 3 <i>Background questionnaire and the participants' answers.....</i>	48
Table 4 <i>Outline of the activities performed by all the participants.....</i>	50
Table 5 <i>Sequence of classroom activities performed by the experimental and comparison groups in the experimental sessions.....</i>	53
Table 6 <i>Results of the Flesch-Kincaid reading ease analysis.....</i>	54
Table 7 <i>Rating scales adapted from Yates (2003).....</i>	57
Table 8 <i>Intraclass Coefficient Correlation (ICC) for all groups in the pronunciation production pre-tests and post-tests</i>	58
Table 9 <i>Attitude questionnaire statements for the experimental and comparison groups.....</i>	59
Table 10 <i>Kruskal-Wallis comparison between the comparison, control and experimental groups in perception pre-tests 1A, 1B and 2.....</i>	64
Table 11 <i>Wilcoxon signed rank test for all groups in the pre-tests and post-tests....</i>	65
Table 12 <i>Descriptive and inferential statistics of the performance of the experimental, comparison and control groups in the production pre-tests.....</i>	66
Table 13 <i>Comparisons of the performance of the groups in the production pre-tests and post-tests</i>	68
Table 14 <i>Descriptive statistics for the obtained scores on the participants' views about the effectiveness of storytelling activities in improving pronunciation.....</i>	70
Table 15 <i>Descriptive statistics for the obtained scores on the participants' views about the effectiveness of textbook activities in improving pronunciation..</i>	71
Table 16 <i>Number of participants of the experimental group who enjoyed/did not enjoy performing storytelling activities and their reasons.....</i>	73

Table 17 <i>Number of participants of the comparison group who enjoyed/did not enjoy performing textbook activities and their reasons.....</i>	74
Table 18 <i>The activities the participants of the experimental group liked best and disliked.....</i>	75
Table 19 <i>The activities the participants of the comparison group liked best and disliked.....</i>	75
Table 20 <i>Number of participants who believed and did not believe storytelling activities were useful to help improve pronunciation.....</i>	76
Table 21 <i>Number of participants who believed and did not believe textbook activities were useful to help improve pronunciation.....</i>	76
Table 22 <i>The activities the participants of the experimental group found most effective in the development of pronunciation.....</i>	77
Table 23 <i>The activities the participants of the comparison group found most effective in the development of pronunciation.....</i>	77
Table 24 <i>Suggestions made by the participants on how to use storytelling activities in a more preferred and/or efficient way to enhance pronunciation.....</i>	78
Table 25 <i>Suggestions made by the participants on how to use textbook activities in a more preferred and/or efficient way to enhance pronunciation.....</i>	78

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Hossein Nassaji, for his patience, guidance, knowledge and tireless support during my entire Doctoral program. Thank you very much, Dr. Nassaji, for all your dedication. I am also grateful to Dr. Li-Shih Huang, Dr. Suzanne Urbanczyk and Dr. Ulf Schuetze for accepting to be part of my supervisory committee and for their invaluable feedback and suggestions on how to improve the quality of my dissertation. Your support is much appreciated. In addition, I would like to thank Dr. Ewa Czaykowska-Higgins, Dr. Hua Lin, Dr. John Esling, Dr. Leslie Saxon, Dr. Sandra Kirkham and Dr. Sonya Bird for their classes, guidance and advice during my doctoral program. Finally, I would like to dedicate a special thank you to Maureen Kirby and Jenny Jessa for all their support.

A special thank you also goes to my former graduate classmates Akitsugu, Khaled, Nicholas, Rebecca and Fatema for the many good and challenging moments we shared together. I will never forget your unconditional support, dedication and friendship. Additionally, I would like to thank my former wife for her dedication and support and express my gratitude to my Canadian and Brazilian friends who live in Victoria. My special thank you goes to my friend and brother Paulo, his wife Daniela and daughters Marina and Julia for their friendship and invaluable support during my studies.

As for contributors in Brazil, a very special gratitude goes out to Dr. Dirley Santos and, especially, to Dr. Bruno Damasio for their invaluable support in Statistics. I would also like to thank Mr. Arthur Crispino for offering the opportunity to collect data at his school and all his members of staff, who kindly helped ensure the experimental sessions proceeded as planned. Last, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to all the learners who participated in this study. Without your participation, this study could not have happened.

Dedication

I would like to dedicate this dissertation to my beloved parents Claudio and Mariá for their tireless support, encouragement, sacrifices and, above all, for their true and unconditional love and also to my beloved children Matheus and Sarah. Their love, support and courage to accept the challenge to move to Canada have truly inspired me never to give up and always do my very best to continue to strive and become a better person. I would also like to dedicate this dissertation to my fiancée Lília for all her love, patience, dedication and companionship, to my sister Bianca for all her dedication and love and, lastly, to my friend and brother Dráuzio for his endless support, wise words, enthusiasm, true friendship and dedication to help me keep on track.

Preamble

One month before I moved to Canada to start my PhD studies in Linguistics, in one of my language classes, in Brazil, I decided to tell my students a story for the first time, in order to see how they would respond to it. I chose the most challenging class I had, whose students had frequent behavioural problems and showed a lack of interest in participating in classroom activities and in learning languages, in order to investigate what the impact would be. I told my students a fictitious story that presented values (i.e., trustworthiness and honesty) and emotions (i.e., love and hate). While I was telling my students the story, I noticed that all of them were attentively listening to the story. In addition, after I finished telling the story, some of my students started to ask questions about it and others demonstrated a strong interest in telling their own stories, based on similar experiences they had gone through. At that moment, I noticed that storytelling could have a strong power to hold students' attention and encourage them to actively participate in oral and written activities related to the story they heard. Since my learners generally had difficulty pronouncing English words clearly, I then started to wonder whether the use of storytelling in the L2 classroom would also have a positive impact on helping learners develop their English pronunciation. This dissertation has therefore offered me the opportunity to investigate the existing empirical evidence in the literature on the role and impact of storytelling in developing students' language skills in L2 and, mainly, carry out an empirical study to investigate whether the use of storytelling activities plays a role in helping Brazilian beginner EFL (English as Foreign Language) learners are 15 years of age and older, who currently represent a large number of the Brazilian population that needs to learn English for job purposes, enhance their

pronunciation of English in areas that are claimed to be difficult for beginner Brazilian Portuguese (BP) native speakers to pronounce properly.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background and Purpose of the Study

Storytelling is one of the oldest forms of human communication, being used for entertainment and for the promotion of education and cultural values. Furthermore, it is considered to be an effective pedagogical instrument in the development of language skills in first (L1) language and also in a foreign or second language (L2), regardless of a learner's age or background (e.g., Cameron, 2001; Isbell, Sobol, Lindauer, & Lowrance, 2004). Storytelling is claimed to be an effective pedagogical tool in the teaching and/or enhancement of L2 skills, since it is said to work on language skills in a fun, motivating and contextualized manner, consequently raising learners' interest in listening to stories, as well as in speaking, writing and reading about them (e.g., Atta-Alla, 2012; Kim, 2010). Moreover, storytelling is claimed to be highly memorable to learners, helping them learn and retain vocabulary, grammatical structures and pronunciation, for instance (e.g., Wajnryb, 2003).

There are empirical studies that have shown that storytelling improves learners' L2 (e.g., Hsu, 2010; Li & Seedhouse, 2010). According to Tarone (2005) and Thornbury (2012), speaking skills comprise linguistic elements (i.e., pronunciation, vocabulary and grammar), as well as the ability to socially interact with interlocutors. Among the researchers who claim that storytelling has an effect on speaking skills, some also claim that it improves L2 learners' pronunciation (e.g., Cary, 1998; Normann, 2011), although such studies do not provide specific information about how

it does so. This lack of specifics on how exactly storytelling can improve pronunciation highlights an important gap in the literature, since pronunciation is considered to play a significant role in successful oral communication (e.g., Baker, 2014; Gilakjani, 2012).

Using quantitative and qualitative research methods, this study aims to investigate whether storytelling activities improve learners' pronunciation. In particular, it aims to investigate the effect of storytelling activities on the development of learners' ability to perceive and produce specific vowel (i.e., /ɪ/, as in *fill*) and consonant (i.e., the 'TH' sounds as in *they* and *thank*) sounds which are not part of the BP consonant and vowel inventories and reported to be of major difficulty to Brazilian learners to pronounce clearly (e.g., Albin, 2010; Cruz, 2008). Furthermore, this research investigates whether storytelling helps learners develop their ability to perceive and pronounce syllable stress in English words that spell similarly or even the same as in BP (i.e., *cinema*, *sofa*, *chocolate*, *fundamental*) but differ in stress placement, resulting in lack of intelligibility/comprehensibility (e.g., Becker, 2013; Silli, 2009). Derwing and Munro (2005) define intelligibility as "the extent to which a listener actually understands an utterance" and comprehensibility as "a listener's perception of how difficult it is to understand an utterance" (p.385).

The second aim of this study is to investigate how storytelling activities compare, in effectiveness, to textbook activities in the development of pronunciation, as the latter are a widely used pedagogical tool in English classes in Brazil and generally considered to be effective in the development of language skills (e.g., Consolo, 1990; Xavier & Uribe, 2006). Lastly, this study aims to examine the Brazilian learners' perception about the

usefulness and relevance of storytelling and textbook text activities for improving pronunciation.

1.2 Significance of this Study

This study offers an important contribution in investigating the impact of storytelling activities on the improvement of pronunciation of Brazilian learners of English. In general, studies claim that storytelling is an important tool in enhancing pronunciation (e.g., Cary, 1998; Kim & McGarry, 2014; Motallebi & Pourgharib, 2013), although they do not provide specific information about what pronunciation areas are enhanced. This study fills this gap in the literature by investigating the effect of storytelling (if any) on Brazilian learners' perception and production of specific segmental (i.e., /ɪ;/i/ and /θ/; /ð/) and suprasegmental (i.e., syllable stress) features that are reported to be difficult to BP speakers and hinder comprehensibility (e.g., Martins, 2011; Rauber, 2006; Schauddech & Silveira, 2013). Therefore, it is relevant to those who teach or intend to teach English pronunciation to such speakers.

Furthermore, since the study also examines learners' perspectives on storytelling, it provides insights into what learners believe are effective storytelling and textbook activities and how such beliefs and perceptions relate to the actual effect of such activities on their pronunciation performance.

1.3 Dissertation Outline

This dissertation consists of five chapters. Chapter one provides the background and purpose of the study, its significance and hypotheses. Chapter two discusses working definitions for storytelling, story types and their effect on pronunciation, and reviews the

relevant literature on the role of storytelling in foreign language development, including empirical studies about pronunciation difficulties encountered by Brazilian learners of English that hinder comprehensibility in oral communication and the research questions of this study. Chapter 3 describes the research methods adopted in this study, the criteria for the recruitment of the participants, information about their background, the participating groups and the tests and experimental (classroom) activities they performed in this study. Moreover, it offers an outline of the activities performed by all the participants. Chapter 4 presents the results and analyses of the quantitative and qualitative data collected and, lastly, chapter 5 discusses the findings of the study, its pedagogical implications, limitations and suggestions for future research, as well as its contributions.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Storytelling: Definitions, Types and Formats

2.1.1 The meaning of storytelling. Researchers in the field of language teaching generally define storytelling in terms of how it works or what it does to promote communication between storytellers and story listeners. For example, Dyson and Genishi (1994) suggest that storytelling is a process where a teller uses a narrative structure, vocalization and/or dramatic and mental imagery to communicate with an audience, who also uses mental imagery to provide the teller with verbal and non-verbal feedback. Likewise, Hsu (2010, p. 7) defines storytelling as “the use of voice, facial expressions, gestures, eye contact and interaction to connect a tale with listeners.” A tale is created through the interaction between the storyteller and the audience. Thus, while the storyteller uses his/her voice and gesture to convey a story, the audience physically reacts to it by either squinting, staring or smiling, providing the storyteller with feedback on how storytelling is being received.

In terms of content or substance, storytelling is defined by McDrury and Alterio (2003) as:

uniquely a human experience that enables us to convey, through the language of words, aspects of ourselves and others and the worlds, real or imagined, that we inhabit. Stories enable us to come to know these worlds

and our place in them given that we are all, to some degree, constituted by stories. (p. 31)

Researchers generally consider storytelling to be a different activity from reading aloud. Groeber (2007), Mello (2001), Lee (2007) and Wang (2007), for instance, argue that in storytelling the teller focuses on the main message(s) of the story and is free to use language improvisation, vocalization, mimetic action and his/her creativity to convey a story message to his/her audience, whereas during the process of reading aloud a reader reads aloud the exact words in a given story or presents a memorized text to the audience. Nevertheless, a few researchers use storytelling as a broad term, which includes reading aloud (e.g., Elkkiliç & Akça, 2008; Huang, 2006; Kamen, Nicholas, Rossiter, & Abott, 2011; Speaker, & Taylor, 2004).

This research considers reading aloud as part of a storytelling activity. Based on this perspective, a teller who reads the exact words in a given story aloud or presents a memorized text to the audience, for instance, can still use elements such as mimetic action and creativity to convey his/her message to an audience. Moreover, the participants were required to perform reading aloud activities to ensure they would pronounce the specific target sounds of this study. If they had been offered the opportunity to use improvisation and create their own stories, it would not have been possible to guarantee they would use the referred target sounds, as they would have focused on meaning rather than on form.

In order to verify whether there is a significant difference between storytelling and reading aloud, to justify a formal distinction between them, further research is needed

to compare the effects of storytelling and reading aloud on the same group or similar groups of L2 learners and verify how such learners would respond to these two different storytelling approaches. In the absence of such evidence, this research refers to storytelling and story reading as the same type of activity (e.g., Groeber, 2007; Mello, 2001).

2.1.2 Story types and their effect on pronunciation. Researchers use different types of stories and story formats to investigate the effect(s) of different types of genre on the development of language skills in L2. For example, Cary (1998) used different types of story such as one fable (i.e., a short story that uses animals that talk or behave like humans as characters, to convey a moral), one fairytale and two folktales (i.e., tales that are part of a culture or tradition and that orally told) to perform an empirical study on the role of contextualized storytelling in enhancing the language skills of child learners of Spanish as a foreign language. Contextualized storytelling is a multi-sensory approach that makes use of verbal and nonverbal resources such as props, visual aids and body language, for instance, in the communication process. Results showed that the use of contextualized storytelling played a role in helping learners improve their comprehension of oral narratives and speaking skills, suggesting that the use of different types of narratives may have had a positive impact on the development of such skills. This is in line with Wajnryb (2003), who claims that narratives “provide the potential for ‘comprehensible input’, that is, language that is within the range of access of the learner” (p.7). However, since other resources such as props, visual aids and body language were also used in the study, it is not possible to know how impactful the use of narratives was in learners’ language skills development.

Another empirical study carried out by Nicholas, Rossiter and Abbott (2011) investigated the impact of the use of stories of personal experiences upon the development of learners' language skills in English as a Second Language. According to them, little has been researched about the use of learners' personal stories in L2 classrooms, despite the fact that the use of authentic texts are considered to increase language skills by promoting interactions in the classroom, motivation and positive affect for learners (e.g., Essig, 2005; Guariento & Morley, 2001; Katsuhiko, 2002). Five ESL/EFL instructors with extensive experience in teaching immigrants and using stories in the language classroom instructors, as well as nine adult ESL new comers to Canada from different countries (i.e., China, India, Japan, Lebanon and Singapore) participated in the study. Although all of the learners had previously lived in Canada, they had basic English proficiency level and attended English classes. The instructors and learners answered a semi-structured interview outside class time. Regarding the instructors, they were asked questions about demographics, teaching techniques, strategies for using personal stories in the classroom, their views about the benefits of using them as well as their challenges, in addition to their suggestions for resources. Instructors worked on all four skills (i.e., speaking, listening, reading and writing) in the storytelling activities they carried out in their classes. As for the learners, they were asked questions about demographics, their experience with stories in their respective L1s and their perceptions about telling and writing personal stories in the ESL classroom. Results showed that instructors believed the incorporation of personal stories into the classroom to be effective in enhancing language skills by promoting classroom interactions, as learners have daily personal experiences to share with one another. However, instructors also

highlighted that some learners do not feel comfortable working on certain personal topics that remind them of negative experiences they have had in the past and that it is important to respect the learners' decision not to participate in such activities. This is in line with Auerbach (2000), who claims that it is important to respect learners' decisions. In terms of learners, they generally perceived stories to be useful in helping them learn language in a more easy and motivating manner. Although the results of the interviews suggest that personal stories played an important role in promoting language learning, in addition to motivating and promoting classroom interactions among learners, the study lacks specific information about how language skills were developed through the use of personal stories. For example, it does not provide details about what specific language activities, if any, were used and how their effectiveness was measured. Furthermore, results are based on instructors' and learners' personal views and were not be compared to other measurement instruments, making them unreliable.

2.2 Pronunciation Learning Models

This section provides a description of L2 pronunciation learning models based on the description provided by Foote and Trofimovich (2018) and also supported by a number of other researchers (e.g., Flege, 2005; Ko et al., 2003; Ryokai et al., 2003; Sillas, 2007), offering an overview of the areas that need to be taken into account to successfully understand what affects pronunciation improvement and promotes its development: 1. the Perception Assimilation Model, 2. Flege's Speech Learning Model – SLM, 3. Psychological Perspective, 4. Interactionist Perspective, 5. Sociocultural Perspective, 6. Identity Perspective and 7. Sociocognitive Perspective as basically presented by Foote and Trofimovich, 2018 and also supported by a number of other researchers (e.g., Flege,

2005; Ko et al., 2003; Ryokai et al., 2003; Sillas, 2007), giving an overview of the areas that need to be taken into account to successfully understand what affects pronunciation improvement and promotes its development.

According to the Perception Assimilation Model – PAM, L2 learners' difficulty to perceive L2 sound contrasts depends on their capacity to distinguish such sounds from similar sounds in their L1. Foote and Trofimovich (2018) state that “listeners ‘compute’ cross language similarity at the articulatory level, such that they actively compare the gestural properties of L2 sounds with gestural properties of potentially similar L1 sounds.” (p.77).

Flege's Speech Learning Model (SLM) proposes that pronunciation learning makes use of long-term memory representations for sounds. Learners' success in learning pronunciation depends on their capacity to identify L1 and L2 sound differences (Foote and Trofimovich, 2018). Flege postulates different hypotheses. In his first hypothesis, he claims that a new phonetic category is probably created when it is perceived by a speaker to be different from his/her L1. His second hypothesis claims that new L2 phonetic categories are not likely to occur during childhood, which is when L1 sounds are still in development. Regarding the third hypothesis, a new phonetic category is not formed when L1 and L2 sounds are too similar. Instead, an intermediary form is created. (Flege, 2005; Sillas, 2007). Additionally, Flege believes that pronunciation learning/development is strongly influenced by the way input is provided to learners and that, although age may have a negative impact on pronunciation learning, it may still occur regardless of learners' age. PAM and SLM models have both been criticized by Foote and Trofimovich (2018) for being limited to the analysis of individual sounds and for having “little to say

about the systematicity and variability of L2 pronunciation.” (p. 78), although these researchers also claim that they are useful and play an important role in showing how L1 influences the improvement of perception and production of L2.

According to the Psychological Perspective, pronunciation learning is like other kinds of learning and comprises three stages: 1) declarative knowledge (i.e., presentation of abstract rules and specific examples), 2) transformation of declarative knowledge into procedural knowledge, which basically consists of the practical application of the abstract rules and examples through training and 3) automatization, which involves a lot of practice to promote spontaneous pronunciation performance (Foote and Trofimovich, 2018). Here, effective pronunciation learning primarily depends on how properly learners receive input, followed by whether and how it is practiced. As mentioned by Foote and Trofimovich (2018), “even if practice occurs, it may not be entirely useful because what gets proceduralized and automatized might be based on incomplete or inaccurate initial knowledge.” (p.79).

The interactionist perspective states that interaction may help learners enhance their pronunciation, since learners are provided with the opportunity to compare how similar or different their language is from the language of their interlocutors, resulting in language skills improvement. Furthermore, interactions involve negotiations for meaning, facilitating comprehension and communication. (Foote & Trofimovich, 2018). Foote and Trofimovich (2018) suggest that the referred perspective shows how pronunciation is learnt outside the controlled language of the classroom, although it does not address individual learning differences or pronunciation articulatory issues.

Sociocultural theory was developed by Lev Vygotsky and basically states that learning does not only occur due to biological factors but also through interactions in a cultural environment that involves values at physical and symbolic level (i.e., language). As for pronunciation, effective learning occurs through sociocultural interactions and within learners' Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) (e.g., Foote and Trofimovich, 2018; Ko et al., 2003; Ryokai et al., 2003), which is defined by Vygotsky as "the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers" (Vygotsky, 1978, p.86). Here pronunciation development is believed to be constructed through feedback and other types of collaboration learners receive from interactions with their teachers and/or other learners at a higher proficiency level, but within their ZPD, in a sociocultural environment. Learners' learning goals, motivation and identity are considered to be important variables in the improvement of pronunciation.

According to the Identity perspective, learners come to the classroom with real and imagined (i.e., desired) values and memberships of different types (i.e., professional, social or linguistic) have an impact on their pronunciation learning. Moreover, learners' differences in age, L1 and in their personal values, histories and communities make them approach pronunciation in different ways as well (Foote & Trofimovich, 2018). For example, these researchers argue that "learners' age and their L1 are also factors that will influence how they position themselves in their imagined communities." (p.83).

Sociocognitive perspective addresses the use of language at cognitive and sociocultural levels. Here language learning is not only an internal process in which

learners' language skills performance is measured but also learners' alignment to the social environment they belong to. Thus, language learning, including pronunciation, involves the use of a range of verbal and non-verbal tools such as concrete objects, body language, voice quality, intonation, fluency, to mention a few). The sociocognitive approach plays an important role in explaining similarities and differences among individuals in how they align their pronunciation to their interlocutors' pronunciation to promote better interactions with them in specific sociocultural contexts (Trofimovich, 2016). The researcher claims that "the goal of interaction is for interlocutors to arrive at a common situation model." (p.412).

As can be seen, there are different framework or suggestions about how learners should learn pronunciation in the L2 to enable them to orally communicate effectively and there is no consensus among researchers on how it should be done (e.g., Darcy et al., 2012). This section provides an overview of the various perspectives that have been used to investigate and account for L2 pronunciation acquisition/learning process. The descriptions offered show that pronunciation development is a complex area that involves a range of different factors at biological, individual and sociocultural levels, to mention a few, and therefore requires thorough analyses to be effectively addressed. In other words, they play an important role in proposing that effective pronunciation instruction should not only focus on the type of text (i.e., stories or textbook text activities), activities or approach (i.e., explicit or implicit), for instance, to be used with learners but also take into account biological, individual and sociocultural factors, as mentioned above and suggested by Foote and Trofimovich (2018). However, McAndrews and Thomson (2017) claim that "pronunciation instruction has historically been dominated by the *nativeness principle*"

(p.267), which basically states that learners should acquire a mastery and even native-like pronunciation in L2. There are a number of researchers, however, who believe that achieving native-like pronunciation is unnecessary for an effective oral communication, in addition to being difficult to achieve it after childhood (e.g., Derwin, 2010; Levis, 2005; McAndrews & Thomson, 2017). Such researchers argue that pronunciation instruction should follow the *intelligibility principle*, through which learners are not expected to pronounce words or sentences in an L2 like a native speaker but be easily understood by their interlocutors in the communication process.

This study follows the *intelligibility principle*, rather than the *nativeness principle*, as the aim here is to evaluate learners' pronunciation according to their level of comprehensibility for daily communication purposes, regardless of their nonnative accent.

2.3 What do We Know about the Role of Storytelling in the Development of L2 Skills?

This section discusses studies on the role of storytelling in the development of language skills in L2, including pronunciation and also studies on the impact of traditional and digital storytelling on language learning. Although there are studies that claim that storytelling enhances L2 learners' pronunciation, most of them do not provide details on how pronunciation benefits from the use of storytelling. This section also reviews a range of qualitative and quantitative empirical studies, which may not be directly comparable in that they use varying methods, participants of different age groups (i.e., child and adult learners) and from a variety of L1 backgrounds.

2.3.1. Storytelling and the development of speaking skills and pronunciation.

Hsu (2010) performed a ten-week empirical study on the role of English storytelling

instruction in the development of speaking skills of a group of 25 grade 5 and 25 grade 6 beginner Taiwanese learners. This small-scale quantitative study included one experimental group and one control group. The experimental group received instructions through the use of storytelling activities as well as through access to an English textbook. The control group, however, only received instructions through the same English textbook. Both groups were pre-tested and post-tested with regards to their oral language complexity. No significant differences were found between groups during the pre-test. However, in the post-test the experimental group was shown to produce longer, more complex oral sentences in L2 than the control group. Hsu (2010) suggests that this happened because, during the study, learners did not only passively listen to stories, but also had the opportunity to retell the stories they heard and practice the new vocabulary and sentence structures introduced to them. Nevertheless, Hsu does not say what exactly he means by “more complex oral sentences” or what such sentences consist of. Therefore, it is not possible to know whether learners were assessed in terms of use of more advanced grammatical structures and/or vocabulary and whether their pronunciation and oral fluency, for instance, were also taken into account. Since Hsu does not focus on learners’ oral grammatical accuracy or on their oral fluency, the term “more complex oral sentences” is vague and, therefore, limited in its use to language teachers and researchers.

Zare-Behatash, Saed and Sajjadi (2016) performed a quantitative study to investigate the effect of storytelling on speaking skills. Their study was carried out for three months in two 90-minute weekly sessions and involved 40 female grade 1 high school students, at between 14 and 16 years of age. There were two groups: an

experimental and a control group. The experimental group (N=20) was exposed to storytelling activities via movies, whereas the control was exposed to traditional teaching methods, such as the Direct method. The participants' performance was analyzed through the use of *t-tests*, through which post-test results were compared to pre-test results. In the first analysis, the researchers compared the pre-test and post-test scores of the participants of the experimental group to verify the progress of this group. According to these researchers, its Mean score in the pre-test was 15.3, whereas in the post-test it was 20.57. Thus, the experimental group had an improvement in its Mean score of 5.27. The control group had an increase in its Mean score in the post-test, though. However, the difference here was not as high as the one found in the experimental group. The Mean score of the control group in the pre-test was 16.83 and, in the post-test, it was 17.99. Therefore, the difference was of 1.16, which is much lower than the Mean score difference of the experimental group. In sum, although both groups showed improvement in performance in their respective post-tests, the improvement of the experimental group was more significant than control group, suggesting that the use of storytelling activities was more effective than traditional teaching methods in the development of speaking skills. Nevertheless, like the other studies reviewed in this dissertation, it lacks methodological consistency. For example, it does not provide details about what speaking tasks the participants were exposed to, nor what speaking skills were enhanced or how their speaking skills were assessed. No samples of the test items or the assessment criteria are mentioned.

Motallebi and Pourgharib (2013) investigated the effectiveness of the use of audio-stories in the improvement of learners' pronunciation. A total of 40 beginner

female Iranian learners, at around 11 years of age, participated in the study. These 40 learners were randomly divided into two different groups of 20 participants each: an experimental and a control group. The study was performed in two 60-minute weekly sessions for eight weeks. The experimental group listened to recorded stories and the control group did not receive any treatment. In the first 30 minutes of each experimental session, the participants of the experimental group did pronunciation activities, through the use of phonetic symbols. Here the participants received instructions on how to understand the symbols. Then, in the remaining 30 minutes, they listened to a story. After listening to the story, their instructor picked up a few words from the story and performed an oral repetition activity with the participants. In such activity, the instructor read words aloud and the participants repeated them. Lastly, the participants listened to the story a second time. A *t-test* was used to compare the mean scores of the participants of the experimental and control groups in the post-tests and pre-tests and results showed that the experimental group significantly outperformed the control group. The mean score of the experimental group was 5.95, while the mean score of the control group was 5.4.

In conclusion, Motallebi and Pourgharib (2013) found storytelling to be an effective tool in the improvement of pronunciation because it motivated learners to listen and also provided them with the opportunity to listen to stories and compare their pronunciation to what they heard. Although the study claims that storytelling has an effect on pronunciation improvement, it does not provide consistent evidence that the participants' pronunciation improvement occurred because they had been exposed to storytelling activities. Put in a different way, since the participants spent 50% of the experimental sessions doing pronunciation activities, including oral repetition activities,

it is not possible to know whether their pronunciation improvement actually occurred because of the storytelling activities or because of the pronunciation activities they had been exposed to, prior to the storytelling activities. Furthermore, the study by Motallebi and Pourgharib does not provide information about the tasks and criteria adopted to assess the participants' pronunciation in the post-test.

Another study on the relationship between storytelling and speaking skills development was conducted by Afrilyasanti and Basthomi (2011). They carried out qualitative research to investigate the role of digital storytelling in the enhancement of five grade 8 EFL learners' oral production, focusing on their opinions about digital storytelling, as well as the quality of their digital storytelling production. According to the researchers, the participants who were considered to have "good" English and computers skills were selected by the school principal and their English teacher to participate in the study. They attended seven meetings after school hours but the length of each meeting is not specified.

Data were collected from classroom observations, written and oral presentations and questionnaires. The participants were reported to perform well in both the designing of digital stories and in their oral presentations, which were rated in a scale of 1 to 4 points. In addition, they were evaluated in terms of four different categories (i.e., 1. voice consistency; 2. fluency; 3. pronunciation; 4. conversational style; 5. voice pacing (rhythm and voice punctuation)). Results showed that, overall, the participants performed well in the written and oral activities. In regards to pronunciation and fluency, for instance, all the participants had a satisfactory performance; two out of five of them were rated the maximum score of 4 points.

Afrilyasanti and Basthomi (2011) believed that exposing learners to digital storytelling activities effectively improved their ability to present their stories intelligibly and also through a smooth, spontaneous speech, basically because they had the opportunity to practice the pronunciation of words until they were satisfactory enough. From the researchers' perspective, this telling and retelling process, which is offered by digital storytelling, positively contributed to the enhancement of the participants' written and oral skills as well as their creativity. Regarding oral skills, for example, the participants had the opportunity to intensively speak the English language (i.e., L2) and listen to their pronunciation production many times, measure their fluency and improve their communication and creativity skills. According to the researchers, "this is in line with Porter's (2008) proposition that digital storytelling builds 21st century communication skills: creativity and inventive thinking, multiple intelligences, higher-order thinking (lessons learned), information literacy, visual literacy, sound literacy, technical literacy, effective communication (oral, written and digital), teamwork and collaboration, project management and enduring understanding" (p. 89 and 90). As for the participants' answers to the questionnaires, all of the participants informed they enjoyed doing digital storytelling activities and found it easy to perform them. They also considered storyboarding¹ to be an effective tool in facilitating and accelerating their speed of production of stories.

However, the study presents some methodological limitations that may affect the reliability of the results. For example, it did not carry out a pre-test to evaluate the initial

¹ Storyboarding basically consists of an outline of the visual flow/content of a story (Tumminello, 2005)

English proficiency level of the participants. Instead, they were subjectively recruited by the school Principal and their English teacher. Thus, it is not possible to know whether their reported satisfactory fluency and pronunciation performance resulted from their exposure to digital storytelling or whether they already had the reported proficiency level before they performed the digital storytelling activities. Furthermore, the study does not describe how speaking production was measured. Although it informs that the participants' oral production was assessed in a 1 to 4-point scale, it does not provide the descriptors for each point.

2.3.1.1 Empirical studies on BP speakers' English pronunciation difficulties.

This section provides an overview of BP speakers' difficulties pronouncing the target segmental (i.e., /ɪ/;/i/ and /θ/;/ð/) and suprasegmental (i.e., syllable stress) sounds, which are the focus of this study. Moreover, it provides a review of relevant studies on the BP native speakers' difficulties perceiving and/or producing such target sounds properly in English, negatively impacting on their comprehensibility.

Researchers have claimed that BP speakers find it hard to pronounce the near-close near-front unrounded vowel /ɪ/ (e.g., Cruz & Pereira, 2006; Shepherd, 2001), since such vowel segment is not part of the vowel phonemic inventory of BP (e.g., Ackerlind & Jones-Kellog, 2011; Azevedo, 2005), resulting in reduced intelligibility. The Brazilian learners pronounce the verb 'live' as [ˈlivi] and the noun 'clip' [ˈklipi]. Note that, besides the vowel alternation from /ɪ/ to /i/, the examples show the use of an additional vowel (i.e., /i/) after /v/ and /p/, as these consonant sounds are not allowed to be used at the end

of syllables in BP. By adding /i/, a new syllable is created and /v/ and /p/ are allowed to be used at the beginning of syllables in BP (e.g., D'Andrade & Mateus, 2000).

Brazilian learners of English are also reported to have difficulty pronouncing the voiced /ð/ and voiceless /θ/ interdental fricative sounds correctly, reducing their oral comprehensibility (e.g., Cruz, 2003; Reis, 2006). Although there are researchers who claim that mispronunciation of such sounds does not hinder intelligibility (e.g., McAndrews & Thomson, 2017; Seidlhofer, 2004; Zoghbor, 2011), there are Brazilian researchers who claim it does (e.g., Becker, 2013; Reis, 2006; Schadech & Silveira, 2013), mainly involving Brazilian learners of English. The studies about the negative impact of mispronunciation of interdentals on intelligibility are discussed later on this section.

The voiced interdental fricative /ð/ is usually perceived and pronounced by beginner Brazilian learners of English as the voiced alveolar stop /d/, the voiced alveolar fricative /z/ or the voiced labiodental fricative /v/. The voiceless dental fricative /θ/ is usually perceived and pronounced as the voiceless alveolar stop /t/, the voiceless alveolar fricative /s/ or the voiceless labiodental fricative /f/ (Reis, 2006; Ruhmke-Ramos, 2009; Schadech & Silveira, 2013). Thus, the demonstrative pronoun “this” /ðɪs/ would tend to be pronounced by Brazilian learners as /dɪs/, /zɪs/ or /vɪs/ and the verb ‘think’ /θɪŋk/ as /tɪŋk/, /sɪŋk/ or /fɪŋk/ (Reis, 2006; Schadech & Silveira, 2013). The substitutions of the voiced and voiceless dental fricatives are claimed to occur, because such phonemes do not exist in the Portuguese consonant inventory (Reis, 2006; Ruhmke-Ramos, 2009; Schadech & Silveira, 2013).

Researchers generally agree that stressing the correct syllable(s) in a word plays a significant role in promoting comprehensibility (e.g., Albini, 2010; Becker, 2013; Cruz, 2003; 2008). They also agree that errors in syllable stress placement reduces intelligibility (e.g., Becker, 2013; Cruz, 2003; Brawerman, 2006). Brawerman (2006) claims that Brazilian learners have a major difficulty placing stress in English suffixed words when it falls on a syllable before the antepenultimate one (i.e., pre-proparoxytone), such as in the words *supervisor* (it means the same in BP but is stressed as *supervisor*) *vegetable* (*vegetal*, in BP) and *personalize* (*personalizar*, in BP), to mention a few. Such difficulty is claimed to occur, because, in BP, stress is assigned from right to left and may only occur on the last (i.e., oxytone), penultimate (i.e., paroxytone) or antepenultimate (i.e., proparoxytone) syllable from the end of a word (Albini, 2010; Brawerman, 2006; Câmara, 1972; Collischonn, 2001). Baptista (1989) also claims that Brazilian learners of English normally have difficulty pronouncing English words that spell similarly or the same as BP words but whose syllable stress is placed differently. This current study investigates the effect of storytelling and textbook activities on enhancing Brazilian learners' ability to use word stress in English properly in words such as *restaurant*, *temperature*, *hospital* and *Canada*. The last two examples have the same spelling and meaning as in BP and only differ from BP words in stress placement. While in English such words are pronounced as HOSpital and CANada, in BP they are pronounced and spelled as hospiTAL and CanADÁ.

In regards to empirical studies on BP native speakers' pronunciation difficulties, Rauber (2006) carried out a quantitative empirical study on advanced Brazilian EFL learners' ability to perceive and produce English vowels. A total of 32 adult participants

participated in the perception test and 39 participants participated in the production test. The participants were divided into three different groups. In the perception test, group 1 consisted of four American English native speakers, group 2 consisted of ten BP monolingual speakers and group 3 consisted of 18 undergraduate and graduate BP EFL learners who had taken an introductory course in English Phonetics and Phonology and were at advanced English proficiency level. The participants listened to different vowel sounds (i.e., /ʊ/, /u/, /ɪ/, /i/, /ɛ/, /æ/) and then chose the alternative that represented each of the sounds they heard. In the production test, group 1 comprised of nine American English native speakers, group 2 of 12 BP monolingual speakers and group 3 of 18 BP EFL learners. As for the production test, the participants read aloud words in isolation and in sentence forms and recorded them. Production performance was measured acoustically, through the analyses of formants, which describe a concentration of acoustic energy found when a speaker produces a periodic sound such as a vowel (O'Grady, 2013, p. 57) and vowel duration values and compared to the performance of the American native speakers. Statistical results showed that the advanced BP EFL learners found it easier to perceive differences between /ɪ/ and /i/ vowel sounds than to produce such vowels properly. Furthermore, the female participants outperformed the male participants in sound perception, while the male participants outperformed the female ones in production. For example, 97.8% of female BP EFL learners perceived such sounds similarly to American native speakers of English, whereas 27.1% of them produced such sounds similarly to the referred native speakers. As for the male participants, 94.0% of them perceived /ɪ/ and /i/ sounds similarly to the American native speakers, whereas 59.5% produced these sounds similarly to the American English native speakers. Despite

their advanced English proficiency level, the BP EFL learners (mainly the female ones) demonstrated difficulty pronouncing English words containing the minimal pairs /ɪ/ and /i/ vowel sounds properly.

The study by Rauber (2006) played an important role in showing that even advanced BP learners of English have difficulty perceiving and producing certain groups of vowels in English, such as the target sounds /ɪ/ and /i/ properly. Nevertheless, it presents a few methodological weaknesses that may have affected the results. In the production tests, for example, when the participants made pronunciation errors, they were asked to reread the items containing the target vowel segments that were mispronounced. The problem is that some of them could not understand what their pronunciation errors were, making them easily feel bored. Another limitation regards the fact that the assessment of the participants' vowel production was compared to how vowels are pronounced in northern California. Because of this single variety, the participants who pronounced vowels intelligibly and even in a native-like manner, but differently from the variety of Northern California, were unfairly assessed.

Likewise, Martins (2011) carried out an empirical study to investigate how accurately Brazilian EFL learners and teachers pronounce the vowel sound minimal pairs (i.e., 'cheap') and /ɪ/ (i.e., 'chip'), as well a /ɛ/ (i.e., 'beg') and /æ/ (i.e., 'bag'). The study consisted of an experimental group with 24 Brazilian EFL learners at intermediate/advanced levels and two Brazilian EFL teachers and of a control group with two American native speakers. All the participants individually read aloud and recorded the minimal pairs (i.e., 'cheap and chip' and 'beg and bag') three times. The three formant values of each minimal pair were summed up and divided by three before the

average values for each minimal pair was analyzed through acoustic parameters of frequency and duration (i.e., F1 and F2 formants). Results of the acoustic analyses showed that although the Brazilian EFL teachers produced the vowels in the English minimal pairs in a native-like manner, the learners did not produce them properly, suggesting they lacked knowledge of the articulatory differences between /i/ and /ɪ/, as well as between /ɛ/ and /æ/. In conclusion, the study by Martins played an important role in showing that even advanced Brazilian EFL learners have difficulty pronouncing vowel sounds in English words intelligibly and in suggesting changes in the production and use of teaching materials, including the incorporation of pronunciation teaching in the classroom.

The studies by the Brazilian researchers Rauber (2006) and Martins (2011) demonstrate how difficult it is for Brazilian learners of English to pronounce the minimal pair /i/ and /ɪ/ intelligibly, regardless of their English proficiency level. Even advanced learners had difficulty producing such pair properly. The findings of these studies show us how important it is to further investigate ways to facilitate the acquisition of such sounds to promote oral intelligibility.

Schadech and Silveira (2013) empirically investigated the effect of BP speakers' pronunciation production of English words containing voiceless /θ/ and voiced /ð/ interdental fricative sounds on comprehensibility, as judged by English native speakers from different parts of the United States. Eight male and two female BP native speakers, at between 18 and 54 years of age, participated in the study. In addition, they had different English proficiency levels and language learning experiences. For instance, eight participants learnt English at an academic environment, whereas two of them learnt

it naturalistically. Moreover, seven, out of ten participants, had lived in English-speaking countries, such as the United States (US) and the United Kingdom (UK), while three of them had never lived in an English-speaking country. All the ten participants read aloud and recorded a short paragraph taken from “the speech accent archive” website². The recordings with the participants’ pronunciation production were, then, assessed by native English speakers from the US and who worked as English instructors in Brazil and were familiar with BP speakers’ English accent. The native English speakers were required to listen to each participant’s recording of the following paragraph, taken from the referred website and 1) rate their proficiency level (i.e., from ‘beginner’ to ‘Advanced’) and 2) rate their comprehensibility level in the pronunciation production of interdental fricative sounds.

“Please call Stella. Ask her to bring these things with her from the store: Six spoons of fresh snow peas, five thick slabs of blue cheese and maybe a snack for her brother Bob. We also need a small plastic snake and a big toy frog for the kids. She can scoop these things into three red bags and we will go meet her Wednesday at the train station. (Target words underlined by the researchers)” (p. 7)

Out of a total of 10 points, comprehensibility was rated as ‘very difficult’ (1 to 2 points), ‘Difficult’ (3 to 4 points), ‘not very easy’ (5 to 6 points), ‘Easy’ (7 to 8 points) and ‘Very easy’ (9 to 10 points). Results showed that, overall, the participants demonstrated difficulty pronouncing interdental sounds properly, hindering

² “the speech accent archive” website is a database that provides recordings of native and non-native speakers of English reading the same paragraph and its phonetic transcription and is intended to offer researchers the opportunity to compare different English accents.

comprehensibility. 68.42% of the mispronounced words were held as ‘not very easy’, ‘difficult’ and ‘very difficult’ to understand. In conclusion, despite the fact that there are researchers who claim that mispronunciation of interdental fricative sounds does not cause difficulty in oral intelligibility (e.g., McAndrews & Thomson, 2017; Seidlhofer, 2004; Zoghbor, 2011), results of the study by Schadech and Silveira (2013) showed that it reduced oral intelligibility as perceived by a group of native speakers of English familiarized with BP speakers’ English accent. Furthermore, the study played an important role in raising teachers’ awareness of the importance of not underestimating the importance of working on the correct pronunciation of interdental sounds with their learners in the classroom to promote oral comprehensibility. In regards to weaknesses, the study used a small number of participants (i.e., ten), which may have affected the reliability of the results. In order to get more generalizable conclusions, it would need to be replicated in larger groups. Furthermore, there was only one group of raters (i.e., listeners), who were familiarized with BP speakers’ English accent. To promote a more detailed evaluation of learners’ pronunciation, different groups of listeners should have been used, as suggested by Schadech and Silveira (2013). Lastly, the study was limited to getting learners to read aloud one paragraph containing interdental fricative sounds. In order to evaluate how impactful mispronunciation of the target sounds is on comprehensibility and, consequently, on oral communication, the referred researchers suggested the participants’ production should have been evaluated in spontaneous speech. This is in line with other researchers (e.g., Luchini, 2017; Thomson & Derwing, 2015) who highlight the importance of evaluation learners’ performance oral performance participants’ performance in freer, naturalistic settings.

Similarly, Reis (2006) carried out a study to investigate how Brazilian EFL learners of Santa Catarina Federal University, at different stages of interlanguage development, perceived and produced interdental fricative sounds in word-initial position. 24 Brazilian EFL learners and five native speakers of English participated in the study and were separated into three different groups: group 1 consisted of 12 pre-intermediate level learners; group 2 consisted of 12 advanced-level learners and group 3 (control) consisted of the five English native speakers. Data were collected through sound perception and production tests, performed at the language laboratory of the referred university. In the perception tests, the participants were basically asked to listen and identify interdental fricatives (i.e., /θ/ and /ð/) and common substitute phonemes, such as /t/, /d/, /s/ and /z/, in the initial position of the words they listened to. As for the production tests, the participants 1) read aloud and recorded a text, 2) retold the story of the text they had read aloud and 3) read a list of sentences. All activities contained words with voiced and voiceless interdental fricative sounds. Only the Brazilian participants performed the production tests. Results showed that, although the participants generally scored high in the perception tests, they generally demonstrated difficulty producing interdental fricative sounds, like in the previous study by Schadech and Silveira (2013), suggesting there is no correlation between perception and production. In other words, accurate sound perception does not necessarily mean accurate sound production. Furthermore, difficulty in producing interdental fricatives intelligibly occurred regardless of the participants' English proficiency level, like in the previous study by Schadech and Silveira (2013). The voiceless /θ/ and the voiced /ð/ interdental fricatives commonly surfaced as the voiceless and voiceless alveolar stops /t/ and /d/, respectively. For

instance, 53% of the intermediate-level group and 40% of the advanced-level group mispronounced /θ/ as /t/ and 96% of the intermediate-level and 92% of the advanced-level groups mispronounced /ð/ as /d/.

With respect to word stress, Silveira (2011) performed a study on how correctly ten BP EFL high school learners and five BP EFL teachers produced primary stress in the pronunciation of a set of eight polysyllabic English words (i.e., *television*, *development*, *improvement*, *seventeen*, *fifteen*, *comfortable*, *interesting* and *vegetable*). *TElevision*, *deVEvelopment*, *imPROvement*, *sevenTEEN*, *fiFTTEEN*, *COMfortable*, *INteresting* and *VEgetable*). The participants' production performance was recorded and results showed that syllable stress misplacement occurred in all the eight target words. For instance, only two out of ten learners and no teachers pronounced *TElevision* properly. Eight learners and all teachers pronounced it as *teleVISION*. *COMfortable* was mispronounced as *comforTABLE*, which is similar to its BP version *conforTAVel*, by five learners and also as *comFORtable* by four learners and three teachers. Lastly, *VEgetable*, it was mispronounced as *vegeTABLE* by three learners and as *veGETable* by five learners and three teachers. According to Silveira, these results suggest a transfer of the BP syllabic structure to the use of stress in English words. In BP, stress may only occur in any of the final three syllables of a word (Colischonn, 1999) and the stressed syllables of the mispronounced words all occur on the fourth syllable. This study has played an important role in providing evidence of typical syllable stress errors that are made by BP EFL learners and in showing the need to focus on the teaching and practice of proper syllable stress assignment to help BP learners improve their pronunciation skills.

A similar study on the influence of BP (i.e., L1) on the production of syllable stress in English (i.e., L2) was carried out by Albini (2010). She recorded and analyzed the pronunciation production of 20 intermediate/advanced EFL learners reading aloud English words of Latin root which spelled similarly to words in BP but differed in syllable stress. Each participant read aloud and recorded 50 words (i.e., 25 pre-proparoxytones and 25 proparoxytones/paroxytones) in isolation and the same 50 words in sentence form, totaling 100 recordings. A total of 1,000 recordings of pre-proparoxytone words and 1,000 proparoxytone/paroxytone were produced in the study. As previously defined in this section, in preproparoxytone words stress occurs on the syllable before the antepenultimate syllable from the end of the word. In proparoxytone words it occurs on the antepenultimate syllable (i.e., the third syllable from the end of the word), and in paroxytone words it occurs on the penultimate syllable (i.e., the second syllable from the end of the word). According to test results, most errors occurred in the pronunciation of pre-proparoxytone words. For example, the participants mispronounced 76% of the preproparoxytones and 11.5% of the proparoxytones/paroxytones read aloud in isolation and 72.8% of the preproparoxytones and 11.7% of the proparoxytones/paroxytones read aloud in sentence form. In sum, findings of the study by Albini suggest that the difficulties encountered by BP EFL learners in placing syllable stress in English properly occur due to transfer of BP syllable stress rules into English. Furthermore, the study contributed to showing teachers the importance of stressing syllables correctly to promote oral comprehensibility. Albini also blamed teachers for not being knowledgeable of English stress rules, although she did not assess teachers' pronunciation performance in her study.

Researchers generally agree that pronunciation development does not only involve the actual production of utterances but also one's ability to perceive differences in meaning that utterances carry, depending on the manner they are pronounced, for instance (e.g., Celce-Murcia, Brighton, & Goodwin, 2010; Council of Europe, 2001; Cruttenden, 2008; Goodwin, & Griner 2010). Furthermore, Gilbert (2008) and Motallebi and Pourgharib (2013) claim that the skills of listening comprehension and pronunciation are interrelated. The following studies focus on the effect of storytelling on listening comprehension.

2.3.2 Storytelling and listening comprehension. Verdugo and Belmonte (2007) carried out a study with six-year-old Spanish beginner learners for 22 weeks, twice a week, to compare the effectiveness of digital storytelling and textbook activities in the development of their listening comprehension in EFL comparing the effectiveness of digital storytelling and textbook activities in the development of their listening comprehension in EFL. A total of 220 participants from six different schools were recruited. The study comprised of an experimental and a control group. A total of 108 participants worked in the experimental group and were exposed to textbook activities and digital storytelling activities. Actually, in the first session of each week, the participants were exposed to textbook activities and, in the second session, they were exposed to storytelling activities. The control group had 120 participants and was exposed to textbook activities only. The participants of both groups were assessed qualitatively, through classroom observations and also quantitatively, through listening comprehension pre-tests and post-tests.

The pre-test consisted of two parts which essentially asked the participants to listen to seven items about animals and colors and circle the correct answer for each item. The test aimed to check whether the participants had similar English proficiency level. As for the post-test, it consisted of three parts. The first two parts offered the same type of items as in the pre-test but new vocabulary (i.e., new animals, colors and numbers). The third type of item consisted of eight 'Yes/No' questions in English on some new vocabulary related to actions, colors, animals, size, descriptive adjectives, etc., taught to all the participants during the semester. The scores of the participants of the experimental group were compared with the scores of the participants of the control group and analyzed by a *t-test*. Results showed that the experimental group significantly outperformed the control groups, suggesting that storytelling was more effective than textbook activities in the enhancement of learners' listening comprehension skills.

However, Verdugo and Belmonte inform that the differences between the referred groups was not strong. As for possible reasons for the better performance of the experimental group, these researchers believed that digital stories were effective because they enhanced children's focus on the oral input received and provided learners with a longer exposure and opportunity to intensively practice the target language. Moreover, results are in agreement with the data collected from classroom observations and from interviews with teachers, which informed learners had performed successfully in the classroom activities. Nevertheless, differences between pre-tests and post-test in terms of content and design may have negatively affected the findings of the study. For instance, in the pre-test, the participants listened to items that referred to animals and colors, whereas in the post-test they listened to items that referred to animals, colors and numbers. Numbers were not part of the content of the pre-test. Likewise, the third part of the post-test (i.e., Yes/No questions) was not found in the pre-test.

Such inconsistencies make the results of part of the post-test not comparable to the results of the pre-test. Furthermore, Verdugo and Belmonte (2007) informed that the participants experienced some technological difficulties (i.e., problems to access the Internet) in the first sessions of the project, which may have also affected the reliability of the results. In sum, despite the positive results of the effect of digital storytelling on the enhancement of learners' listening skills, the methodological flaws found in the study make it necessary to further research the effectiveness of digital storytelling on the improvement of listening skills before generalizable conclusions may be drawn.

Another relevant study on the relationship between storytelling and listening comprehension improvement was carried out by Skhela (2010). In fact, their one-year study aimed to investigate the effectiveness of storytelling in enhancing learners' listening comprehension skills. Seventy-four female participants were recruited for the study. 50% of them worked in the experimental group (i.e., storytelling group) and the other 50% worked in the control group (i.e., traditional English class group). According to Skhela (2010), post-test results, analyzed by a *t-test*, showed that the participants of the experimental group outperformed the participants of the control group in their listening sub-skills, such as prediction, their ability to tell the main ideas of the stories they listened to and summarize them. The researcher argued that storytelling was more effective than traditional activities in enhancing learners' listening skills because it offers learners substantial comprehensible input, enriched by nonverbal cues such as the tellers' use of body language and raises learners' motivation and ability to focus on what they listen to. Despite the results, suggesting that storytelling plays a role in improving listening skills, the study does not provide details about how the participants' listening

performance was scored in the tests. In addition, it lacks an analysis and discussion of the traditional listening activities the storytelling activities were compared to in effectiveness.

2.3.3 Storytelling as a motivating tool. Storytelling is considered to be an effective instrument to boost learners' motivation to learn languages (e.g., Wajnryb, 2003; Wright, 1995), increasing their active participation in the language learning process and, consequently, facilitating language learning. According to Wajnryb (2003), the content and meaning of stories are powerful enough to engage learners in the learning process, helping them improve their skills in L2. Similarly, Wright (1995) claims that storytelling increases learners' interest in listening and reading stories, playing an important role in improving their listening and reading skills in L2. Storytelling is, therefore, considered to be a powerful instrument to motivate learners to learn languages, by encouraging them to actively participate in the language learning process.

This issue was also examined by a significant one-year quasi-experimental study carried out by Yang and Wu (2012) on the effects of digital storytelling (DST) on the motivation of 110 grade 10 EFL learners in Taiwan and on the improvement of their language skills in EFL. The participants were divided into an experimental group and a comparison group. Although both groups were pre and post-tested and also exposed to the same language contents, assessment tasks and instructor, they used different teaching strategies. The experimental group was exposed to DST activities, through which learners were encouraged to actively participate in the language learning process, using creative thinking in the production of oral and written language. In contrast, the comparison group was mostly exposed to textbook readings and the listening of lectures on PowerPoint slides. Data were collected and analyzed qualitatively and quantitatively, through

questionnaires, tests and descriptive statistical analysis. Results indicated that the participants in the experimental group outperformed the comparison group in all the three groups of variables measured: learning motivation, creative thinking and language skills and features (listening, reading, writing, grammar and vocabulary). Yang and Wu suggest that DST played an important role in improving learners' motivation and language skills by providing them with opportunities to work on language skills actively and creatively, through the use of modern digital resources, for instance. Moreover, learners exposed to DST were encouraged to use language in meaningful contexts, related to their personal experiences. Yang and Wu's study has made a substantial contribution to the literature, as it investigated the effects of DST on the motivation of a large number of L2 learners (n= 110), for a long period of time (1 year) and by using mixed (qualitative and quantitative) research methods.

In a smaller scale study, Elkkiliç and Akça (2008) conducted research on the role of storytelling in motivating a group of Turkish child learners to learn EFL. A total of 21 grade 4 beginner learners participated in this study. They were asked to read a series of statements in a questionnaire and choose the statements which best reflected their opinion. Furthermore, they were asked open-ended questions about their reason(s) for studying EFL (in order to determine whether they were being intrinsically or extrinsically motivated to learn English), the activities they like doing in their classes, as well as the activities that they do not enjoy doing. According to Schunk (2008), extrinsic motivation occurs when a learner is motivated to do something for an external reward, such as higher grades or a job promotion, whereas intrinsic motivation refers to one's desire to participate in an activity, solely for the pleasure in doing the activity itself. In Elkkiliç

and Akça' study, most participants reported to enjoy the storytelling activities in their EFL classes and learn something new from the stories they had been exposed to. Results indicate that learners perceive storytelling as an important motivational tool in EFL learning. Although learners' opinions on the importance of storytelling in motivating and helping them improve their language skills in L2 is important to teachers and/or researchers to show them what learners' views are, it may not reflect how learners actually react or respond to storytelling activities in the classroom. Thus, in order to confirm whether learners' opinions are in agreement with the actual way they respond to storytelling activities, the kind of study carried out by Elkkiliç and Akça could also provide learners with storytelling activities and evaluate their motivation level in such activities. Such evaluation could be carried out through classroom observations, for example. The findings of the questionnaire on learners' views could be compared to their actual performance in the classroom. This comparison would provide language teachers and researchers with more reliable, comprehensive conclusions on the role of storytelling in enhancing learners' motivation and language learning.

Taken together, these two studies seem to support the claims on the effectiveness of storytelling in motivating learners to learn L2 and in enhancing their receptive (i.e., reading and listening) and productive (i.e., speaking and writing) skills, by providing learners with the opportunity work on the referred language skills in fun, meaningful activities. Besides helping L2 learners develop their language skills for being a motivating tool, storytelling is also claimed to help learners improve their language skills through social interactions, as assessed in the next section.

2.3.4 Storytelling as a tool to provide comprehensible input and facilitate

language skills development. Researchers generally agree that storytelling creates ideal language learning conditions, because it provides learners with *comprehensible input* (e.g., Brewster, Ellis, & Girard, 2002; Hendrickson, 1992; Wajnryb, 2003). Wajnryb (2003), for instance, claims that “the text of the story provides the potential for comprehensible input, that is language that is within the range of access of the learner” (p. 7). Some empirical studies have investigated the role of storytelling in providing learners with comprehensible input and facilitating the development of skills in L2.

For example, Cary (1998) performed a qualitative study on the effectiveness of a Contextualized Storytelling Approach (CSA) in facilitating the comprehension of English, which was the participants' L2, as well as in impacting the quantity of L2 speaking in a group of 12 beginner Latino learners, whose L1 was Spanish. Three English-Spanish bilingual classrooms were analyzed during a period of four weeks. Data were collected through observations, field notes, recorded dialogues between the researcher and the three participant teachers and through recorded informal dialogues between the teachers and the learners. Four traditional stories were selected for the study. Props, costumes, music, movement and sound effects, as well as synonyms and paraphrasing, role-playing and teacher-facilitated post-story discussion were used to promote comprehension of the oral stories. The results obtained showed that CSA increased learners' comprehension of L2. Cary observed that learners were engaged to attentively listen to stories, which facilitated their comprehension. Furthermore, the quantity of L2 speaking was also increased after exposure to CSA stories. Despite the

fact that the findings from Cary's research are limited by the lack of a control group, the study makes an important contribution to the literature, by showing that CSA facilitates learners' comprehension and also develops their listening and speaking skills in L2. The use of a control group would play a relevant role in Cary's study, since it investigates the effects of a pedagogical instrument (CSA) on learners' comprehension and speaking skills in L2.

A further study on the role of storytelling in providing learners with comprehensible input was performed by Isbell et al. (2004). Their empirical study compared the effects of storytelling and reading-aloud activities on the improvement of comprehension of 38 three to five-year-old children during a 12-week study. The study used two groups: the first group was exposed to storytelling activities, whereas the second was exposed to reading-aloud activities. As mentioned in Section 2, storytelling and reading aloud activities may be defined and used differently in the literature. The study by Isbell et al. (2004) refers to storytelling as an activity where the teller is free to use language improvisation and creativity to convey the message of a story and to reading aloud as an activity where the teller reads aloud the exact words in a given story or presents a memorized text to the audience. Results showed that although the storytelling group outperformed the reading aloud group in story retelling and the reading aloud group outperformed the storytelling group in the development of a wordless picture book story, both storytelling and reading aloud played an important role in providing learners with comprehensible input. Storytelling and reading aloud are fun and motivating tasks, providing learners with a clear understanding of their meanings.

Hsu, Huang, Hsu and Lin (2014) did a six-week study with 59 grade 6 learners to investigate the effectiveness of using a web-based multimedia system in the development of EFL learning, including speaking skills. The participants were divided into two groups: one experimental ($n=30$) and one control group ($n=29$) and attended three one-hour EFL classes on a weekly basis. Additionally, the participants of both groups were exposed to the same types of tasks and language content, delivered by the same instructor. In the first three weeks of the study, the participants of both groups performed warming-up and individual storytelling activities. The warming-up activities were intended to contextualize the lessons and get the participants engaged with them. After performing the warming-up activities, all the participants were provided with pictures and asked to create stories on their own, based on the pictures they had received. Then, from week 4 to week 6, however, the participants were asked to create stories in groups, interacting with their classmates. Here, the participants of the experimental group used a web-based multimedia system that offered them a range of different digital resources to help them create their stories, as well as online EFL speaking environment where students could practice their speaking skills. On the other hand, the participants of the control group could only use pen and paper to create their stories. According to Hwang et al. (2014), post-test results showed that the experimental group outperformed the control group, suggesting that the use of digital storytelling activities enhanced learners' speaking skills. Nonetheless, the study by Hwang et al. have shown some important methodological inconsistencies, such as the lack of specifics on what speaking skills were improved, for instance and no recording of the speaking performance of the participants of the control group. In fact, the study does not even make it clear what criteria were

adopted to compare the speaking performance of the participants of the experimental and control groups.

2.3.5 The effectiveness of storytelling: Some conclusions. Clearly, there is a large range of literature in the field that addresses the impact of storytelling on L2 learners. Although the studies reviewed here show similarities and differences in the way they investigate the role of storytelling in developing L2 speaking skills, some common threads can be seen across the findings of studies that differ in the way they explore storytelling, such as the importance of encouraging learners to actively participate in the language learning process by not only listening to stories but also by discussing them and telling their own stories in class. Learners' active participation in storytelling activities is held to help them develop their language skills in L2. Notwithstanding the fact that there are a considerable number of empirical studies that claim that storytelling plays an important role in the development of L2 learners' language skills, including pronunciation, few of them have investigated the relationship between storytelling and the enhancement of L2 pronunciation. As previously mentioned, a number of studies claim that storytelling has an effect on pronunciation production (i.e., Cary, 1998; Kim & McGarry, 2014; Motallebi & Pourgharib, 2013). For instance, Motallebi & Pourgharib state that "using audio-stories can help learners improve their pronunciation and speaking skill" (p. 5). However, such studies lack specific information about what pronunciation areas, exactly, are improved by the use of storytelling activities in the L2 classroom.

2.4 Rationale for the Current Study

Although there are a number of studies in the literature that suggest that storytelling improves learners' speaking skills, including pronunciation (e.g., Afrilyasanti and Basthomi, 2011; Cary, 1998; Hsu, 2010; Kim & McGarry, 2014; Zare-Behatash, Saed and Sajjadi, 2016; Motallebi & Pourgharib, 2013), in general, they do not provide evidence on what pronunciation areas, exactly, are benefited by the use of storytelling, making its claimed effectiveness on pronunciation development questionable. This study fills such gap in the literature by investigating the effectiveness of storytelling on specific segmental (i.e., /t/; /i/ and /θ/; /ð/) and suprasegmental (i.e., syllable stress) features.

Moreover, the studies in the literature generally do not provide any information on how learners perceive the effectiveness of storytelling and textbook activities in the development of pronunciation, to identify strengths and weaknesses in the use of storytelling and textbook activities for pronunciation improvement purposes and/or determine how similar learners' perceptions are to the actual impact of such activities. This study fills such gap in the literature through attitude and evaluation questionnaires.

To this end, this study investigates the effectiveness of storytelling activities in the improvement of pronunciation by examining its effects on specific segmental (i.e., /t/; /i/ and /θ/; /ð/) and suprasegmental (i.e., word stress) features that are reported to be difficult for Brazilian learners of English to pronounce and to hinder intelligibility, as previously discussed in section 2.2.1.1. It also compares them to textbook activities, which are considered to be effective pedagogical tools in the development of language skills, in general and are widely used in English classes in Brazil (e.g., Consolo, 1990; Urió & Xavier, 2006) to find out whether it is advantageous to incorporate storytelling

activities into EFL/ESL classes for pronunciation development purposes and also whether they are more effective than textbook activities.

This study does not only examine learners' performance in terms of production, but also in terms of perception, as researchers widely agree that pronunciation development involves the production of utterances as well as one's ability to perceive differences in meaning that utterances carry, depending on the manner they are pronounced, for instance (e.g., Celce-Murcia et al., 2010; Council of Europe, 2001; Cruttenden, 2008).

2.5 Research Questions

1. What is the effect of storytelling on the accuracy of pronunciation perception and production of segmental (i.e., /l:/i/ and /θ/; /ð/) and suprasegmental (i.e., syllable stress) features by Brazilian learners of English?
2. How do storytelling activities compare to EFL/ESL textbook activities in their effectiveness?
3. What is the Brazilian learners' perception about the usefulness and relevance of storytelling activities as compared to textbook activities for the improvement of the targeted features?

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODS

3.1 The Methods

This study used quantitative and qualitative research methods, including quantitative and qualitative data. The quantitative method statistically investigated the effect of storytelling on pronunciation improvement and compared the use of storytelling and textbook text activities in effectiveness. The qualitative method investigated the participants' perceptions about the relevance and usefulness of storytelling (i.e., experimental group) and textbook text (i.e., comparison group) activities in the improvement of pronunciation.

3.2 The Participants

Eighty-six beginner EFL learners who were 15 years of age and older, born and raised in Brazil, voluntarily participated in this study. As previously mentioned in Section 1.1, the rationale for recruiting beginner learners relies on the fact that there has been an increasing interest and demand for basic English instruction in Brazil lately, mainly from adolescents and adults who look for job opportunities to work in international events hosted in the country, such as the last World Cup in 2014, Rock concerts and the Rio 2016 Olympic Games, to mention a few (Amorin, 2012; Friedrich, 2000; Sugete, 2012).

3.2.1 The recruitment process. After Ethics approval was granted, the learners were invited to participate in this study and informed about the pre-requisites necessary

to participate, the time they would need to dedicate to it and the activities to be performed by the participants of the experimental, comparison and control groups. Lastly, the learners were informed that, if they accepted the invitation, they would be randomly selected to their groups.

Since English classes in Brazilian regular schools normally have learners of different English proficiency levels (Divitiis, 2013; Miccoli, 2007), it was necessary to ensure that all the 93 initially recruited participants were at beginner level. To do so, they were initially asked to self-assess their English proficiency level, by referring to the “Common European Framework of Reference” (CEFR) self-assessment grid. Despite the fact that all of the participants classified themselves as beginner learners (i.e., A1/A2 levels), they were also required to take the written and oral *English Unlimited* placement tests, published by Cambridge University Press, to confirm their English proficiency level. The tests cover five CEFR levels (e.g., A1, A2, B1, B2, C1).

The written test comprised 120 multiple-choice items on grammar and vocabulary at A1 (Starter), A2 (beginner), B1 (Pre-Intermediate), B1-B2 (Intermediate), B2 (Upper-Intermediate) and C1 (Advanced) levels. The potential participants were allowed a maximum of 40 minutes to do the test and told to stop doing the test when the questions became too difficult for them to answer, as advised by the teacher’s guide instructions for the placement test. Table 1 provides a summary of the written test scores and their respective English proficiency levels.

Table 1 *Written test scores and provisional proficiency level placement*

Starter	beginner	Pre-intermediate	Intermediate	Upper-intermediate	Advanced
---------	----------	------------------	--------------	--------------------	----------

Written test score	0-15	16-35	36-55	56-75	76-95	96+
--------------------	------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-----

Retrieved from www.cambridge.es/.../EU_PlacementTest_TeachersGuide.pdf

According to Table 1, only those participants who answered a maximum of 35 items correctly were classified as beginner learners and, therefore, were eligible to participate in this study. Out of the 93 potential participants, 91 of them were able to answer up to item number 33 of the test correctly; one participant answered up to item 46 correctly and another one stopped doing the test at item 65. In sum, 91 participants were provisionally eligible to participate in this study, as they were placed at beginner level.

The oral test consisted of a total of 30 interview questions, divided into five questions for each CEFR level. Each of the 93 participants was interviewed individually and initially asked introductory questions such as “what’s your name?”, “how do you spell your surname?”, “where are you from?”, as suggested by the teacher’s guide, followed by four to five questions for each of the six CEFR levels and were encouraged to give full answers to the questions. The participants were awarded a score for each question they answered, based on the band descriptors below, from English Unlimited Placement test.

Table 2 Band descriptors for the oral test and criteria for defining the participants' level

1. Band descriptors	Score
Insufficient sample of spoken language. Student fails to understand question, even when repeated.	0
Evidence of understanding at a basic level, but frequent inaccuracies in grammar and vocabulary may obscure the message. Significant hesitation and inaccuracies in pronunciation impede understanding. Utterances left unextended.	1
Clear evidence of comprehension. Grammar and vocabulary sufficient to convey intended meaning and extended answers effectively. Utterances are reasonably relevant and coherent with only occasional hesitation. However, complex vocabulary and grammatical structures are avoided (except in obviously well-rehearsed utterances).	2
Questions fully understood. Accurate and appropriate use of a range of simple and complex grammatical forms and vocabulary to develop responses fully. Utterances intelligible and linked coherently and logically without undue hesitation.	3
2. Place the student as follows:	
Oral score	Level
Mainly 1s	One level below written score
Mainly 2s	At same level as written score
Mainly 3s	One level above written score

Retrieved from www.cambridge.es/.../EU_PlacementTest_TeachersGuide.pdf

Out of the 93 potential participants interviewed, 79 of them (84.9%) were unable to answer the five initial questions of the test (i.e., A1 level questions). Moreover, only 14 participants (15.1%) were able to answer all the five A1 questions but part of A2 questions properly. The two participants who had been placed in the written test as being at a higher level than beginner answered the beginner questions (i.e., A1/A2 questions) easily and were able to answer up to the pre-intermediate/intermediate questions of the oral test satisfactorily (i.e., B1/B2), confirming they were not eligible to participate in the study.

In sum, 91 participants were classified as beginner and started to participate in the study, although only 86 of them attended all the phases of the study. Samples of the written and oral tests are available in Appendix B.

The participants who did not participate in the study, either because they were not beginner learners or because they did not want to, were provided with an alternative classwork activity. The school offered them the possibility to attend regular English classes, doing review activities, under the supervision of their regular English teacher, at the same time the experimental sessions took place. Moreover, all the potential participants were clearly informed that if they decided not to participate in the study, they would not be penalized for their decision. Those who decided to participate in the study clearly understood they had the right to withdraw from the experimental sessions at any time, without consequences or penalty of any kind.

3.2.2 The participants' background. After the participants were recruited, they were asked to fill out a background questionnaire, which took place in the first week of the experiment. Since the learners were at beginner level, to ensure they clearly understood what they were supposed to do, the questions of the questionnaire were offered in English and in Portuguese. A sample of the questionnaire is available in Appendix C.

The questionnaire consisted of ten questions and was answered by all the participating learners of the experimental, comparison and control groups. Table 3 shows the answers of the participants. The percentual figures provided correspond to the total of 86 participants of this study.

Table 3 Background questionnaire and the participants' answers

	The participants' answers		
	Experimental group (n=28)	Comparison group (n=29)	Control group (n =29)
1. Identification			
2. Age group			
Between 15 and 16 years of age	28	28	25
19+ years of age	0	1	4
3. Where born and raised			
In Brazil	28	29	29
Elsewhere	0	0	0
4. Length of English studies			
5 years	11	8	9
6 years	8	12	9
7 years	9	9	11
5. Attend an English course?			
Yes	1	0	1
No	27	29	28
6. Been to an English-speaking country before?			
Yes	0	0	0
No	28	29	29
7. Is it important to learn English?			
Yes and reasons	28	28	29
to get a good job	22	23	20
English is the mostly spoken language in the world	2	2	2
English helps understand songs and movies	1	0	4
English enables us to communicate with foreigners	1	0	1
English is an important language	2	3	2
No and reason	0	1	0
English is boring			
8. What skills are...			
a) The most important?			
Speaking	25	23	24
Grammar	3	3	5
Listening	0	3	0
b) The easiest?			
Writing	11	13	10
Reading	11	12	10
Grammar	3	0	5

Speaking	2	2	2
Listening	1	2	2
c) the most difficult?			
Speaking	18	16	8
Listening	10	2	9
Writing	4	6	5
<hr/>			
9. Pronunciation course?			
Yes	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
No	<u>28</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>29</u>
<hr/>			
10. How do you feel when you speak English in class?			
Like it and always try to	7	5	9
Like it but always avoid it	0	3	0
don't mind doing it and always try to	14	11	8
don't mind doing it but always avoid it	0	4	6
prefer not to speak it but always try to	1	2	0
prefer not to speak it and always avoid it	5	4	5
don't like it but always try to	0	0	0
don't like it and always avoid it	1	0	1

Note: N=86

3.3 Data Collection Procedures

The participants were randomly divided into three groups: an experimental, a comparison and a control group. The experimental group performed storytelling activities, the comparison group performed textbook text activities and the control group received no treatment at all. As previously mentioned, although the study started with a total of 91 participants, it ended with a total of 86 participants, as five participants missed some of the experimental sessions and, consequently, had to be dismissed of the study. There were 28 participants in the experimental group, 29 participants in the comparison group and 29 participants in the control group.

3.3.1 The procedures for the experimental and the comparison groups. The experimental (i.e., storytelling) and comparison (i.e., textbook text) groups performed three weekly classroom activities of 25 minutes long each. Data were collected at “Colégio Cenecista Alberto Torres” private school, henceforth known as “CCAT”, from October 20th (i.e., Placement Tests) until November 28th 2014 (i.e., Session 12).

Table 4 outlines the activities performed by the three participating groups and the dates of the performed activities. The sequence of the pronunciation features, as presented, were expected to go from the least difficult to the most difficult ones for the participants to pronounce intelligibly.

Table 4 *Outline of the activities performed by all the participants*

October 20 th -30 th		Placement test		
Experimental Sessions				
Classroom Sessions (from November 3 rd to November 26 th)	Experimental Group (<i>n</i> =28) (Storytelling)	Comparison Group (<i>n</i> =29) (Textbook)	Control Group (<i>n</i> =29) (No Treatment)	
Session 1 – November 3 rd (week 1)	Pre-tests (1-4). Background questionnaire – was assigned for homework and returned on November 5 th .			
	25 minutes of class	25 minutes of class	No class	
Session 2 – November 5 th (Week 1)	Collection of Background questionnaire. Storytelling activities that focused on /I/ and /i/ sounds.	Collection of Background questionnaire. Reading, listening and reading aloud activities that focused on /I/ and /i/ sounds	Collection of Background questionnaire.	
Session 3 – November 7 th (week 1)	Storytelling activities that focused on /I/ and /i/ sounds.	Reading, listening and reading aloud activities that focused on /I/ and /i/ sounds.	Performed reading activities, which did not involve English, at the school library	

Session 4 – November 10 th (week 2)	Storytelling activities that focused on /ɪ/ and /i/ sounds. Attitude questionnaire	Reading, listening and reading aloud activities that focused on /ɪ/ and /i/ sounds Attitude questionnaire	Performed reading activities, which did not involve English, at the school library
Session 5 – November 12 th (week 2)	Storytelling activities that focused on /ð/ and /θ/sounds.	Reading, listening and reading aloud activities that focused on /ð/ and /θ/sounds.	Performed reading activities, which did not involve English, at the school library
Session 6 – November 14 th (week 2)	Storytelling activities that focused on /ð/ and /θ/sounds.	Reading, listening and reading aloud activities that focused on /ð/ and /θ/sounds.	Performed reading activities, which did not involve English, at the school library
Session 7 – November 17 th (week 3)	Storytelling activities that focus on /ð/ and /θ/sounds. Attitude questionnaire.	Reading, listening and reading aloud activities that focused on /ð/ and /θ/sounds. Attitude questionnaire.	Performed reading activities, which did not involve English, at the school library
Session 8 – November 19 th (week 3)	Storytelling activities that focused on word stress.	Reading, listening and reading aloud activities that focused on word stress.	Performed reading activities, which did not involve English, at the school library
Session 9 – November 21 st (week 3)	Storytelling activities that focused on word stress.	Reading, listening and reading aloud activities that focused on word stress.	Performed reading activities, which did not involve English, at the school library
Session 10 – November 24 th (week 4)	Storytelling activities that focused on word stress. Attitude questionnaire.	Reading, listening and reading aloud activities that focused on word stress. Attitude questionnaire	Performed reading activities, which did not involve English, at the school library
Session 11 – November 26 th (week 4)	Post-tests (1-4)	Post-tests (1-4)	Performed reading activities, which did not involve English, at the school library
Session 12 – November 28 th (week 4)	Evaluation questionnaire	Evaluation questionnaire	Performed reading activities, which did not involve English, at the school library

Note: N=86.

3.3.1.1 *The activities performed by the experimental group.* Each classroom session consisted of seven activities. In activity 1, the participants did a contextualization activity to get familiarized with the topic/theme of the story they would be working on. They were asked to look at five to ten story pictures, taken from Ligon and Tannenbaum (1990), as well as from Ligon, Tannenbaum and Rodgers (1992) and try to guess what the story they would work on was all about. Although the participants were encouraged to speak as much English as possible, since they are beginner learners, they were allowed to speak Portuguese in this contextualization activity. Then, in activity 2, the participants listened to the story. In activity 3, they listened to phrases from the story and then numbered the set of pictures according to the sequence of phrases they heard. In activity 4, the participants were asked to compare their numbered sequence of pictures with their partners, in pairs and, in activity 5, the participants checked their sequence with their teacher and then with their class as a whole and, in activity 6, they listened to the story one more time and followed it (reading it silently). Lastly, in activity 7, they read the story aloud and recorded it through “Praat” computer software package, for assessment purposes. Samples of the storytelling activities are available in Appendix D.

3.3.1.2 *The activities performed by the comparison group.* The participants in the comparison group performed textbook activities, provided by Wilson (2011). The book provides learners with activities for the development of receptive (i.e., listening and reading) and productive (i.e., speaking and writing) language skills, was designed for beginner learners of English as L2 and offers texts on different topics. Each classroom session consisted of three to four activities. In activity 1, the participants performed a contextualization activity, by studying the illustrations corresponding to the textbook

texts and/or their titles and trying to predict what the text they would read was all about. The aim here was to get the participants familiarized with the topic/theme of the text they would be reading. Afterwards, in activity 2, the participants listened to the text and followed it, by reading the text silently. In activity 3, the participants did some vocabulary and reading comprehension activities individually and, in activity 4, they compared their answers in pairs. Then, in activity 5, the vocabulary and comprehension activities were with the class as a whole. In activity 6, the textbook text was read aloud a second time and the participants followed it, like in activity 2. Lastly, the participants read the textbook text aloud and recorded it for assessment purposes. Further details about the textbook activities are available in Appendix E.

Table 5 summarizes the structure and sequence of classroom activities performed by the experimental and comparison groups in each experimental session. Each class is divided into two different stages.

Table 5 *Sequence of classroom activities performed by the experimental and comparison groups in the experimental sessions*

Experimental Group ($n=28$)	Comparison Group ($n=29$)
Stage 1: Story comprehension and listening	Stage 1: Textbook text comprehension and listening
1. Contextualization: the participants are initially asked to look at the story pictures and try to guess what the story they will be working on is about. The idea here is to help the participants get familiarized with the topic/theme of the story they will be working on in the session.	1. Contextualization: the participants are initially asked to look at the picture and title of the textbook text and try to guess what the text they will be working on is about (i.e., “Before You Read” activity). The idea here is to help the participants get familiarized with the topic/theme of the textbook text they will be working on in the session.
2. The story is read aloud to the participants.	2. The text is read aloud to the participants, who read it silently.
3. The participants work on comprehension.	3. The participants work on comprehension.
4. The participants compare their answers in pairs.	4. The participants compare their answers in pairs.

5. The participants' answers are checked with the class as a whole and their comprehension doubts, if any, are clarified.	5. The participants' answers are checked with the class as a whole and their comprehension doubts, if any, are clarified.
6. The story is read aloud one more time.	6. The textbook text is read aloud one more time.
Stage 2: Speaking - Pronunciation of target features	Stage 2: Speaking - Pronunciation of target features
7. Reading aloud: the participants read aloud the story and record it, for pronunciation assessment purposes.	7. Reading aloud: the participants read aloud the textbook text and record it, for pronunciation assessment purposes.

Note: $N=86$.

The story and textbook text of each classroom session had the same target words, which are the same ones found in the pre-tests and post-tests. Furthermore, the stories and the textbook texts used in each session have the same level of readability, as verified by *Flesch-Kincaid Reading Ease* scores (<https://readable.io/text/>). The results of the readability analysis are provided in Table 6.

Table 6 Results of the *Flesch-Kincaid reading ease* analysis

Session	Story	Textbook Text
2	82.1	83.9
3	76.8	74.8
4	81.9	78.1
5	85.6	91.1
6	86.4	89.8
7	86.3	84.2
8	71.0	69.3
9	89.6	93.5
10	76.3	75.6

According to *Flesch-Kincaid Reading Ease* readability analysis, a score between 70 and 80 indicates that the text is fairly easy to read and the higher the score is, the easier the text is to read (<https://readable.io/content/the-flesch-reading-ease-and-flesch-kincaid-grade-level/>).

3.3.2 Testing

3.3.2.1 Pre-tests. The participants took four different pre-tests: two pre-tests on sound perception (i.e., pre-tests 1A, 1B and 2) and two pre-tests on sound production (i.e., pre-tests 3A, 3B and 4). Pre-tests 1A and 1B tested the participants' ability to perceive segments /ɪ/-/i/ and /ð/-/θ/, respectively and pre-test 2 tested the participants' ability to perceive syllable stress by listening to a set of 20 multi-syllable words that spelled similarly or the same as their counterparts in BP but differed in syllable stress. For each word they heard, they were asked to mark the alternative that showed the syllable receiving the main stress. Pre-tests 3A and 3B tested the participants' ability to produce segments /ɪ/-/i/ and /ð/-/θ/, respectively and pre-test 4 tested the participants' ability to produce syllable stress. The first perception pre-test involved ten minimal pairs containing /ɪ/ and /i/ (i.e., pre-test 1A) and ten minimal pairs containing /ð/ and /θ/ (i.e., pre-test 1B). In this pre-test, the participants were asked to listen to a recording of a native speaker of English reading aloud a word for each minimal pair and then mark, in their test sheet, the word they heard in each pair. The two remaining pre-tests (i.e., pre-tests 3 and 4) tested the participants' ability to pronounce the target sounds of this study comprehensibly. In pre-test 3A, the participants were asked to read aloud and record a set of ten words containing /ɪ/ and /i/ vowel sounds and, then, in pre-test 3B, they were asked to read aloud and record another set of ten words containing /ð/ and /θ/ consonant sounds (i.e., pre-test 3). Likewise, in pre-test 4, they were asked to read aloud and record a set of 20 words that spelled similarly to BP words but differed in syllable stress.

3.3.2.2 Post-tests. At the end of this classroom study, in session 11, all the three participating groups (i.e., experimental, comparison and control) took post-tests. The data

collected in the post-tests played a significant role in this study, as they showed whether exposing the participants to treatment (i.e., through storytelling activities (Experimental group) and textbook activities (Comparison group) had an effect on their pronunciation performance, in terms of both perception and production skills. Furthermore, the post-tests showed how the mediums used in this study (i.e., stories and textbook texts) compared in efficiency. In terms of format and content, the words in the post-tests are exactly the same as in the pre-tests. These tests only differ in the sequence the words are presented.

The stimuli for the perception and production pre-tests/post-tests have been adapted from pronunciation the books by Celce-Murcia et al. (2010) and Gilbert (2005), and samples of such tests are available in Appendix F. Their limitations, such as the fact that not all contrast words used in the minimal-pair perception tests 1A and 1B (i.e., /ɪ/-/i/ vowel and /ð/-/θ/ consonant sounds) were included in the stories and textbook activities, are discussed later on this study.

3.3.2.3 The scoring of the perception (i.e., pre-tests and posttests 1A/B and 2) and production (i.e., pre-tests and post-tests 3A, 3B and 4) tests. The

participants' performance in the sound perception and the pronunciation production tests is scored differently. For the perception tests, a percentage number of participants who score each test item correctly is calculated for each group (i.e., experimental, comparison and control groups). In the production tests three native English speakers familiar with BP native speakers' English accent rank the participants' level of pronunciation comprehensibility, using a five-point scale adapted from Yates (2003), as shown in Table 8. Raters 1 and 2 were Canadian and have always lived with BP native speakers in

Canada. Rater 3 was born and lived in the state of Iowa, in the United States. She moved to Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, at the age of 15. She has extensive experience hearing -BP native speakers speaking English; mainly from the period when she did not master the Portuguese language and needed to communicate in English orally with Brazilians.

Production pre-tests/post-tests 3A and 3B consist of 10 items each and pre-test/post-test 4 of 20 items. Since the highest score in the pronunciation production of each word is 5 points, pre-tests/post-tests 3A and 3B total a maximum of 50 points each per participant, whereas pre-test/post-test 4 total a maximum of 100 points. If we take into account the number of participants of each group, the maximum sum of scores of the experimental group totals 1,400 points in pre-tests/post-tests 3A and B and 2,800 points in pre-test/post-test 4. All the percent figures regarding production performance in the tests are based on the above sums of scores (i.e., ranked/ordinal data). The rating scales adopted in this study are described in Table 7.

Table 7 *Rating scales adapted from Yates (2003)*

Band	Pronunciation
5	Extremely easy to understand.
4	Easy to understand.
3	Somewhat understandable.
2	Very difficult to understand.
1	Impossible to understand.

Furthermore, to avoid an order effect problem in the production scoring and consequently increase the reliability of the assessment process, the audio files were randomized by “File Order Randomizer” software program.

3.3.2.4 Reliability of the tests. Intra-class correlation coefficient (ICC) analyses were conducted to evaluate the consistency across the three raters for the mean scores of

the participants' production of the words of each of the three, three-session-groups (i.e., group 1 (sessions 2, 3 and 4 - /v/ and /i/); group 2 (sessions 5, 6 and 7- /ð/; /θ/); group 3 (sessions 8, 9 and 10– syllable stress). Values higher than .70 indicate consistency among the raters (Thomas, 2017), as reported in Table 8.

Table 8 *Intraclass Coefficient Correlation (ICC) for all groups in the pronunciation production pre-tests and post-tests*

	Experimental Group (n=28)	Comparison Group (n=29)	Control Group (n=29)	Experimental Group (n=28)	Comparison Group (n=29)	Control Group (n=29)
	Pre-test			Post-test		
Tests	ICC	ICC	ICC	ICC	ICC	ICC
3A - /v/ and /i/	0.80	0.83	0.78	0.83	0.78	0.77
3B - /ð/ and /θ/	0.86	0.89	0.78	0.85	0.88	0.79
4 – Stress	0.87	0.89	0.89	0.80	0.83	0.89

Note: N=86.

The ICC mean values provided in Table 8 show a strong consistency among the raters in all tests and in all the three groups, as they were all higher than .70.

3.3.2.5 The scoring of production in the classroom sessions. The three raters who assessed the participants' pronunciation production in the pre-tests and post-tests also assessed their production in the classroom sessions (i.e., Sessions 2 to 10; Table 6), through recordings. By the end of the sessions, all the participants read aloud and recorded stories (i.e., experimental group) and textbook texts (i.e., comparison group).

From session 2 to 4 (i.e., /v/ and /i/), as well as from session 5 to 7 (i.e., (/θ/; /ð/), the participants of the experimental and comparison groups were assessed in the production of 10 target words, totaling a score of 50 possible points (i.e., a maximum of 5 points per word x 10 words) in each session group. From session 8 to 10 (i.e., stress),

they were assessed in the production of 20 words, totaling 100 points. Both groups were assessed in the production of the same target words, which were also found in the tests.

3.3.3 The questionnaires. In order to address the research question 3, the participants of the experimental and comparison groups were asked to answer three quantitative attitude questionnaires and one qualitative evaluation questionnaire.

3.3.3.1 The attitude questionnaires. The first questionnaire is about the participants' experience in classroom sessions 2 to 4 (i.e., /t/ and /i/) and was answered at the end of session 4. The second one is about their experience in classroom sessions 5, 6 and 7 (i.e., /ð/-/θ/) and is answered at the end of session 7. The third is about their experience in classroom sessions 8, 9 and 10 (i.e., word stress) and is answered at the end of session 10. The questionnaire statements are provided by Table 9. Each questionnaire consists of five statements and the participants are asked to choose from five Likert Scale alternatives (i.e., 1 - *Disagree*; 2 *Partially disagree*; 3- *Neither agree nor disagree*; 4 - *Somewhat agree*; 5 - *Agree*). Higher scores mean higher levels of positive attitude toward the intervention.

Table 9 *Attitude questionnaire statements for the experimental and comparison groups*

	Experimental Group (n=28)	Comparison Group (n=29)
Statement 1	I listened to very interesting stories.	I listened to very interesting textbook texts.
Statement 2	The themes of the stories and/or their follow-up activities encouraged me to participate more actively in the classroom oral activities.	The themes of the textbook texts and/or their follow-up activities encouraged me to participate more actively in the classroom oral activities.

Statement 3	I think the stories I listened to and/or their follow-up activities helped me improve my English pronunciation.	I think that the textbook text activities helped me improve my English pronunciation.
Statement 4	I believe that storytelling activities are an effective tool for pronunciation learning/development.	I believe that textbook text activities are an effective tool for pronunciation learning/development.
Statement 5	I would love to work on storytelling activities, like the ones I was exposed to during the experimental sessions, again in future classes.	I would love to work on textbook text activities, like the ones I was exposed to during the experimental sessions, again in future classes.

Note: $N=86$.

In order to assess how similar the evaluation of the experimental and comparison groups is for each three-session group, a set of *Mann-Whitney* tests is performed.

3.3.3.2 The evaluation questionnaire. In the last experimental session (i.e., Session 12), the participants of the experimental and comparison groups answered an evaluation questionnaire, which aimed to qualitatively detail the quantitative answers that are provided by the attitude questionnaires. It consisted of seven open-ended questions on the effectiveness of the classroom activities in the improvement of their pronunciation. In the questionnaire, the participants were encouraged to provide detailed information about their evaluation of the activities they had been exposed to in the classroom sessions, as a whole.

The questionnaire data were content-analyzed using Bardin's (1977) techniques, which basically consist of 1) pre-analysis, 2) exploration of material and 3) treatment of results. Initially, all the participants' answers to each questionnaire item were carefully read, hand coded according to their themes and then put under their corresponding

categories (i.e., “Yes”, “Yes but not much”, “No”; “those who liked storytelling”). In addition, the analyses of the answers followed a logical sequence (i.e., from general to more specific answers). The answers were then quantified (i.e., number of participants who answered each of them) and qualitatively compared (i.e., experimental vs. comparison groups, to mention a few), before conclusions were drawn. The evaluation questionnaire for the experimental and comparison groups is available in Appendix G.

3.4 The Statistical Tests

Aiming to address the research questions 1 and 2, a set of descriptive and inferential statistical tests were conducted for the analyses of the participants’ performance in the pronunciation perception and production tests, classroom activities and quantitative attitude questionnaires. Nonparametric statistical tests such as *Mann-Whitney*, *Kruskal-Wallis* and *Wilcoxon* tests were used because the participants’ production scores consisted of ordinal data (i.e., pronunciation ranking, through a five-point scale). *Friedman’s two-way ANOVA* was used to compare ordinal data from the same population under three or more different conditions (Tavakoli, 2012). *Mann-Whitney* was used for the comparison of data involving ordinal scale of two independent groups, while *Kruskal-Wallis* was applied to test more than two independent groups (Brown, 1998; Lowie & Seton, 2013). Lastly, *Wilcoxon* test was used to test samples of the same individual at different points in time, such as in pre-tests and post-tests (Elliot & Woodward, 2007; Makeig & Nielsen, 2006). *Kruskal-Wallis* test was used to evaluate the extent to which the experimental, comparison and control groups were similar in pre-tests 1A, 1B and pre-test 2, in order to ensure that all groups had the same levels in the pre-tests and, thus, that differences found in the pre-test and post-test evaluations were due to

the intervention and not to initial differences in the groups. *Wilcoxon* signed rank tests were conducted to compare the groups' performances in the pre-tests and post-tests 1A, 1B and 2. Lastly, *Mann-Whitney* test analyzed the effectiveness of storytelling and textbook activities in enhancing pronunciation in the classroom sessions. For this analysis, the control group was excluded, as it received no intervention.

For all significant results, effect size estimates were computed, in order to inform which group presented higher differences between the pre-tests and post-tests. Effect size is a quantitative measure of the strength of the obtained differences. The method which was adopted to calculate its values was proposed by Field (2009), where Z (the test value) is divided by the square root of the total sample size (i.e., N). Effect size range can be interpreted as follows: "small effect" ($\leq .3$), "medium effect" ($.3 < \text{Effect} \leq .5$) and "large effect" ($> .5$) (Field, 2010).

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSES AND RESULTS: QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE DATA

This chapter is divided into two sections. The first one compares the pronunciation scores of the experimental, comparison and control groups in the pre-tests, post-tests and in the experimental sessions. The aim of this session is to evaluate 1) whether storytelling activities (experimental group) played a role in improving the participants' pronunciation and 2) how storytelling and textbook activities compare in effectiveness in improving pronunciation. In order to assure the results, both experimental and comparison groups are compared to a control group, which received no intervention. The second section evaluates how the participants perceived the intervention process. For this purpose, quantitative and qualitative research methods were implemented, as participants of the experimental and comparison groups answered quantitative attitude questionnaires and a semi-structured qualitative evaluation questionnaire.

4.1 Impact of the Treatments on Pronunciation Perception and Production

4.1.1 Results

4.1.1.1 Perception tests. Initially, *Kruskal-Wallis* test evaluated the extent to which experimental, control and comparison groups were similar in pre-tests 1A, 1B and pre-test 2, as demonstrated by the Table 10.

Table 10 *Kruskal-Wallis comparison between the comparison, control and experimental groups in the perception pre-tests 1A, 1B and 2*

	<i>Group</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean Rank</i>	<i>Kruskal-Wallis</i>	<i>p-value</i>
Pre-test 1A (/ɪ/; /i/)	Comparison	29	6.03	0.82	44.09	0.28	0.87
	Control	29	6.00	1.07	44.76		
	Experimental	28	5.93	0.77	41.59		
Pre-test 1B (/ð/; /θ/)	Comparison	29	7.00	1.16	43.83	0.88	0.65
	Control	29	7.03	1.15	46.21		
	Experimental	28	6.89	0.74	40.36		
Pre-test 2 (Stress)	Comparison	29	13.62	1.95	43.41	0.85	0.63
	Control	29	13.41	2.06	40.59		
	Experimental	28	13.86	1.88	46.61		

Note: $N=86$.

As can be seen in Table 10, no significant differences were found in the three groups, attesting their initial equivalence. Then, *Wilcoxon* signed rank tests were conducted to compare the groups' performances in the pre-tests and post-tests 1A, 1B and 2, as shown in Table 11. According to the table, in pre-test and post-test 1A, both the comparison and experimental groups presented higher scores in the post-test when compared to the pre-test, which means that they perceived more words accurately in the post-tests. Effect size analyses showed that the impact of textbook activities on the development of /ɪ/ and /i/ target sounds was greater in the comparison group than in the experimental group.

As for pre-test and post-test 1B, significant differences were found only for the comparison group, which presented higher scores in the post-test when compared to the pre-test, indicating that the comparison group improved their perception of interdental fricative sounds. Lastly, in pre-test and post-test 2A no significant difference was found in any of the groups. All significant results presented low effect size.

Table 11 Wilcoxon signed rank test for all groups in the perception pre-tests and post-tests

Tests	Groups		Pre-tests		Post-tests		Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test				
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Sum of negative ranks	Sum of positive ranks	Test value	p-value	Effect Size
1A (/v/; /i/)	Comparison	(n=29)	6.03	0.82	6.28	0.84	0.00	28.00	-2,646	0.008	0.29
	Control	(n=29)	6.00	1.07	6.03	1.02	4.00	6.00	-0.378	0.705	--
	Experimental	(n=28)	5.93	0.77	6.36	.95	30.00	123.00	-2,358	0.018	0.26
1B (/ð/; /θ/)	Comparison	(n=29)	7.00	1.16	7.21	1.18	4.50	31.50	-2,121	0.034	0.23
	Control	(n=29)	7.03	1.15	7.10	1.20	2.50	3.33	-0.707	0.480	--
	Experimental	(n=28)	6.89	0.74	7.21	0.96	0.00	0.00	-1,856	0.063	--
2 (Stress)	Comparison	(n=29)	13.62	1.95	13.90	2.08	26.50	78.50	-1,761	0.078	--
	Control	(n=29)	13.41	2.06	13.41	2.08	40.50	112.50	0.000	1,000	--
	Experimental	(n=28)	13.86	1.88	14.07	1.74	26.00	65.00	-1,500	0.134	--

Notes: N=86. Negative test values indicate a higher number of positive ranks (i.e., Post-test > Pre-test; Field & Hole, 2003)
 Effect sizes values were only reported in comparisons where significant difference (i.e., $p < 0.05$) between pre-tests and post-tests was found.

Finally, in Table 11, although the mean values of the comparison and experimental groups in pre-test and post-test 1A as well as the mean values of the comparison group in pre-test and post-test 1B are similar, significant differences (i.e., $p < 0.05$) were found between these groups. This occurred because non-parametric tests (e.g., *Kruskal-Wallis* and *Wilcoxon signed-rank test*) do not rely on mean values to calculate significance level but on rank and/or sum of ranks, instead (e.g., Field, 2009; Freund, Mohr, & Wilson, 2010).

4.1.1.2 Production tests. Descriptive and inferential results of the production performance of the participants in the pre-tests and post-tests are reported in Table 12. The maximum score possible for each participant in pre-test/post-test 3A or 3B is 50 points (i.e., 10 items x maximum score of 5 points in the production of each word) and in pre-test/post-test 4 is 100 points (i.e., 20 items x maximum score of 5 points in the production of each word).

Table 12 *Descriptive and inferential statistics of the performance of the experimental, comparison and control groups in the production pre-tests*

	<i>Group</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean Rank</i>	<i>Kruskal-Wallis</i>	<i>p-value</i>
Pre-test 3A (/ɪ/; /i/)	Experimental	28	35.11	1.82	55.30	5,327	0.070
	Comparison	29	33.51	2.75	37.38		
	Control	29	33.59	2.15	38.22		
Pre-test 3B (/ð/; /θ/)	Experimental	28	26.38	3.28	44.63	0.173	0.917
	Comparison	29	26.42	3.32	43.93		
	Control	29	25.77	2.20	41.98		
Pre-test 4 (Stress)	Experimental	28	72.34	4.94	49.64	4,860	0.088
	Comparison	29	71.68	3.93	45.55		
	Control	29	69.75	4.51	35.52		

Note: $N=86$.

According to Table 12, no significant difference was found among the groups, as the *p-values* in all production pre-tests were greater than 0.05. In order to address research questions 1 and 2, *Wilcoxon* test was carried out to compare the performance of the experimental, comparison and control groups in the production pre-tests and post-tests, as shown by Table 13. Results showed that both experimental and comparison groups significantly increased their scores in all post-tests (i.e., $p < 0.05$). As for the mean values of the experimental and comparison groups in pre-test 3A (i.e., /i/-/i/), for instance, they were, respectively, 35.12 and 33.52 (i.e., pre-test), whereas in post-test 3A they were 36.46 and 34.34, respectively. In post-test 3B (i.e., /ð;/ /θ/), all the three groups improved their performance and, lastly, in post-test 4 (i.e., word stress), only the experimental and comparison groups showed a mean value increase in comparison to pre-test 4. For example, the mean of the experimental group in the pre-test was 72.35, while in the post-test it was 74.76. In regards to the comparison group, in the pre-test it was 71.68, where in the post-test it was 74.95.

Table 13 Comparisons of the performance of the groups in the production pre-tests and post-tests

Tests	Groups		Pre-test		Post-test		Wilcoxon signed rank test				
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Sum of Negative ranks	Sum of positive ranks	Test value	p-value	Effect Size
3A (/i/; /i/)	Experimental	(n=28)	35.12	1.82	36.46	2.10	0.00	12.00	-4.210 ^b	0.00	0.46
	Comparison	(n=29)	33.52	2.75	34.34	2.52	0.00	8.00	-3.419 ^b	0.00	0.37
	Control	(n=29)	33.60	2.15	33.68	2.17	0.00	3.50	-2.333 ^b	0.20	-
3B (/ð/; /θ/)	Experimental	(n=28)	26.38	3.28	27.21	2.74	0.00	7.00	-3.185 ^b	0.00	0.34
	Comparison	(n=29)	26.43	3.32	26.97	3.17	1.00	6.50	-2.851 ^b	0.00	0.30
	Control	(n=29)	25.77	2.20	25.89	2.21	0.00	4.50	-2.640 ^b	0.01	0.28
4 (Stress)	Experimental	(n=28)	72.35	4.94	74.76	3.89	0.00	13.00	-4.376 ^b	0.00	0.47
	Comparison	(n=29)	71.68	3.94	74.95	3.44	0.00	14.50	-4.626 ^b	0.00	0.50
	Control	(n=29)	69.75	4.51	69.76	4.52	0.00	1.00	0.317	0.32	--

Notes: N=86. Negative test values indicate a higher number of positive ranks (i.e., Post-test > Pre-test; Field & Hole, 2003)
 Effect size values were only reported in comparisons where significant difference (i.e., $p < 0.05$) between pre-tests and post-tests was found

In Table 13, significant differences were found in comparisons where the mean values are similar, like in Table 11. Again, this may be explained by the fact that non-parametric tests are based on rank values, instead of mean or standard-deviation values (i.e., Field, 2009). The participants' individual scores in the production pre-tests and post-tests are available in appendix H.

4.1.1.3 Concluding remarks about the participants' pronunciation performance.

According to the inferential statistical results, as previously reported, the use of storytelling and textbook activities had different impacts on the participants' pronunciation perception and production. In terms of perception, for example, textbook activities had a stronger effect on the enhancement of the participants' perception of segmental features (i.e., /t/;/i/ and /ð/;/θ/) than storytelling activities, although the effect size where a significant difference was found was small. Additionally, storytelling and textbook activities were as effective in the development of the participants' perception of stress. In regards to production, comparisons between pre-test and post-test results showed that storytelling activities were more effective than textbook activities improving the production of the referred segmental features, whereas textbook activities were more effective in improving the participants' ability to use syllable stress properly. In the classroom activities, however, storytelling activities were overall more effective than textbook activities. In sum, storytelling and textbook activities were, in general, similar, in effectiveness, in the improvement of learners' pronunciation.

4.2 The Participants' Views about the Relevance and Usefulness of Storytelling/ Textbook Activities in Enhancing Pronunciation

4.2.1 The attitude questionnaires. Tables 14 and 15 provide descriptive analyses of the participants' views about the effectiveness of the activities they had been exposed to in the experimental sessions in improving pronunciation.

Table 14 *Descriptive statistics for the obtained scores on the participants' views about the effectiveness of storytelling activities in improving pronunciation*

<i>Experimental Group (n=28)</i>				
	<i>Questionnaire Statements</i>	<i>Mean Scores</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean Rank</i>
Questionnaire 1 Sessions 2, 3 and 4 (/I/-/i/)	1	2.86	0.93	29.63
	2	2.75	0.89	29.52
	3	2.25	0.75	26.80
	4	2.21	0.74	26.39
	5	3.00	0.98	27.45
	Total	13.07	3.09	27.55
Questionnaire 2 Sessions 5, 6 and 7 (/ð/-/θ/)	1	2.21	0.88	22.21
	2	2.36	0.91	23.00
	3	2.18	0.72	24.25
	4	2.32	0.82	25.79
	5	2.68	0.90	25.29
	Total	11.75	2.46	21.73
Questionnaire 3 Sessions 8, 9 and 10 (Word stress)	1	2.57	0.88	24.71
	2	2.36	0.73	22.43
	3	2.54	1.00	28.91
	4	2.64	0.91	29.34
	5	3.07	0.90	25.11
	Total	13.18	3.10	24.38

Results of Table 14 showed that the participants of the experimental group found the activities they had performed in sessions 2, 3 and 4 (i.e., /I/-/i/) to be the most effective ones on the development of pronunciation, as their mean score (i.e., 27.55) is the highest of the three questionnaires. Sessions 8, 9 and 10 (i.e., word stress) were

perceived by the participants to be the second most effective ones (i.e., mean = 24.38) and sessions 5, 6 and 7 (i.e., /ð/-/θ/) were the least effective (i.e., mean = 21.73).

Most agreements found in the three questionnaires referred to statements 1 and 2 of sessions 2, 3 and 4 (i.e., 29.63 and 29.52, respectively). The answers for such statements indicated that the participants strongly perceived the stories of the sessions on /i/-/i/ vowel sounds to be very interesting and that the themes and/or follow-up activities they had been exposed to encourage them to participate more actively in the oral activities. However, such agreement was not found in the sessions 5, 6 and 7, on interdentals and on sessions 8, 9 and 10, on stress. For instance, the mean scores for statements 1 and 2 of the sessions on interdentals were, respectively, 22.21 and 23.00 and on stress 24.71 and 22.43). Regarding the participants' view about the effectiveness of the stories they had listened to and/or their follow-up activities in helping them improve their pronunciation (i.e., statement 3) as well as their belief that storytelling plays an important role in the development of pronunciation (i.e., statement 4), agreement to these statements was strongly found in the sessions on stress, as their mean values were, respectively, 28.91 and 29.34. Lastly, results of the sessions on /i/-/i/ vowel sounds showed that the participants demonstrated a stronger desire (i.e., mean = 27.45) to perform storytelling activities in the future than in the sessions on interdentals (i.e., mean= 25.29) and word stress (i.e., mean rank = 25.11).

Table 15 *Descriptive statistics for the obtained scores on the participants' views about the effectiveness of textbook activities in improving pronunciation*

<i>Comparison Group (n=29)</i>				
	<i>Questionnaire Statements</i>	<i>Mean Scores</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean Rank</i>
Questionnaire 1	1	2.79	0.82	28.40

Sessions 2, 3 and 4 (/i/-/i/)	2	2.69	0.85	28.50
	3	2.48	0.83	31.12
	4	2.48	0.83	31.52
	5	3.21	0.82	30.50
	Total	13.66	2.91	30.40
Questionnaire 2 Sessions 5, 6 and 7 (/ð/-/θ/)	1	3.07	1.07	35.55
	2	3.07	0.84	34.79
	3	2.76	0.91	33.59
	4	2.76	0.95	32.10
	5	3.14	0.95	32.59
Total	14.79	3.51	36.02	
Questionnaire 3 Sessions 8, 9 and 10 (Stress)	1	3.03	1.02	33.14
	2	3.10	0.86	35.34
	3	2.52	0.87	29.09
	4	2.59	0.78	28.67
	5	3.52	0.69	32.76
Total	14.76	3.02	33.47	

In the comparison group, the participants' agreement on the questionnaire statements mostly occurred in sessions 5, 6 and 7 (i.e., /ð/-/θ/ interdentals; mean= 36.02), followed by sessions 8, 9 and 10 (i.e., stress; mean = 33.47) and sessions 2, 3 and 4 (i.e., /i/-/i/ vowels - mean = 30.40).

In sessions 2, 3 and 4, the participants' strongest perception about the effectiveness of the textbook texts refers to statements 3 (i.e., that the textbook text activities helped them improve their English pronunciation) and 4 (i.e., such activities are an effective tool for pronunciation development). Although the participants strongly perceived the activities they had been exposed to to be effective, they demonstrated less agreement on statement 1, which stated that they listened to very interesting texts (i.e., mean = 28.40) and on statement 2, which stated that the activities they had been exposed to encouraged them to participate more actively in the oral activities (i.e., mean = 28.50). In sessions 5, 6 and 7 (i.e., interdentals), however, learners mostly agreed on the referred statements 1 (i.e., mean = 35.55) and 2 (i.e., mean = 34.79), although the level of

agreement on the other three remaining statements were similar. Likewise, in sessions 8, 9 and 10 (i.e., stress), most agreements regarded sessions 1 and 2, whereas in statements 3 (i.e., mean = 29.09) and 4 (i.e., mean = 28.67) the participants had a lower perception of the effectiveness of the textbook text activities as a pedagogical tool in helping them enhance pronunciation. Lastly, in all the three session groups (i.e., sessions 2, 3 and 4; sessions 4, 5 and 6; sessions 8, 9 and 10) the participants strongly agreed they would like to perform textbook activities in the future.

According to Table 16, nine participants of the experimental group (32.1%) liked performing the activities, whereas three participants did not like performing the activities. The majority of the participants (i.e., 16 participants - 57.2%), however, informed that they liked the activities but not much, As for those who complained about the activities, they informed they found some of them boring or repetitive. In regards to the comparison group, Table 17 shows that 13 participants (i.e., 44.8%) liked performing the textbook activities, and 15 of them informed they liked them but not much. Similarly to the experimental group, the participants who complained about the activities generally found them boring. Last, only one participants of the comparison group did not like doing the textbook activities.

4.2.2 The evaluation questionnaire

Table 16 *Number of participants of the experimental group who enjoyed/did not enjoy performing storytelling activities and their reasons*

Experimental Group (<i>n</i> =28)	
Yes	9 (32.1%)
• Found them interesting.	3 (10.7%)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believed the activities helped them improve their English skills as a whole. 	2 (7.1%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believed the activities helped them improve their listening skills. 	4 (14.3%)
Yes, but not much	16 (57.2%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enjoyed some story topics and/or the activities in general, although some were boring or repetitive. 	13 (46.5%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Found some topics boring but the activities easy to perform. 	3 (10.7%)
No	3 (10.7%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Found the activities, as a whole, boring. 	

Table 17 *Number of participants of the comparison group who enjoyed/did not enjoy performing textbook activities and their reasons*

Comparison Group (n=29)	
Yes	13 (44.8%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Found them interesting. 	4 (13.8%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believed the activities helped them improve vocabulary and/or pronunciation. 	6 (20.7%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did not provide any reasons. 	3 (10.3%)
Yes, but not much	15 (51.7%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enjoyed some textbook topics and/or the activities in general, although some were boring or repetitive. 	2 (6.9%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enjoyed the reading aloud activity, although they found some topics boring. 	13 (44.8%)
No	1 (3.5%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Found the activities, as a whole, boring. 	

With respect to the activities that the participants of the experimental group liked best and disliked, Table 18 indicates that 15 participants (53.6%) liked listening to stories best, and 25 participants (89.3%) did not enjoy performing comprehension activities. As for the comparison group, Table 19 shows that the majority of the participants (55.2%) liked performing text comprehension activities best, and 41.4% of the participants did not like reading texts aloud and recording them.

Table 18 *The activities the participants of the experimental group liked best and disliked*

Experimental Group (n=28)
Activities the participants liked best and why.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 (53.6%) - liked listening to stories, as most of them were interesting/fun. • 11 (39.3%) - liked reading stories aloud best. • 2 (7.1%) – liked all the activities, because they had illustrations and were easy to understand.
The activities the participants disliked and why.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25 (89.3%) participants did not like the story comprehension activities, because they were either uninteresting or too easy. • 2 (7.1%) participants informed they did not like reading stories aloud. • 1 (3.6%) participant said he felt uncomfortable reading stories aloud.

Table 19 *The activities the participants of the comparison group liked best and disliked*

Comparison Group (n=29)
Activities the participants liked best and why.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 16 (55.2%) - liked performing textbook comprehension activities best. • 10 (34.5%) - liked reading texts aloud. • 3 (10.3%) - showed no preference for any specific activities.
The activities the participants disliked and why.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12 (41.4%) participants said they did not like reading texts aloud and recording them. • 11 (37.9%) participants did not enjoy doing the comprehension activities. 8 of these participants found them boring and/or repetitive and 3 of them found them too easy to perform. • 6 (20.7%) participants did not mention any activities they disliked.

With respect to the participants' beliefs about the effect of storytelling on pronunciation improvement, Table 20 indicates that eight of them (28.6%) found storytelling activities to be useful to enhance pronunciation. Six of these participants (21.4%) perceived the activity of reading and listening to stories to be useful to help them see how words are pronounced and two of them (7.1%) found the activities useful because they consisted of short sentences, making it easy to see how words were

pronounced. However, most participants (60.7%) found the activities useful but not much. They generally commented on the need for more practice to see consistent results.

Table 20 *Number of participants who believed and did not believe storytelling activities were useful to help improve pronunciation*

Experimental Group (n=28)	
Yes	8 (28.6%)
• Listening to and/or reading stories helped them see how words are pronounced.	6 (21.4%)
• It was easy to perceive pronunciation because the sentences were short.	2 (7.1%)
Yes, but not much	17 (60.7%)
• The participants found the activities useful although they also believed they would need more practice to see consistent results.	
Participants who did not respond	3 (10.7%)

Regarding the comparison group, Table 21 shows that 34.5% of the participants found the textbook activities useful to help them improve pronunciation, although most of them (58.6%) were unsure of the effectiveness of such activities on their pronunciation.

Table 21 *Number of participants who believed and did not believe textbook activities were useful to help improve pronunciation*

Comparison Group (n=29)	
Yes	10 (34.5%)
• Listening to and/or reading textbook texts helped them see how words are pronounced.	3 (10.7%)
• The classroom activities, as a whole, were useful.	5 (17.2%)
• Did not inform the reason(s).	2 (6.9%)
Yes, but not much	17 (58.6%)
• Were not sure of the effect of the activities on pronunciation improvement.	
Participants who did not respond	1 (6.9%)

The participants of the experimental group considered reading stories aloud and listening to them the most effective activities in helping them develop pronunciation, as shown in Table 22. Similarly, the participants of the comparison group found reading texts aloud and listening to them effective activities to enhance their pronunciation (See Table 23).

Table 22 *The activities the participants of the experimental group found most effective in the development of pronunciation*

Experimental Group (<i>n</i> =28)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18 (64.3%) participants said that reading stories aloud was the most effective activity. • 10 (35.7%) participants found listening to the stories the most effective activity.

Table 23 *The activities the participants of the comparison group found most effective in the development of pronunciation*

Comparison Group (<i>n</i> =29)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18 (62.1%) participants found reading textbook texts aloud the most effective activity. • 9 (31%) participants mentioned a combination of listening to texts and reading them aloud. • 2 (6.9%) participants said that the activities, in general, played a role in helping them develop their pronunciation.

Regarding learners' suggestions on how to use storytelling and textbook activities in a more preferred and/or efficient way to enhance pronunciation, the few participants of the experimental and comparison groups who have made suggestions similarly informed that learners should be exposed to more diversified activities. For instance, the participants of the experimental group (i.e., Table 24) suggested the use of famous stories and that learners should be given the opportunity to create their own stories.

Table 24 *Suggestions made by the participants on how to use storytelling activities in a more preferred and/or efficient way to enhance pronunciation*

Experimental Group (n=28)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14 (50%) participants did not make any suggestions at all. • 5 (17.9%) participants suggested there should be more interesting and less childish stories in class. • 5 (17.9%) participants suggested learners should be given the opportunity to create their own stories. One of these participants even suggested stories should be written in Portuguese and then translated into English. • 4 (14.2%) participants suggested that famous stories, such as the ones from “Harry Potter” books, should be used in class, as they are interesting and would make learners listen to them more carefully.

Table 25 *Suggestions made by the participants on how to use textbook activities in a more preferred and/or efficient way to enhance pronunciation*

Comparison Group (n=29)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 13 (44.8%) participants said they liked all the activities they performed in the sessions and did not make any further comments. • 4 (13.8%) participants suggested the textbook activities should be more diversified. • 12 (41.4%) participants did not make any suggestions.

Lastly, a small number of participants reported to have practiced English orally outside of the experimental sessions and English classes at school.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter discusses the findings of this study related to the questions it addressed. The chapter begins by discussing the results in relation to each research question and concludes with a discussion about the contributions of this research.

5.1. Research Question 1: What is the Effect of Storytelling on the Accuracy of Pronunciation Perception and Production of Segmental (i.e., /ɪ/;/i/ and /θ/;/ð/) and Suprasegmental (i.e., syllable stress) Features by Brazilian Learners of English?

The first aim of this study was to investigate whether storytelling enhances pronunciation by investigating its effect on Brazilian learners' sound perception and production skills.

Results indicated that storytelling activities led to the improvement of learners' pronunciation abilities at perception (i.e., Table 11) and production (i.e., Table 12) levels, as, in general, significant differences (i.e., $p < 0.05$) between pre-tests and post-tests were found. In other words, such activities seemed to be an effective tool in helping learners develop their pronunciation skills and this finding is in line with the studies reviewed in chapter 2, which suggest storytelling has a positive effect on pronunciation improvement (e.g., Cary, 1998; Hsu, 2010; Motallebi & Pourgharib, 2013; Zare-Behatash, Saed, & Sajjadi, 2016). According to Hsu (2010), for instance, storytelling promotes the

development of speaking because it offers learners the opportunity to practice language by retelling the stories they listen to, making language learning (i.e., vocabulary) a memorable process. In this current study, the participants did not only listen to stories but also had the opportunity to practice them through recordings at the end of the experimental sessions and, based on Hsu (2010), this may have played a role in their pronunciation development. Another possible explanation for the effectiveness of storytelling in the development of production, for instance, may be the fact that it motivated the participants and offered them to see how sounds were produced by firstly listening to them. This explanation is in agreement with the findings of the study by Motallebi and Pourgharib (2013) on the relationship between the use of audio-stories and pronunciation improvement. The effectiveness of storytelling seems to be strongly driven by its power to motivate learners and provide them with comprehensible input, as observed in the experimental sessions and informed by the participants in the attitude and evaluation questionnaires, to be discussed later on this chapter. These explanations are in line with other research reviewed in this study (e.g., Cary, 1998; Elkikiliç & Akça, 2008; Yang & Wu, 2012), in addition to providing learners with comprehensible input as claimed by Cary (1998) and Isbell et al. (2004), for example.

5.2 Research Question 2: How do Storytelling Activities Compare to EFL/ESL

Textbook Activities in their Effectiveness?

This study also compared storytelling activities to textbook activities, to identify which one is more effective in terms of perception and production. Findings suggest that these activities were equivalent in effectiveness, since results of the pre-tests and post-tests, as reported in Chapter 4, indicate that the participants of the experimental and comparison

groups overall performed similarly in the perception and in the production of the segmental and suprasegmental target sounds of this study. Such similar impact of stories and textbook texts on the participants' performance also suggests that pronunciation improvement may not be primarily influenced by the text type learners are exposed to but by other variables that are considered to play a role in the development of pronunciation such as learners' individual learning features, including identity, how input is introduced to them and practiced, their age as well as sociocultural interactions, to mention a few, as proposed by Foote and Trofimovich (2018) and described in section 2.2. Furthermore, findings indicate that, overall, storytelling and textbook activities played a significant role in improving learners' pronunciation, suggesting that the stimuli that were provided to the participants of both groups drew their attention to how sounds were produced. One possible explanation for this may be the fact that at the beginning of each session the participants performed contextualization activities through picture analysis, for example, to get familiarized with the topic/theme of the story/textbook text they were going to work on in the session, prior to the reading aloud activities. According to researchers, contextualized language learning facilitates language comprehension and helps make connections between form and meaning, raising learners' interest and attention to form (i.e., pronunciation) (e.g., Perin, 2011; Shrum, & Glisan, 2009). Moreover, learners' attention to how sounds were produced may have also been influenced by the fact that they knew that, at the end of each experimental session, they would have to record the story/textbook text they listened to. However, this hypothesis would need to be further investigated.

In sum, although storytelling activities proved to play a role in enhancing learners' pronunciation, findings of this study did not show storytelling activities to be more

effective than traditional teaching methods (i.e., textbook activities), as claimed by a number of researchers (e.g., Hsu, 2010; Li & Seehouse, 2010; Saed and Sajjadi, 2016; Zare-Behatash), suggesting that storytelling should be treated as an alternative type of activity that is effective but not necessarily better than textbook activities in the teaching of pronunciation.

Despite the fact that significant differences between pre-test and post-test results were found in the experimental and comparison groups, effect size values generally indicated that the differences were not strong ($r < .5$). One possible explanation for the significant but not strong differences between pre-test and post-test results may involve the participants' age. All the participants of this current study were at least 15 years of age and, according to the critical period hypothesis, there is a biologically determined stage when foreign learners may acquire a nativelike pronunciation. Such pronunciation is widely claimed to be only possible to occur before puberty, which is when the brain still keeps its plasticity. After the critical period, when brain lateralization and loss of neuro-muscular flexibility occur, pronunciation perception and production performance is believed to decrease (e.g., Celce-Murcia et al. 2010; Kusumoto, 2012; Long, 1990; Lowen, 2015; Szyszka, 2017). Scott (1989), for example, claims that sound perception skills reduce with age. Similarly, Long (1990) claims that learners' pronunciation skills start to decline after the age of six years of age and Szyszka (2017) states that "16 and 60-year-old learners have the same chances of learning FL pronunciation." (p.19). Another possible explanation may involve the participants' difficulty perceiving differences between the target segmental sounds that are not part of the BP vowel (i.e., /ɪ/) and consonant (i.e., /ð/-/θ/) inventories but sound very similar to their counterparts in BP (i.e.,

/i/; /t/;/d/). This hypothesis is in line with the third hypothesis of Flege's Speech Learning Model, which basically proposes that successful pronunciation learning does not occur when L1 and L2 sounds are too similar and, consequently, an intermediary form is created (Flege, 2005; Foote & Trofimovich, 2018; Sillas, 2007). A third possibility for the low to medium effect size of the participants' performance refers to the Psychological Perspective, as described by Foote and Trofimovich (2018) and described in chapter 2. According to this perspective, factors such as how properly the target sounds (i.e., input) was presented to learners, how these sounds were practiced as well as the length of exposure of the participants to such sounds may have played a role in the participants' performance. To give an example, the participants received input implicitly, with no pronunciation instruction. Moreover, they had little exposure to target sounds (i.e., three 25-minute sessions for each target sound). However, before conclusions may be drawn, all these hypotheses would need to be further investigated in future studies.

5.3 The Participants' Performance in the Perception and Production Tests

Results of this study showed that participants performed better in the production tests than in the perception tests, although performance in perception tests are generally expected to be greater than in production tests (e.g., Flege, 2005; Isbell, 2016; Koerich, 2006; Romig, 2013). Such finding is in line with a group of researchers who have found no correlation between perception and production (e.g., Peperkamp & Bouchon, 2011; Reis, 2006; Sebastián-Gallés & Baus, 2005). To give an example, Kusumoto (2012) investigated the relationship between Japanese EFL learners' perception and production of /r/-/l/ sounds, which are claimed to be difficult for them to perceive and pronounce in English (e.g., Iverson, et al. 2003; Takagi, & Mann 1995). Results indicated that they

perceived and produced /r/-/l/ sounds differently, showing no relationship between perception and production performance. Likewise, in a study to investigate the relationship between L2 perception and production of /ɪ-/i/ vowel sounds, Peperkamp and Bouchon (2011) found no correlation between the perception and the production of such segmental sounds. The researchers claimed that the lack of correlation occurred because the perception test did not give the participants enough time to practice the test stimuli subvocally and process the sounds they heard. This may explain why the participants of this current study performed better in the production tests than in the perception tests. In fact, they listened to a set of minimal pairs (i.e., pre-tests/post-tests 1A/1B) and words in isolation (i.e., pre-test/post-test 2) and may not have had enough time to process the sounds they heard. In the production tests, however, the participants had time to rehearse the words they would need to record. Another possible explanation for the better performance of the participants in the production tests than in the perception tests may be due to the fact that some of the words found in the minimal-pair tests (pre-tests/post-tests 1A and 1B) were not included in the stories and textbook texts they had been exposed to during the experimental sessions.

5.4 Research Question 3: What is the Brazilian learners' Perception about the Usefulness and Relevance of Storytelling Activities as Compared to Textbook Activities for the Improvement of the Targeted Features?

Like in the perception/production tests and classroom activities, in general, the participants' answers to the three quantitative attitude questionnaires and to the qualitative evaluation questionnaire showed that the participants of the experimental and

comparison groups shared similar views about the effectiveness of the storytelling and textbook activities they had been exposed to in the development of pronunciation.

With respect to the experimental group (i.e., Table 14), the participants' answers to the three questionnaires showed that, in general, they liked performing storytelling activities and perceived them to be useful and relevant to the improvement of their pronunciation. Although the answers may not be reliable enough, due to the fact that the participants may not have expressed their real opinions about the statements proposed, the questionnaires seem to have played a role in showing that storytelling increased learners' motivation in the pronunciation learning process. Similarly, the answers of the participants of the comparison group (i.e., Table 15) showed they enjoyed performing the textbook activities they had been exposed to, in addition to finding them useful and relevant to the development of pronunciation.

The similarities found in this study in the views of the participants of both experimental and comparison groups about the usefulness and relevance of storytelling and textbook activities, respectively, for the improvement of pronunciation are in line with the findings of the perception and production tests, as previously discussed, but not in line with previous research that claimed that learners who had worked on storytelling activities outperformed those who had worked on traditional teaching activities (e.g., Hsu, 2010; Li & Seehouse, 2010; Zare-Behatash, Saed and Sajjadi, 2016). Additionally, the participants' answers to the questionnaires played an important role in suggesting that both storytelling and textbook texts were similarly seen by learners as interesting, motivating and useful tools in the teaching of pronunciation.

Findings of the evaluation questionnaire showed that the majority of the participants of both groups provided similar answers to the questionnaire items, indicating that, like in the attitude questionnaires, they had similar views regarding the effectiveness of the storytelling/textbook activities on their pronunciation improvement, despite the different text types they had been exposed to. As for the first item of the questionnaire, on whether the participants enjoyed the storytelling/textbook activities or not, the majority of them said they did but not much. It was surprising to see that the participants of the experimental group did not enjoy the storytelling activities much, as storytelling is generally claimed to be a very enjoyable activity (e.g., Afrilyasanti & Basthomi 2011; Burns, 2017; Hsu et al., 2014; Yang & Wu, 2012).

Similarly, the majority of the participants of both groups did not seem to be certain of the effectiveness of the activities they had been exposed to on their pronunciation improvement. In the experimental group, for instance, 60.7% of the experimental group and 58.6% of the comparison group were not sure of the effectiveness of storytelling/textbook activities. It was surprising to see a larger number of participants of the experimental group unsure of the effectiveness of their respective activities, as storytelling is claimed to be an effective pedagogical instrument in the development of language skills, including pronunciation (e.g., Atta-Alla, 2012; Kim, 2010). Likewise, it was also surprising to see that the majority of the participants of the experimental group did not perceive much effectiveness of their respective activities, as a whole, in the development of pronunciation, although most of them reported that they found “reading aloud” the most effective activity they did. In other words, getting the participants to reading stories aloud was not enough to make them perceive improvement

in their pronunciation. This applied to the comparison group as well, since most participants found reading aloud the most effective activity.

The participants' lack of perception of the effectiveness of the storytelling and textbook activities may have been influenced by different variables such as how input (i.e., target sounds) was presented and practiced, including length of practice, 2) learners' difficulty to identify differences between the target L2 and their L1 (i.e., BP) segmental sounds, which are very similar and the participants' age and low English proficiency level (e.g., Derwing, Thomson, & Munro, 2006; Ioup, Boustagi, El Tigi, & Moselle, 1994; Kennedy & Trofimovich, 2010). Input practice, for example, is in line with the participants' comments in Table 20, as most participants of the experimental and comparison groups stated they believed they would need more practice to improve pronunciation and, by "more practice," they may have referred to more hours of exposure to L2. However, "more practice" may also mean that learners expected to be provided with more pronunciation activities to improve their pronunciation skills. The latter is in line with empirical studies that suggest that pronunciation instruction plays a relevant role in learners' pronunciation enhancement (e.g., Bradlow, Pisoni, Akahare-Yamada, & Tohkura, 1997; Derwing & Munro, 2005; Kissling, 2012; Matthews, 1997; Thomson, 2011; Zielinsky, 2012). Lastly, in a study with beginner -level learners, Derwing, Thomson and Munro (2006) found that the majority of these learners had a negative perception about their pronunciation performance owing to their low proficiency level. Similarly, the participants of this current study, who are at beginner level, may have had a low perception of the effectiveness of the activities they had been exposed to because of their low English proficiency level.

5.5 Conclusions

This study investigated the role of storytelling in improving L2 pronunciation and also compared its effectiveness to textbook activities. The statistically significant differences found between pre-test and post-test results suggest that storytelling is an effective tool in the development of pronunciation, although effect size values also indicated they are not strong. In fact, low to medium values were reported where significance was found. As for possible reasons for such values, this study proposes that a range of different variables at individual, identity, psychological, sociocultural and sociocognitive levels, for example, as presented by Foote and Trofimovich (2018), may have had a direct influence on the participants' pronunciation performance. Furthermore, the reported low effect of storytelling and textbook activities may have been influenced by a possible lack of sufficiently powerful statistical analyses, as a result of the limited number of participants who were exposed to storytelling (i.e., $n = 28$) and textbook (i.e., $n = 29$) activities.

This study also investigated how the participants perceived the relevance and usefulness of storytelling and textbook activities in improving their pronunciation. Findings of the three attitude questionnaires, as well as of the evaluation questionnaire, revealed the experimental and comparison groups generally shared similar perceptions regarding the effectiveness of storytelling and textbook activities, respectively, in the improvement of pronunciation.

5.6 Pedagogical Implications

The findings of the present study have a number of pedagogical implications. First, this study suggests that exposing learners to the target sounds implicitly through storytelling only seems to have little effect on their pronunciation enhancement (e.g., Akahare-Yamada, & Tohkura, 1997; Derwing & Munro, 2005; Thomson, 2011). One possible alternative to improve learners' pronunciation could be through the use of explicit pronunciation instruction. However, such alternative would possibly apply to any type of text, giving instructors no reasons for using stories for pronunciation teaching purposes. Another potential alternative to increase the effectiveness of pronunciation improvement through storytelling could involve a change in how learners are exposed to target sounds, through the use of enhanced input. When reading stories aloud, for example, instructors would pronounce the words containing target sounds in a more salient manner to try to increase learners' attention to how these sounds are pronounced. Researchers claim that such inductive approach may facilitate learners' acquisition of linguistic input (e.g., Chapelle, 2003; Rast, 2008). Furthermore, since storytelling is considered to be an effective pedagogical instrument in the development of L2 skills, as it is fun and motivating, consequently raising learners' attention to listening (e.g., Atta-Alla, 2012; Kim, 2010), the use of enhanced input could result in pronunciation improvement, because learners would be probably focused on listening to the story. However, research on the effectiveness of enhanced input in the development of perception and production of specific target sounds would certainly need to be done, as learners could focus their attention on meaning rather than on form, for example.

Pronunciation development may also be related to a number of different factors, such as learners' individual learning aptitude and L2 proficiency level, identity, how properly input is presented and practices, learners' capacity to identify phonological differences between their L1 and L2, sociocultural interactions, age and motivation, for example, as previously discussed, requiring the need for proper teacher training for effective pronunciation teaching purposes. Thus, teachers should be aware of the importance of working on pronunciation at segmental and suprasegmental levels and, ideally, also be trained on how to teach pronunciation. For example, teachers should be aware of the importance of learning about the main phonological differences between their learners' L1 and the target sounds in their L2, to be able to design pedagogical activities and develop teaching approaches that effectively address their learners' needs. Moreover, teachers should be aware of the main pronunciation difficulties encountered by learners of different proficiency levels, so as to be able to figure out ways to address such difficulties properly. Finally, teachers should look at learners as individual beings who have individual learning needs and also be able to identify such needs.

5.7 Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

This study has some limitations that should be addressed in future research.

First, the words of the perception pre-tests and post-tests were read aloud by only one English native speaker, which may have affected the usefulness of the results. Furthermore, although all the words of the perception pre-test/post-test 1 containing target sounds were included in the stories and textbook texts, not all of their counterparts in the minimal pairs were included. In other words, in the experimental sessions the participants were not exposed to the sounds of all of the words found in the minimal-pair

test items (i.e., pre-tests/post-tests 1A and 1B) and this possibly exerted a negative impact on the results of such perception tests.

Second, the assessment of participants' production was limited to requiring them to read aloud word sets that contained the target pronunciation features of this study. Although reading aloud is argued to be the most common assessment of pronunciation (e.g., Thomson and Derwing, 2015, p.331), it is criticized by researchers for being a limited manner to measure learners' pronunciation skills as it does not evaluate the participants' performance in freer, spontaneous speech, which is the primary goal of pronunciation instruction (e.g., Luchini, 2017; Thomson & Derwing, 2015). Controlled reading aloud was adopted in this study for the purpose of ensuring the participants would focus on the perception and production of the intended target sounds and stress patterns. Future research should focus on designing new ways to assess specific pronunciation features through extemporaneous or spontaneous speech tests, which would reflect natural communication to provide more informative outcomes. Thomson and Derwing (2015), for example, suggest tests "such as picture narratives, monologues, or conversations". (p.337).

Third, despite the fact that the participants were given the opportunity to express their perceptions about the usefulness and relevance of storytelling activities as compared to textbook activities in the improvement of pronunciation, the information provided may not be reliable as learners may not have expressed their real points of view. Appropriate qualitative analyses would possibly offer more reliable data about learners' individual learning differences. According to Thomson and Derwing (2015), "complementary qualitative analyses should be conducted to provide insights into individual differences in

learning, such as motivation, the nature of interactions in the L2 and other social influences. Such analyses can reveal evidence that quantitative research cannot access.” (p.328).

Fourth, the participants of the experimental and comparison groups were exposed to target sounds implicitly, with no feedback or pronunciation intervention. It would be helpful to compare the performance of a storytelling group that would receive no explicit pronunciation instruction to another storytelling group that would be exposed to the same storytelling activities and additionally receive explicit pronunciation instructions on target sounds, in order to see how the groups would compare and test the effectiveness of incorporating such explicit instructions into pronunciation teaching.

Fifth, this study was limited to investigating the effectiveness of storytelling on the pronunciation of beginner EFL learners (i.e., A1/A2 level). As pointed out by Thomson and Derwing (2014), learners’ proficiency level may influence results and, therefore, it would be relevant to investigate the impact of storytelling activities on the pronunciation improvement of learners at higher proficiency levels and, if a correlation between storytelling and proficiency level is detected, it would also be relevant to identify what pronunciation areas/features are mostly benefited and at what learners’ levels.

Sixth, as previously mentioned in this chapter, another limitation of this study regards the length of exposure of the participants to the target sounds in the experimental sessions (i.e., 12, 25-minute sessions). It would be relevant to investigate the effectiveness of storytelling on the pronunciation of EFL learners for a longer period of time, mainly because learners, like the ones recruited in this study, are exposed to their

L1 (i.e., BP) most of the time. As previously discussed, degree of exposure has an important impact on pronunciation enhancement (e.g., Derwing, 2008; Lee et al., 2015; Thomson & Derwing, 2015). Likewise, Lee et al. (2015) claim that longer pronunciation interventions result in more effective results. In short, the general lack of effect of storytelling and textbook activities on learners' pronunciation improvement may have occurred because of the limited length of exposure to the target sounds and this should definitely be further investigated. Another possible direction could be to expose learners to target sounds inductively through enhanced input, as previously mentioned in Section 5.5, although its effectiveness in regards to pronunciation improvement would need to be investigated.

Seventh, due to time constraints (i.e., three 25-minute sessions for each target sound), the effectiveness of storytelling on pronunciation was tested through the analysis of a small number of segmental (i.e., /ɪ-/i/; /ð/ and /θ/) and suprasegmental (i.e., syllable stress) features. Additionally, it would be important to test the effectiveness of storytelling on the improvement of pronunciation of other segmental (i.e., vowels and consonants) and suprasegmental features (i.e., rhythm and intonation) to investigate whether there is any relationship between the degree of effectiveness of storytelling and specific pronunciation features.

Eighth, the amount of exposure to target sounds was not exactly the same in the experimental and comparison groups and this may possibly explain the differences in performance found between them, as one group had more opportunity to hear and practice the target sounds than the other.

Ninth, this study was limited to using “Praat” speech analysis software program solely for the purpose of recording the participants’ performance for the assessment by the three native English speakers, as described in Section 3.3.2.3. Maybe it would be informative to do research that would use such software program to assess the participants’ production acoustically, for instance. The results of such software assessment could then be compared to the results of the raters’ assessment.

Tenth, a small number of learners participated in the storytelling activities (i.e., $n=28$). Before conclusions on the effectiveness of storytelling activities on the improvement of pronunciation can be drawn, it would be relevant to replicate this study with a larger sample size to see whether there would be statistically different results.

Eleventh, this study was limited to exposing learners only to printed, paper-based stories, although, as previously reviewed in chapter 2, a number of studies widely suggest that digital storytelling is a very effective tool in the development of L2 learners’ speaking skills (e.g., Afrilyasanti & Basthomi 2011; Hsu et al., 2014; Verdugo & Belmonte, 2007; Yang & Wu, 2012). Comparing the effect of traditional, printed stories to the effect of digital storytelling on BP learners’ pronunciation would certainly make an important contribution to those who primarily work with Brazilian learners of English.

Last, this study only investigated the effect of storytelling on monocultural groups, comprised of Brazilian learners. Since ESL classes offered in English-speaking countries normally consist of multicultural groups, this study could be replicated in a multicultural environment to verify the impact of storytelling on learners of different L1. As claimed by Thomson and Derwing (2014), by investigating the effect of storytelling

on different L1s speakers, it would be possible to identify whether there are cross-linguistic pronunciation learning patterns shared by such speakers.

5.8 Contributions

This study has offered different contributions in the investigation of the relationship between storytelling and the pronunciation development. It has addressed methodological limitations of previous studies on the relationship between storytelling and pronunciation development (e.g., Cary, 1998; Normann, 2011), by testing the effectiveness of storytelling on the development of learners' ability to perceive and produce specific target sounds at segmental (i.e., /ɪ/; /ð/; /θ/) and suprasegmental (i.e., syllable stress) levels. As previously described in Section 1.2, studies that claim that storytelling is an effective activity for the development of pronunciation lack specifics on what pronunciation areas, for example, are improved (e.g., Cary, 1998; Kim & McGarry, 2014; Motallebi & Pourgharib, 2013). Furthermore, the finding that the implicit approach adopted by this study in the use of storytelling and textbook activities did not have a significant effect on learners' pronunciation has contributed to showing teachers and researchers that only getting beginner-level learners to listen to stories/textbook texts and read them aloud does not seem to promote effective pronunciation improvement. In order to potentially promote the effectiveness of storytelling on pronunciation improvement, this study has suggested teachers should expose learners to target sounds inductively, through enhanced input, as shown in Section 5.5.

Findings of this study suggest that storytelling had a positive effect on pronunciation improvement, despite the fact that the participants had been exposed to

target sounds for a short period of time. If the methodological limitations, as described in Section 5.6, for instance, are properly addressed and teaching techniques are further refined, storytelling seems to be a promising pedagogical tool for L2 pronunciation instruction purposes.

REFERENCES

- Abdi, A. R. (2010). *Explicit vs. Implicit Teaching of English Vowels and Stress Patterns to Iranian High-School Students*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Payame-Noor University, Tehran.
- Ackerlind, S., & Jones-Kellog, R. (2011). *Portuguese: A reference manual*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Albini, A. (2010). A importância do ensino da pronúncia do inglês para a produção de sílabas tônicas. Porto Alegre: *BELT Journal*, 1(1), 34-43.
- Ammar A. & Spada, N. (2006). "One size fits all? Recasts, prompts and L2 learning." *Studies in second language acquisition* 28, 543-574.
- Amorin, M. (2012). Brasileiros não sabem falar inglês: apenas 5% dominam o idioma. Retrieved from <http://oglobo.globo.com/emprego/brasileiros-nao-sabem-falar-ingles-apenas-5-dominam-idioma-6239142>.
- Atkey, S. 2002. The acquisition of non-native segmental contrasts: A look at English speakers' acquisition of Czech palatal stops. In A. James, & J. Leather (eds.), *New Sounds 2000: Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium on the Acquisition of Second-Language Speech*, Klagenfurt: University of Klagenfurt, 22–31.
- Atta-Alla, M. (2012). Integrating language skills through storytelling. *English Language Teaching*, 5(12), 1-13.

- Auerbach, E. (2000). Creating participatory learning communities: Possibilities and paradoxes. In Hall, K., & Eggington, W. (Eds.). *The sociopolitics of English language teaching*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Azevedo, M. (2005). *Portuguese: A linguistic introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baptista, B. (1989). Strategies for the prediction of English word stress. *IRAL-International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 27(1), 1-14.
- Baptista, B.O. (2001). Frequent pronunciation errors of Brazilian learners of English. In: M. B. Fortkamp, & R.P. Xavier (Eds.). *EFL teaching and learning in Brazil: theory and practice* (pp. 223-230). Florianópolis: Insular.
- Becker, M. (2013). *Inteligibilidade da língua inglesa sob o paradigma de língua franca: percepção de discursos de falantes de diferentes L1s por brasileiros*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Universidade Federal do Paraná, Curitiba.
- Beecher-Monas, E. (2007). *Evaluating scientific evidence: An interdisciplinary framework for intellectual due process*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bradlow, A. R., Pisoni, D. B., Akahane-Yamada, R., & Tohkura, Y. (1997). Training Japanese listeners to identify English /ɪ/ and /i/: IV. Some effects of perceptual learning on speech production. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 101, 2299-2310.
- Brawerman, A. (2006). *Uma análise de erros de estudantes brasileiros de inglês na acentuação de palavras com sufixos*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Universidade Federal do Paraná, Curitiba.

- Brewster, J., Ellis, G., & Girard, D. (2002) *The Primary English Teacher's Guide*. New Edition. England: Pearson Education.
- Brown, J. D. (1988). *Understanding research in second language learning: A teacher's guide to statistics and research design*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Burns, G. (2017). *101 stories for enhancing happiness and well-being: Using metaphors in positive psychology and theory*. New York: Routledge. Taylor, & Francis Group.
- Cameron, L. (2001). *Teaching languages to young learners*. Cambridge Language Teaching Library. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cary, S. (1998). *The effectiveness of a contextualized storytelling approach for second language acquisition*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of San Francisco, California.
- Celce-Murcia, M., Brinton, D., & Goodwin, J. (2010). *Teaching pronunciation: A course book and reference guide*. Second edition. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Chapelle, C. (2003). *English language learning and technology: Lectures on applied linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins B.V.
- Collischonn, G. (2001). O acento em português. In Bisol, L. (Organizer). *Introdução a estudos de fonologia do português brasileiro*. Porto Alegre: EDIPUCRS, 125-158.
- Consolo, D. (1990). *O livro didático como ensino na aula de língua estrangeira (inglês)*

na escola pública. (Unpublished Master's thesis). Instituto de Estudos da Linguagem. Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas.

Council of Europe (2001). *The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Couper, G. (2003). The value of an explicit pronunciation syllabus in ESOL teaching. *Prospect*, 18(3), 53-70.

Cruttenden, A. (2008). *Gimson's pronunciation of English*. Seventh edition. New York: Hodder Education.

Cruz, N. (2003). An exploratory study of pronunciation intelligibility in the Brazilian learner's English: Intelligibilidade da Pronúncia do Aprendiz Brasileiro de Inglês. *The ESPecialist*, 24(2), 155-175.

Cruz, N.; Pereira, M. (2006). Pronúncia de aprendizes brasileiros de inglês e inteligibilidade: Um estudo com dois grupos de ouvintes. *Revista Virtual de Estudos da Linguagem –ReVEL*, Ano 4(7), 1-26.

Cruz, N. (2008). Familiaridade do ouvinte e inteligibilidade da pronúncia de aprendizes brasileiros de inglês. *Revista Horizontes de Linguística Aplicada*, 7(1), 88-103.

D'Andrade, E., & Mateus, M. (2000). *The phonology of Portuguese*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Derwing, T. M., Munro, M. J., & Wiebe, G. (1998). Evidence in favor of a broad framework for pronunciation instruction. *Language Learning*, 48, 393-410.

- Derwing, T., & Munro, M. (2005). Second language accent and pronunciation teaching: A research-based approach. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39(3), 379-397.
- Derwing, T., Thomson, R., & Munro, M. (2006). English pronunciation and fluency development in Mandarin and Slavic speakers. *System*, 34(2), 183-193.
- Derwing, T. (2008). Curriculum issues in teaching pronunciation. In J. Edwards, & M. Zampini, (Eds.). *Phonology and second language acquisition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Divitiis, G. (2013). Inglês nas escolas regulares brasileiras: adequações metodológicas para a eficácia do ensino e aprendizagem. *SILEL* 3(1), 1-17.
- Dyson, A. & Genishi, C. (1994). Introduction: The need for story. In A. Dyson, & C. Genishi (Eds.). *The need for story: Cultural diversity in classroom and community*. Illinois: The National Council of Teachers of English.
- Elkkiliç, G. & Akça, C. (2008). Attitudes of the students studying at Kafkas university EFLclassrooms towards storytelling and motivation. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 4(1), 1-27.
- Essig, W. (2005). Storytelling: Effects of planning, repetition and context. In C. Edwards, & J. Willis (Eds.). *Teachers exploring tasks in English language teaching*. (pp. 201-213). Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Field, A. (2010). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics*. 3rd edition. London; Sage Publications Ltd.
- Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics*. 4th edition. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

- Field, A., & Hole, G. (2003). *How to design and report experiments*. London: Sage Publications.
- Field, J. (2003). The fuzzy notion of ‘intelligibility’: A headache for pronunciation teachers and oral testers. *IATEFL Special Interest Groups Newsletter*, Special issue, 34-38.
- Field, J. (2005). Intelligibility and the listener: The role of lexical stress. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39, 399-423.
- Flege, J. (1995). Second-language speech learning: Theory, findings and problems. In Strange, W. (Ed.), *Speech Perception and Linguistic Experience: Issues in Cross Language Research*, 229-273. Timonium: York Press.
- Flege, J., & MacKay, I. (2004). Perceiving vowels in a foreign language. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 26, 1–34.
- Flege, J. (2005). Origins and development of the Speech Learning Model [PowerPoint slides]. Retrieved from http://jimflege.com/files/Vancouver_April_2005.pdf
- Foot, J.; Trofimovich, P. (2018). Second language pronunciation learning. An overview of theoretical perspectives. In O. Kang, O., R. Thomson, & M. Murphy. *Routledge Handbook of Contemporary English Pronunciation*. New York: Routledge.
- Friedrich, P. (2000). English in Brazil: functions and attitudes. *World Englishes*, Blackwell Publishers, 19(2), 215-223.
- Gilbert, J. (2005). *Clear speech: Pronunciation and listening comprehension in North American English. Third edition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Gilbert J, 2008. *Teaching pronunciation: using the prosody pyramid*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Guariento, W., & Morley, J. (2001). Text and task authenticity in the EFL classroom. *ELT Journal*, 55, 347–353.
- Hendrickson, J. (1992). *Storytelling for foreign language and linguistics*. Washington, D. C.: ERIC Clearing House on Language and Linguistics. (Eric Document Reproduction No. ED 355-824), 1-25.
- Heo, H. (2004). Story telling and retelling as narrative inquiry in cyber learning environments. In R. Atkinson, C. McBeath, D. Jonas-Dwyer, & R. Phillips, (Eds.). *Beyond the comfort zone: Proceedings of the 21st ASCILITE Conference*, 374-378. <http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/perth04/procs/heo.html>.
- Hsu, Y. (2010). *The influence of English Storytelling on the Oral language complexity of EFL primary students*. (Unpublished master's thesis). National Yunlin University of Science & Technology, Yunlin.
- Hsu, J., Huang, Y., Hsu, G., & Lin, Y. (2014). Effects of storytelling to facilitate EFL speaking using web-based multimedia system. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 215-241.
- Huang, H. (2006). The effects of storytelling on EFL young learners' reading comprehension and word recall. *English Teaching & Learning*, 30(3), 51-74.
- Huang, L.S. (2013). Cognitive processes involved in performing the IELTS speaking test: Respondents' strategic behaviours in simulated testing and non-testing contexts. *IELTS Research Reports Online Series*, 1, 1-51.

- Isbell, R., Sobol, J., Lindauer, L., & Lowrance, A. (2004). The effects of storytelling and story reading on the oral language complexity and story comprehension of young children. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 32(3), 157-163.
- Isbell, D. (2016). The Perception-Production Link in L2 Phonology. *MSU Working Papers in SLS 2016*, 7, Isbell – Perception Production Link 57, 57-67.
- Iverson, P. et.al. (2003). A perceptual interference account of acquisition difficulties for non-native phonemes. *Cognition* 87, 47–57.
- Iverson, P., & Evans, B. (2007). Learning English vowels with different first language vowel systems: perception of formant targets, formant movement and duration. *Journal of Acoustical Society of America*, 122(5), 2842-2854.
- Katsuhiko, S. (2002). One Japanese SHS teacher's story of storytelling. *The Language Teacher*, 26(2), np.
- Kennedy, S., & Trofimovich, P. (2010). Language awareness and second language pronunciation: a classroom study. *Language Awareness*, 19(3).
- Khanbeiki, R. (2015). The Effect of Explicit vs. Implicit Instruction on the Learnability of English Consonant Clusters by Iranian Learners of English. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 6(2), 103-112.
- Khasanah, U. (2011). *Improving listening skill through storytelling*. (Unpublished undergraduate dissertation). Department of Education Faculty State Institute for Islamic Studies, Salatiga.
- Kim, M. (2010). The effects of storytelling on adult English language learners. *Linguistic Research*, 27(3), 447-473.

- Kim, M., & McGarry, T. (2014). Attitudes to storytelling among adult ESL learners. *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning* 4(1), 15-36. Retrieved from <http://journal.jltl.org/index.php/jltl/article/viewFile/225/52>
- Ko, J.; Schallert, D.; Walters, K. (2003). Rethinking Scaffolding: Examining Negotiation of Meaning in an ESL Storytelling Task. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(2), 303-324.
- Koerich, R. (2006). Perception and production of vowel paragoge by Brazilian EFL students. In B. Baptista, & Watkins, M. (Eds.). *English with a latin beat. Studies in Portuguese/Spanish – interphonology*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Kusumoto, Y. (2012). Between Perception and Production: Is the ability to hear L1-L2 sound differences related to the ability to pronounce the same sounds accurately? *Polyglossia* 22, 15-33.
- Lakhani, D. (2005). *Persuasion: The art of getting what you want*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Lambert, D. (1977). Learning to Recognize Foreign Speech Sounds: Strategies of Auditory Processing. (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation), University of California, San Diego.
- Lee, J.; Jang, J.; Plonsky, L. (2014). The effectiveness of second language pronunciation instruction: A meta-analysis. *Applied Linguistics*, 345-366.
- Levis, J., & LeVelle, K. (2012). Social factors in pronunciation acquisition. *Proceedings of the 3rd Pronunciation in Second Language Learning and Teaching Conference*, 1-10. Iowa State University.

- Li, C., & Seedhouse, P. (2010). Classroom interaction in story-based lessons with young learners. In P. Robertson, & R. Nunn (Eds.). *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, 12(2), 288-312.
- Ligon, F., & Tannenbaum, E. (1990). *Picture stories: Language and literacy activities for beginners*. New York: Longman.
- Ligon, F., Rodgers, C., & Tannenbaum, E. (1992). *More Picture Stories: Language and Problem-Posing Activities for Beginners*. New York: Longman.
- Long, M. (1990). Maturational constraints on language development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 12, 251-285.
- Lowen, S. (2015). *Introduction to instructed second language acquisition*. New York: Routledge.
- Luchini, P. (2017). Measurements for accentedness, pause and nuclear stress placement in the EFL context. *Ilha do Desterro* 70(3), 185-200.
- Makeig, K., & Nielsen, D. (2006). *Practical handbook of environmental site characterization and ground-water monitoring*. Second edition. Boca Raton: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Markham, D. (1997). *Phonetic Imitation, Accent and the Learner*. Lund: Lund University Press.
- Martins, M. (2011). *Estudo acústico da pronúncia de pares mínimos vocálicos do inglês por falantes nativos, professores brasileiros e alunos de nível intermediário e avançado*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Universidade Estadual Paulista "Júlio de Mesquita Filho", Araraquara.

- McAndrews, M.; Thomson, R. (2017). Establishing an empirical basis for priorities in pronunciation teaching. *Journal of Second Language Pronunciation* 3(2), 267-287.
- McDrury, J., & Alterio, M. (2003). *Learning through storytelling in higher education*. Sterling, VA: Kogan Page Limited.
- Miccoli, L. (2007). Experiências de professores no ensino de língua inglesa: uma categorização com implicações para o ensino e a pesquisa. *Linguagem & Ensino* (10), 1, 47-86.
- Morley, J. (1991). The pronunciation component in teaching English to speakers of other languages. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25, 481–520.
- Motallebi, S., & Pourgharib, B. (2013). The impact of audio stories (listening skills) on pronunciation of EFL learners. *Journal of Language Sciences & Linguistics* 1(1), 1-6.
- Munro, M., Derwing, T., & Morton, S. (2006). The mutual intelligibility of L2 speech. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 111-131.
- Munro, M. (2008). Foreign accent and speech intelligibility. In Edwards, J.; Zampini, M. (Eds.), *Phonology and second language acquisition* (pp. 193–218). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Munro, M., & Derwing, T. (2001). Modeling perceptions of the accentedness and comprehensibility of L2 speech: The role of speaking rate. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 23, 451-468.

- Murphy, J. (2014). Intelligible, comprehensible, non-native models in ESL/EFL pronunciation teaching. *Elsevier*, 42, 258-269.
- Nicholas, B; Rossiter M.; Abbott, M. (2011). The Power of story in the ESL classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 67(2), 247-268.
- Normann, A. (2011). *Digital storytelling in second language learning: A qualitative study on students' reflections on potentials for learning*. (Unpublished Master's thesis). Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim.
- O'Grady, G. (2013). *Key concepts in phonetics and phonology*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- O'Malley, M., & Chamot, A. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Paiva, V. (2003). A LDB e a legislação vigente sobre o ensino e a formação de professor de língua inglesa. In: Stevens, C.; Cunha, M. *Caminhos e Colheitas: ensino e pesquisa na área de inglês no Brasil*. Brasília: UnB, 53- 84.
- Pallu, P. (2004). *Língua inglesa e a dificuldade de aprendizagem da pessoa adulta*. (Unpublished Master's thesis). UDESC – Universidade do Estado de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis.
- Papachristou, V. (2014). *The Effectiveness of Explicit or Implicit Pronunciation Teaching to Greek learners of English: the case of acquisition of English vowels*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki.

- Peperkamp, S.; Bouchon, C. (2011). The relation between perception and production in L2 phonological processing. *ISCA*, 161-164.
- Perin, D. (2011). Facilitating student learning through contextualization. New York: *CCRR: Community College Research Center. Teachers College. Columbia University*. 1-58.
- Porte, G. (2012). *Replication research in applied linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Quertemont, E. (2011). How to statistically show the absence of an effect. *Psychologica Belgica*, 51(2), 109–127
- Rast, R. (2008). *Foreign language input: Initial processing*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Rauber, A. (2006). *Perception and production of English vowels by Brazilian EFL speakers*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis.
- Reis, M. (2006). *The Perception and Production of English Interdental Fricatives by Brazilian EFL Learners*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis.
- Ruhmke-Ramos, N. (2009). *The effects of training and instruction on the perception of the English interdental fricatives by Brazilian EFL learners*. (Unpublished Master's thesis). Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis.

- Saito, K. (2011). Examining the role of explicit phonetic instruction in native-like and comprehensible pronunciation development: An instructed SLA approach to L2 phonology. *Language Awareness*, 20, 45-59.
- Saito, K. (2012). Pronunciation-specific adjustment strategies for intelligibility in L2 teacher talk: Results and implications of a questionnaire study. *Language Awareness* 21(4), 369-385.
- Sebástian-Gallés, N.; Baus, C. (2005). On the relationship between perception and production in L2 categories. In A. Cutler (Eds.). *Twenty-first century psycholinguistics: Four cornerstones*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Sardegna, V. (2012). Learner differences in strategy use, self-efficacy beliefs and pronunciation improvement. In J. Levis, & K. LeVelle (Eds.). *Proceedings of the 3rd Pronunciation in Second Language Learning and Teaching Conference*, 39-53. Iowa State University.
- Schadech, T. (2013). *The production of word-initial /l/ by Brazilian learners of English and the issues of comprehensibility and intelligibility*. (Unpublished Master's thesis). Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis.
- Schadech, T.; Silveira, R. (2013). How do the non-target pronunciations of the consonants /θ/ and /ð/ by Brazilian learners of English affect comprehensibility? Porto Alegre: *Cadernos do IL*(46), 4-23.
- Schunk, D. (2008). *Learning theories: An educational perspective*. 5th Edition. New York: Prentice Hall.

- Seidlhofer, B. (2004). Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 209-239.
- Shepherd, D. (2001). Portuguese speakers. In Swan, M.; Smith, B. (Eds.). *Learner English: A teacher's guide to interference and other problems*. Second Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shrum, J.; Glisan, E. (2009). *Teacher's handbook. Contextualized language instruction*. Fourth edition. Boston: Heinle Cengage Learning.
- Silli, R. (2009). Priorities in pronunciation teaching. *Speak out! IATEFL Pronunciation Special Interest Group Newsletter Issue NN*, 1-4.
- Silva, R. (1998). A small-scale investigation into the intelligibility of the pronunciation of Brazilian intermediate students. *Speak out! IATEFL SIG Newsletter 17*, 15-23.
- Silveira, A. (2011). Deslocamento de acento na aquisição da língua inglesa como segunda língua. Shift emphasis on the acquisition of English as a second language. *Letras de Hoje*, 46(2), 104-112.
- Skhela, K. (2010). *The Effectiveness of Using Storytelling Technique in Enhancing 11th Graders' Listening Comprehension Sub-Skills in Middle Gaza Governorate*. (Unpublished Master's thesis). College of Education of the Islamic University, Gaza.
- Strange, W., & Shafer, V. (2008). Speech perception in second language learners: The re-education of selective perception. In H. Edwards, & M. L. Zampini (Eds.). *Phonology and second language acquisition* (pp. 153–192). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Sugete, A. (2012). Cursos de idioma miram 2014 e veem procura aumentar (n.d.). In *Negócios: Diários do Nordeste*. Retrieved from <http://diariodonordeste.globo.com/materia.asp?codigo=1192372>.
- Szyszka, M. (2017). *Pronunciation learning strategies and language anxiety: In search of an interplay*. Cham: Springer.
- Takagi, N., & Mann, V. (1995). The limits of extended naturalistic exposure on the perceptual mastery of English /r/ and /l/ by adult Japanese learners of English. *Applied Psycholinguistics* 16, 379–405.
- Tanner, J. (2012). *Factors affecting the acquisition of pronunciation: culture, motivation, and level of instruction*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Utah, Brigham Young University, Utah.
- Tarone, E. (2005). *Speaking in a second language*. In Hinkel, E. (Ed.). *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*. New York: Routledge, 485-505.
- Tavakoli, H. (2012). *A dictionary of research methodology and statistics in applied linguistics*. Tehran: Rahanna Press.
- Thompson, I. (1991). Foreign accents revisited: The English pronunciation of Russian immigrants. *Language Learning*, 4, 177-204.
- Thomson, R. (2011). Computer assisted pronunciation training: Targeting second language vowel perception improves pronunciation. *CALICO Journal*, 28(3), 744-765.

- Thomson, I., & Derwing, T. (2015). The effectiveness of L2 pronunciation instruction: A narrative review. *Applied Linguistics*, 36(3), 326-344, <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amu076>.
- Trofimovich, P. (2016). Interactive alignment. A teaching-friendly view of second language pronunciation learning. *Language Teaching*, 49(3), 411-422.
- Verdugo, D., & Belmonte, I. (2007). Using digital stories to improve listening comprehension with Spanish young learners of English. *Language Learning & Technology* 11(1), 87–101.
- Wajnryb, R. (2003). *Stories: Narrative activities in the language classroom*. Cambridge Handbooks for Language Teachers. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- Wang, F., & Lee, S. (2007). Storytelling is the bridge. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 3(2), 30-35.
- Wilson, K. (2011). *Smart choice. 2nd edition. Student book 1*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wright, A. (1995). *Storytelling with children*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Xavier, R., & Urio, E. (2006). O professor e o livro didático: Que relação é essa? Campinas: *Trabalhos em Linguística Aplicada* 45(1), 29-54.
- Yang, Y., & Wu, W. (2012). Digital storytelling for enhancing student academic achievement, critical thinking and learning motivation: A year-long experimental study. *Computers & Education* 59, 339–352.
- Yates, K. (2003). *Teaching linguistic mimicry to improve second language pronunciation*. (Unpublished Master's thesis). University of North Texas, Texas.

- Zare-Behtash, E.; Saed, A.; Sajjadi, F. (2016). The Effect of Storytelling Technique on Speaking Ability of Female Iranian Intermediate EFL Learners. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature* 5(1), 209-214.
- Zoghbor, W. (2011). Teaching the pronunciation of English as a lingua franca: Reducing skepticism and increasing practicality. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences* 1(8), 285-288.

5. APPENDICES

APPENDIX A


The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages - CEFR band descriptors.

	A1	A2	B1	B2	C1	C2
Listening	I can recognise familiar words and very basic phrases concerning myself, my family and immediate concrete surroundings when people speak slowly and clearly.	I can understand phrases and the highest frequency vocabulary related to areas of most immediate personal relevance (e.g. very basic personal and family information, shopping, local area, employment). I can catch the main point in short, clear, simple messages and announcements.	I can understand the main points of clear standard speech on familiar matters regularly encountered in work, school, leisure, etc. I can understand the main point of many radio or TV programmes on current affairs or topics of personal or professional interest when the delivery is relatively slow and clear.	I can understand extended speech and lectures and follow even complex lines of argument provided the topic is reasonably familiar. I can understand most TV news and current affairs programmes. I can understand the majority of films in standard dialect.	I can understand extended speech even when it is not clearly structured and when relationships are only implied and not signalled explicitly. I can understand television programmes and films without too much effort.	I have no difficulty in understanding any kind of spoken language, whether live or broadcast, even when delivered at fast native speed, provided I have some time to get familiar with the accent.
Reading	I can understand familiar names, words and very simple sentences, for example on notices and posters or in catalogues.	I can read very short, simple texts. I can find specific, predictable information in simple everyday material such as advertisements, prospectuses, menus and timetables and I can understand short simple personal letters.	I can understand texts that consist mainly of high frequency everyday or job-related language. I can understand the description of events, feelings and wishes in personal letters.	I can read articles and reports concerned with contemporary problems in which the writers adopt particular attitudes or viewpoints. I can understand contemporary literary prose.	I can understand long and complex factual and literary texts, appreciating distinctions of style. I can understand specialised articles and longer technical instructions, even when they do not relate to my field.	I can read with ease virtually all forms of the written language, including abstract, structurally or linguistically complex texts such as manuals, specialised articles and literary works.
Spoken Interaction	I can interact in a simple way provided the other person is prepared to repeat or rephrase things at a slower rate of speech and help me formulate what I'm trying to say. I can ask and answer simple questions in areas of immediate need or on very familiar topics.	I can communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information on familiar topics and activities. I can handle very short social exchanges, even though I can't usually understand enough to keep the conversation going myself.	I can deal with most situations likely to arise whilst travelling in an area where the language is spoken. I can enter unprepared into conversation on topics that are familiar, of personal interest or pertinent to everyday life (e.g. family, hobbies, work, travel and current events).	I can interact with a degree of fluency and spontaneity that makes regular interaction with native speakers quite possible. I can take an active part in discussion in familiar contexts, accounting for and sustaining my views.	I can express myself fluently and spontaneously without much obvious searching for expressions. I can use language flexibly and effectively for social and professional purposes. I can formulate ideas and opinions with precision and relate my contribution skilfully to those of other speakers.	I can take part effortlessly in any conversation or discussion and have a good familiarity with idiomatic expressions and colloquialisms. I can express myself fluently and convey finer shades of meaning precisely. If I do have a problem I can backtrack and restructure around the difficulty so smoothly that other people are hardly aware of it.
Spoken Production	I can use simple phrases and sentences to describe where I live and people I know.	I can use a series of phrases and sentences to describe in simple terms my family and other people, living conditions, my educational background and my present or most recent job.	I can connect phrases in a simple way in order to describe experiences and events, my dreams, hopes and ambitions. I can briefly give reasons and explanations for opinions and plans. I can narrate a story or relate the plot of a book or film and describe my reactions.	I can present clear, detailed descriptions on a wide range of subjects related to my field of interest. I can explain a viewpoint on a topical issue giving the advantages and disadvantages of various options.	I can present clear, detailed descriptions of complex subjects integrating sub-themes, developing particular points and rounding off with an appropriate conclusion.	I can present a clear, smoothly-flowing description or argument in a style appropriate to the context and with an effective logical structure which helps the recipient to notice and remember significant points.
Writing	I can write a short, simple postcard, for example sending holiday greetings. I can fill in forms with personal details, for example entering my name, nationality and address on a hotel registration form.	I can write short, simple notes and messages relating to matters in areas of immediate needs. I can write a very simple personal letter, for example thanking someone for something.	I can write simple connected text on topics which are familiar or of personal interest. I can write personal letters describing experiences and impressions.	I can write clear, detailed text on a wide range of subjects related to my interests. I can write an essay or report, passing on information or giving reasons in support of or against a particular point of view. I can write letters highlighting the personal significance of events and experiences.	I can express myself in clear, well-structured text, expressing points of view at some length. I can write about complex subjects in a letter, an essay or a report, underlining what I consider to be the salient issues. I can select style appropriate to the reader in mind.	I can write clear, smoothly-flowing text in an appropriate style. I can write complex letters, reports or articles which present a case with an effective logical structure which helps the recipient to notice and remember significant points. I can write summaries and reviews of professional or literary works.

(Retrieved from http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/education/elp/elpreg/Source/assessment_grid/assessment_grid_english.pdf)


APPENDIX B


The Oral and Written Placement Tests and the Teacher's Guidelines for Marking Purposes.

1 Starter		 A1
	<i>Question</i>	<i>Goals (with coursebook unit)</i>
1	What do you do? Do you work or are you a student?	Say where you work (2)
2	Tell me about your family.	Talk about families (2)
3	What do you do in your free time? (Do you play football or any sports?)	Say how you spend your time (4)
4	What do you do every day? What time do you get up / start work?	Talk about your daily routine (6)
5	Tell me about the town where you live.	Talk about a place you know (7)

2 Elementary

	Question	Goals (with coursebook unit)
6	Tell me about something you can do well. (Can you swim? Can you cook?)	Say what you can do (1)
7	How often do you usually see your friends? (What do you do together?)	Say what you do in your free time (3)
8	Where do you live? Tell me about your home.	Talk about homes (5)
9	What are you going to do at the weekend?	Talk about hopes and plans (14)
10	Have you been to an English-speaking country? Tell me about your visit. (OR Tell me about an interesting place you have been to.)	Talk about trips and past events (4) Talk about experiences (13)


3 Pre-intermediate		 B1
	<i>Question</i>	<i>Goals (with coursebook unit)</i>
11	Tell me about something that you did with your friends/family recently. Why did you enjoy it?	Describe past events (4)
12	Tell me about the weather in your country. Which is your favourite season and why do you like it?	Talk about weather (8) Give opinions (3)
13	Imagine that I am a visitor to your country. What advice would you give me?	Give advice (5) Make recommendations (7)
14	Can you tell me about an object that is special for you? Why is it special?	Talk about possessions (8)
15	Where do you live – in a house or an apartment? What's it like?	Talk about homes and housing (11)

4 Intermediate		 B1 to B2
	<i>Question</i>	<i>Goals (with coursebook unit)</i>
16	What sort of television programmes do you like?	Talk about TV and radio (1) Express preferences (1)
17	How do you keep in touch with your friends and family (by phone/email)? How do you think communication might change in the future?	Talk about methods of communication (2) Speculate about the future (2)
18	Tell me about the last film you saw at the cinema (or the last book you read). Would you recommend it?	Describe a book [or film] (1) Make recommendations (1)
19	Think about an interesting person you have met. What is he/she like?	Describe personality (7)
20	Have you ever been on a journey where something went wrong?	Talk about unexpected travel situations (8) Talk about something that went wrong (5)

5 Upper Intermediate



	<i>Question</i>	<i>Goals (with coursebook unit)</i>
21	Tell me about something you are good at.	Talk about things you're good at (1)
22	Can you tell me about a famous landmark/person in your country? What do you know about it/them?	Talk about landmarks where you live (4) Talk about well-known people where you live (4)
23	What do you use the internet for? Do you think it will ever replace books and newspapers? Why / why not?	Talk about media and the internet (6) Justify your point of view (6)
24	If an English person wanted to learn your language, how should they do this and why?	Make and justify recommendations (12)
25	Where do you see yourself in five years' time?	Talk about the future (14) Describe personal hopes and expectations (14)

6 Advanced		 C1
	<i>Question</i>	<i>Goals (with coursebook unit)</i>
26	How has the way you learn English changed over the years?	Describe experiences of language learning (3)
27	Do you think life for children today is easier or harder than it was for your parents / for you?	Make comparisons and talk about changes (4)
28	Describe an advert you have seen. How effective do you think it is?	Talk about advertising and marketing (8)
29	What image do other people have of your country, its food and its people? Do you think it is accurate?	Speculate about image (9)
30	Are you concerned about climate change? What evidence of it is there in your country?	Talk about climate change (11)

English Unlimited Placement test

Written test

 A1 to C1

- Choose the best answer for each question.
- Stop when the questions become too difficult.
- Spend no more than 40 minutes on the test.

- Where _____ from?
I'm from Russia.
A you are B you C are you
- We have _____ house in Moscow.
A any B a C an
- I have two _____, a boy and a girl.
A sons B daughters C children
- I work in a _____. I'm a doctor.
A hospital B hotel C supermarket
- This is my brother. _____ name's Paul.
A Her B His C He's
- _____ five people in my family.
A They are B There is C There are
- I get up _____ 7 o'clock in the morning.
A for B at C in
- I like apples, but I _____ bananas.
A don't like B like C do like
- Excuse me, _____ speak French?
A do you B you do C you
- How much are _____ shoes?
A this B these C that

- 11 Where are my glasses?
They're _____ the table.
A at B on C in
- 12 My sister _____ tennis very well.
A plays B play C playing
- 13 I usually go to work _____ train.
A on B with C by
- 14 I don't see my parents very often _____ they live in South Africa.
A so B but C because
- 15 Rosie stayed _____ home yesterday afternoon.
A in B at C to
- 16 Last night I _____ to the cinema.
A went B did go C was
- 17 The _____ is quite expensive but the food there is excellent.
A film B restaurant C book
- 18 Do you want to listen to music or _____ TV?
A see B look C watch
- 19 _____ were you at the weekend?
I was in Scotland.
A When B Where C What
- 20 _____ you have a good time at the party?
Yes, it was fun.
A Did B Were C Had
- 21 Are you _____ English teacher?
A Maria B Marias' C Maria's
- 22 Bob will meet _____ at the airport.
A us B we C our
- 23 I'm going to a concert tonight. _____ you like to come?
A Do B Are C Would

- 24 _____ use your dictionary?
Sure. Here you are.
A Could I B Could you C Do I
- 25 I like this apartment but the _____ is too expensive for me.
A money B rent C cost
- 26 Excuse me, how do I _____ to the bus station?
A come B get C arrive
- 27 Do you sell stamps?
Yes, we do. How _____ do you want?
A any B many C much
- 28 Sorry I'm so late.
That's _____.
A OK B great C right
- 29 I'd like _____ milk in my coffee, please.
A some B any C a
- 30 _____ a bus stop near my flat.
A It's B Here's C There's
- 31 Is this a good time to talk?
Sorry, no. I _____ dinner.
A cook B am cooking C cooking
- 32 I think cycling is more dangerous _____ driving.
A as B like C than
- 33 We _____ going to the theatre next Saturday.
A will B do C are
- 34 _____ meet for coffee some time soon.
A Let's B Do you C Shall they
- 35 Kamal has got a holiday home near _____ sea.
A a B the C some

- 36 If you've got a headache, you _____ go home.
A should B did C had
- 37 _____ ever been to New York?
A Have you B Are you C Did you
- 38 I only get about five hours' sleep a night.
That's not _____ .
A enough B lot C too much
- 39 Did Amina finish the report?
No. She _____ it tomorrow.
A finishes B Is going to finish C finished
- 40 Paula _____ loves working with children.
A very B really C much
- 41 Is Ottawa the capital of Canada?
I think _____ .
A is B yes C so D right
- 42 We never _____ a television when I was a child.
A have had B hadn't C had D didn't have
- 43 We paid the restaurant bill _____ credit card.
A to B with C on D by
- 44 The last time I _____ Joanna was in Paris.
A have seen B saw C see D was seeing
- 45 If you _____ money from a friend, you should always pay it back promptly.
A borrow B earn C spend D lend
- 46 Can I make myself a cup of coffee?
Of course. You _____ to ask.
A haven't B mustn't C needn't D don't have
- 47 I _____ a lot of sport in my free time.
A do B practise C make D exercise
- 48 _____ anywhere interesting recently?
A Do you go B Have you been C Are you going D Will you go

- 49 It's Walter's birthday on Friday. He _____ be 30, I think.
A should B can C will D shall
- 50 Learning the piano isn't as difficult _____ learning the violin.
A like B so C than D as
- 51 If the weather _____ bad tomorrow, we can go to a museum.
A will be B was C is D would be
- 52 About a billion cans of Coca-Cola _____ drunk around the world every day.
A is B are C was D were
- 53 My mum's not very well.
Oh, _____ .
A It doesn't matter B I do apologise C sorry to hear that D not bad, thanks.
- 54 Hans isn't here. He _____ to see his grandmother. He'll be back tomorrow.
A has gone B had been C has been D had gone
- 55 Would you mind changing my appointment? _____ time on Friday is fine.
A Next B All the C Every D Any
- 56 When I was a child, I _____ climb the wall and jump into our neighbours' garden.
A would B did C have D used
- 57 Have you finished _____ the wall yet?
A paint B to paint C painting D painted
- 58 Can you help me? I've tried _____ hotel in the city and can't find a room.
A many B any C every D all
- 59 Lena used to find work boring _____ she became a nurse.
A unless B until C if D since
- 60 If I _____ closer to my office, I could walk to work.
A lived B would live C had lived D live
- 61 I _____ outside the cinema when suddenly a police car arrived.
A stood B was standing C have stood D am standing

- 62 Shall we go to *The Riceboat* for dinner?
It _____ be fully booked. They're sometimes busy on a Monday.
A will B may C can D must
- 63 We've _____ come back from a trip to India. It was amazing.
A already B yet C just D only
- 64 I've got to be at work in five minutes.
Don't worry, I _____ you a lift if you want.
A give B am giving C 'll give D 'm going to give
- 65 My doctor advised me _____ more exercise.
A take B taking C having taken D to take
- 66 I couldn't _____ up with the noise in the city, so we moved to the countryside.
A put B live C set D take
- 67 There's no name on this dictionary.
It _____ be mine then. Mine's got my name on the front.
A might not B mustn't C won't D can't
- 68 Julia _____ married since she was 20.
A is B was C has been D is being
- 69 Don't worry if I _____ late tonight. I'm going to the gym after work.
A am B will be C would be D was
- 70 I've got a terrible headache, and it won't go away.
Have you tried _____ some aspirin?
A to take B take C took D taking
- 71 Boxing is a sport _____ requires a lot of speed and fitness.
A it B that C what D where
- 72 Jon _____ working on this project for a couple of months so he hasn't made much progress yet.
A is only B has only been C was only D had only been
- 73 I was wondering _____ I could ask you some questions.
Sure, go ahead.
A what B if C that D how

- 74 What clothes should I pack for a trip to Boston?
Well, it depends _____ the time of year that you go.
A on B with C up D to
- 75 I've finished this salad and I'm still hungry. I _____ ordered something more filling.
A must have B would have C should have D may have
- 76 Do you ever ask your neighbours to do favours _____ you?
A for B to C with D about
- 77 Some married couples seem to get more _____ over time.
A alike B same C like D equal
- 78 I don't know how much this card costs. The price label's _____ off.
A gone B taken C done D come
- 79 Ben got the job because he _____ a very good impression at his interview.
A made B did C put D took
- 80 Salsa music always _____ me of my trip to Cuba.
A remembers B realises C recognises D reminds
- 81 I _____ to be picking Tom up at the station but I've lost my keys.
A am supposed B am requested C am intended D am obliged
- 82 How about going to Colours nightclub?
There's no _____ I'm going there. It's awful!
A hope B way C time D opportunity
- 83 By the age of 18, I _____ not to go to university.
A had decided B decided C have decided D was deciding
- 84 I'm afraid your car _____ repaired before next week.
A hasn't been B wasn't C wouldn't be D can't be
- 85 The amount of organically grown food on sale has _____ enormously in recent years.
A raised B lifted C increased D built
- 86 Can you believe it? A woman has been _____ for hacking into the computer of her online virtual husband.
A accused B suspended C arrested D suspected

- 87 You may borrow my laptop _____ you promise to look after it.
A unless B in case C as long as D although
- 88 It's a huge painting. It _____ taken ages to complete.
A must have B can't have C should have D won't have
- 89 Pierre tends to put _____ dealing with problems, rather than dealing with them immediately.
A down B off C over D away
- 90 If the taxi hadn't stopped for us, we _____ standing in the rain.
A were still B would still be C are still D will still be
- 91 My mother's Italian, so _____ the language has been quite easy for me.
A to learn B learn C having learned D learning
- 92 _____ I had the talent, I still wouldn't want to be a movie star.
A In case B Even if C Provided that D However much
- 93 The factory workers threatened _____ on strike if they didn't get a pay rise.
A going B to go C that they go D to have gone
- 94 I was about to go to sleep when it _____ to me where the missing keys might be.
A remembered B happened C appeared D occurred
- 95 There's going to be a new department at work. They've asked me to _____ it up.
A take B set C put D bring
- 96 If the film is a _____ success, the director will get most of the credit.
A big B high C large D good
- 97 By the end of today's seminar I will _____ to each of you individually.
A speak B have spoken C be speaking D have been speaking
- 98 This is a photo of my little sister _____ ice cream on the beach.
A eat B eating C was eating D having eaten
- 99 Our students take their responsibilities very _____.
A considerably B thoroughly C seriously D strongly
- 100 Pia was _____ delighted with the birthday present.
A very B completely C fairly D absolutely

- 101 People were amazed that the burglary took place in _____ daylight.
A wide B broad C large D open
- 102 She invested a lot of time _____ researching the most appropriate university course.
A to B for C with D in
- 103 The police claimed that they acted in self-_____.
A interest B confidence C defence D discipline
- 104 I _____ remember putting my briefcase down on that shelf.
A deeply B entirely C clearly D strongly
- 105 He turned _____ to be considerably older than I had imagined.
A over B up C out D round
- 106 The windows in this house are in urgent _____ of replacement.
A need B help C want D demand
- 107 Speed cameras _____ shown to reduce accidents.
A have B were being C have been D are being
- 108 Life is a _____ deal easier for immigrants who can speak the local language.
A far B huge C big D great
- 109 The experiment _____ testing people's responses before and after drinking coffee.
A contained B incorporated C involved D consisted
- 110 We may be a bit late. We're _____ in a traffic jam.
A buried B stuck C blocked D surrounded
- 111 Having _____ his driving test several times, Paul finally passed at the fourth attempt.
A taken B made C had D attended
- 112 Gospel music has been a major influence _____ other musical styles, especially soul.
A with B to C about D on
- 113 Maintaining an accurate balance sheet is essential, _____ business you're in.
A however B wherever C whatever D whenever
- 114 It's _____ likely that this novel will win a literary prize.
A totally B deeply C strongly D highly

- 115 It's no _____ for me to get Brad's phone number – I'll be seeing him tonight.
A point B wonder C secret D problem
- 116 I'd lived in Australia, so I was used to _____ on the left side of the road.
A driving B drive C having driven D drove
- 117 I don't think the colours in Julia's outfit _____ together.
A fit B suit C match D go
- 118 Very rarely _____ here in July.
A it rains B does it rain C is it raining D it is raining
- 119 I prefer to buy CDs _____ download music from my computer.
A in contrast to B as opposed to C rather than D in comparison to
- 120 The number of turtles on the island _____ by 70% over the last decade.
A has declined B has been declining C has been declined D is declining

English Unlimited Placement test

Teacher's guide

This placement test is designed to help teachers decide at which level of *English Unlimited* new students should be placed.

The test contains:

- 120 written multiple-choice questions, 20 at each level from Starter to Advanced (covering CEF levels A1 to C1). The questions focus on the language taught across the six levels of *English Unlimited*.
- an oral placement test, designed to be used in conjunction with the written test. The questions in this test are linked to the goals in the *English Unlimited* coursebooks, which in turn are based on the CEF 'can-do' statements. The oral test is designed to be flexible. This should allow teachers to get an overview of students' speaking ability in order to 'fine-tune' their assessment of the correct level at which to place students.
- keys and tables for interpreting scores.

Written test procedure

- 1 Ask the student to start at the beginning of the written test and stop when the questions become too difficult. Allow 30–40 minutes for the test.
- 2 Mark the test and use the table below to place the student provisionally at one of the six levels of *English Unlimited*.
- 3 Use the oral placement test to confirm or adjust this placement (see Oral test procedure below).

	Starter	Elementary	Pre-Intermediate	Intermediate	Upper Intermediate	Advanced
Written test score	0–15	16–35	36–55	56–75	76–95	96+

Oral test procedure

- 1 Check the student's written test score and provisional placement.
- 2 Ask the student the introductory questions and note the information on the score sheet.
- 3 Ask a minimum of four questions from the question bank that corresponds to the level of the provisional placement.
- 4 Encourage the student to give full answers, by means of prompts rather than direct questions. Allow 5–10 minutes per question, depending on level.
- 5 Award a score for each question, using the band descriptors below, *interpreted at the relevant level*.

Band descriptors	Score
Insufficient sample of spoken language. Student fails to understand question, even when repeated.	0
Evidence of understanding at a basic level, but frequent inaccuracies in grammar and vocabulary may obscure the message. Significant hesitation and inaccuracies in pronunciation impede understanding. Utterances left unextended.	1
Clear evidence of comprehension. Grammar and vocabulary sufficient to convey intended meaning and extend answers effectively. Utterances are reasonably relevant and coherent with only occasional hesitation. However, complex vocabulary and grammatical structures are avoided (except in obviously well-rehearsed utterances).	2
Questions fully understood. Accurate and appropriate use of a range of simple and complex grammatical forms and vocabulary to develop responses fully. Utterances intelligible and linked coherently and logically without undue hesitation.	3

- 6 Place the student as follows:

Oral score	Level
Mainly 1s	One level below written score
Mainly 2s	At same level as written score
Mainly 3s	One level above written score

- 7 Where there is a significant discrepancy between the student's written score and oral performance, teachers should use their professional judgement to place the student at the correct level.
- 8 Teachers may like to ask students for their own assessment of their level of English, bearing in mind, however, that this judgement is likely to be very subjective.

English Unlimited Placement test

Score sheet

Student's full name							
Nationality							
Previous English experience							
Additional notes							
Written test	Score / 120	Provisional placement					
Oral test scores	Question number						
	Score						

Final placement

Starter	Elementary	Pre-intermediate	Intermediate	Upper Intermediate	Advanced

APPENDIX C

The Background Questionnaire

This questionnaire aims to learn about your profile, background and experience as an English learner language and the reasons for studying this language, in order to better identify the profile of the participants of this study. The answers can be given in English or in Portuguese.

(Este questionário objetiva adquirir informações sobre o seu perfil, formação e experiência como estudante de inglês, bem como as razões que o(a) levaram a estudar o idioma, para melhor identificar os participantes deste estudo. As respostas poderão ser dadas em inglês ou em português).

1. Identification Code: _____ Date (Data): _____
 2. What age group are you in? (*Em que faixa etária você se encontra?*)
 adolescent - 15-18 years old (*adolescente 15-18 anos de idade*)
 adult - 19+ (*adulto a partir de 19 anos*)
 3. Where were you born and raised? (*Onde você nasceu e foi criado?*)
 4. How long have you studied English at school? (*Há quanto tempo você estuda inglês na escola?*)
 For (*Há*) _____
 5. Do you attend English classes at an English course? If so, how long? (*Você faz curso de inglês?*)
 For (*Há*) _____
 6. Have you ever visited, lived or studied in an English-speaking country?
 (*Você já visitou, morou ou estudou em um país cuja língua oficial é o inglês?*)
 No (*Não*) Sim (*Yes*).
 If yes, what country is it? _____
 (*Caso tenha, que país é esse?*)

 How long did you stay in the country? _____
 (*Por quanto tempo você ficou no país?*)
 7. Do you think it is important to learn English? (*Você acha importante aprender inglês?*)
 Yes, because (*Sim, porque*)
-

No, because (*Não , porque*)

8. When you are studying English, what skill (for instance, speaking, listening, reading or writing) do you find...

(Quando você está estudando inglês, que habilidade linguística (por exemplo, fala, escuta, leitura ou escrita) você acha...)

a) the most important? (*a mais importante?*) _____.

b) the easiest? (*a mais fácil?*) _____.

c) the most difficult? (*a mais difícil?*) _____.

9. Have you ever taken any specific course for the development of pronunciation in English?

(Você já fez algum curso específico para o desenvolvimento da pronúncia em inglês?)

Não.

Yes (Sim). When? (*Quando?*)

10. How do you feel when you need to speak English in class?

(Como você se sente quando você tem de falar inglês em sala de aula?)

Eu gosto de falar inglês (I like speaking English)

Eu não me importo de falar inglês (I don't mind speaking English)

Prefiro não falar inglês (I prefer not to speak English)

Eu não gosto de falar inglês (I do not like to speak English)

and (*e*)/ but (*mas*)

I always try to speak English (*Eu sempre tento falar inglês*)

I always try to avoid speaking English (*Eu sempre evito falar inglês*)

Adapted from http://www.skolverket.se/polopoly_fs/1.18475!/Menu/article/attachment/student_background.pdf

APPENDIX D

The Storytelling Activities

All the stories and respective activities used in the experimental sessions were designed by this researcher and are based on illustrations from 1) Ligon and Tannenbaum (1990) and 2) Ligon and Tannenbaum (1992). The activity items the participants of the experimental group worked on in all classroom sessions are provided as follows:

1. Look at the pictures below. What do you think the story is about?
2. Listen to the story.
3. Now listen to phrases from the story. Then number the pictures to which each phrase refers to.
4. Compare your answers with your partner.
5. Check your answers with your teacher and the class as a whole.
6. Listen to the story again and follow it.
7. Read the story aloud and record it.

Next are the stories that were used in each session.

Session 2

All the illustrations of this session are available in: Ligon and Tannenbaum (1990), p.49

Old Friends	
(1)	(2)
Mrs. Gray lives in a beautiful house with her husband, a very competent and dedicated teacher from Manhattan. He's also a very good husband.	One day, she decides to telephone her friend, Mrs. Green, to talk to her and see how she is doing in her life.

(3)	(4)
The phone rings and Mrs. Green goes answer it. Interestingly, she thinks it's Mrs. Gray calling her and her guess is correct.	Mrs. Green quickly picks up the telephone and really gets excited when she hears Mrs. Gray's voice. Mrs. Gray and Mrs. Green are actually very old friends and live on 6th Avenue.
(5)	(6)
Mrs. Gray and Mrs. Green say "hello" to each other and then start a fun conversation.	A few minutes later, Mrs. Gray invites Mrs. Green to come to her house tomorrow afternoon, to chat and have something to eat.
(7)	(8)
Mrs. Green immediately accepts the invitation and gets very excited, as she loves meeting with Mrs. Gray. Next day Mrs. Green walks to Mrs. Gray's house.	When Mrs Green arrives at Mrs. Gray's place, she knocks on the door.
(9)	(10)
Two minutes later, Mrs. Green opens the door excitedly and says: "Come in, my friend." "It's great to see you again."	They are really very happy whenever they have the opportunity to get together. In fact, they always wish to spend most of the time together. Mrs. Gray loves to talk about her husband and his funny classroom experiences as a teacher.

Session 3

All the illustrations of this session are available in: Ligon and Tannenbaum (1990), p.7

Emergency	
(1)	(2)
A baby and his mother live in a dream house; a perfect fit for them.	The baby gets a bottle of ant poison and drinks the poison (it is summer now and in this season there are lots of ants).
(3)	(4)
Then he immediately starts to feel sick.	And suddenly falls down.
(5)	(6)
The mother was watching her team on TV play the soccer national championship.	She drops her coffee and starts to scream. Actually, she thinks her baby is

When she goes to the kitchen to get some coffee, she sees her son lying on the floor unconscious.	dying as he's very pale. At least, he is suffering.
(7)	(8)
She immediately calls the emergency number 911, as the situation looks very serious.	"911, what is your emergency?", asks the operator. "My son is dying! He needs help. He is just a baby", says the mother, crying desperately.
(9)	(10)
"What happened?", asks the operator? "Actually, he drank poison", informs the mother.	"An ambulance is certainly on the way and will be there shortly", says the operator.

Session 4

All the illustrations of this session are available in: Ligon and Tannenbaum (1990), p.67

Tourist in Trouble	
(1)	(2)
A tourist is in Orange street, near beautiful beaches, looking for a phone. He's not carrying his cell phone and urgently needs to make a phone call.	Then he goes to a department store to try to find a phone. It's a very popular store that has cheap, expensive and even free products.
(3)	(4)
He asks the store cashier "Can I use your phone?" The cashier simply says "No" to him, in a very impolite manner.	Then he leaves the store and sees a telephone booth next to the store.
(5)	(6)
He goes inside the telephone booth and leaves his suitcase outside.	He takes out a quarter (25 cents) to pay for the call.
(7)	(8)
He carefully inserts a quarter (25 cents) in the pay phone.	He dials the number. He's very worried as his phone call is extremely important.
(9)	(10)
The tourist is talking on the phone, very focused on his conversation.	The thief slowly moves his feet and the suitcase and steals it.

Suddenly a thief passes by and sees the suitcase.	Fortunately, there were only clothes in the tourist's suitcase.
---	---

Session 5

All the illustrations of this session are available in: Ligon and Tannenbaum (1992), p.67

Packing for College	
(1)	(2)
A man gets a letter. He can go to the prestigious and outstanding Y.U. College in Chicago, USA. The man is very happy with the wonderful news from Chicago.	The man opens his suitcase and starts to pack to go to Y.U. College.
(3)	(4)
He puts a suitcase on the bed. There are lots of items to pack and they are all necessary. Firstly, he puts a pair of pants in the suitcase.	He puts a pair of sunglasses. They are special.
(5)	(6)
He puts a pair of leather, waterproof shoes in the suitcase.	He also puts a few pairs of warm socks. He loves them.
(7)	(8)
Then he puts a pair of gloves. It is extremely cold at Y.U. College on winter days.	He puts a few pairs of underwear.
(9)	(10)
He's so excited about his experience in College that he doesn't notice he puts his dog in the suitcase.	He gets surprised and starts to think about it. "Am I crazy?" "Animals are not allowed to be packed in suitcases. Maybe I'm taking more items than I really need."

Session 6

All the illustrations of this session are available in: Ligon and Tannenbaum (1992), p.55

A Bad Boss	
(1)	(2)
Linda works very hard as a receptionist for a computer company. Actually, she works for three managers. One of them is a vocalist for a local Rock band.	One day, one of the managers calls her into his office. He is going to be away for a few months and needs to talk to Linda.
(3)	(4)
She asks "What?" and he says "Come here."	Linda goes into his office. The boss pinches her as she walks by. She is surprised.
(5)	(6)
The boss asks Linda to sit down on their sofa, close to him.	They are sitting together on the sofa. Linda asks her boss "What do you want?"
(7)	(8)
And the boss tries to kiss Linda. Linda says "No" to him, then.	At this moment, the boss asks Linda "Do you like your job?" Linda says "Yes."
(9)	(10)
The boss asks Linda "Can I kiss you?" And Linda says "No."	The boss says "Ok, no job. If you don't kiss me, you'll have to look for another job." Linda is very shocked at such unprofessional behaviour.

Session 7

All the illustrations of this session are available in: Ligon and Tannenbaum (1990), p.1

A Terrible Stomachache	
(1)	(2)
A mother cooks some steaks for dinner. They are thick and very juicy.	The mother and her daughter have dinner and have a great time together.

	Actually, they talk about different topics and every thought they have about life is optimistic.
(3)	(4)
The daughter wants to watch TV. There is a great evening show on channel 4 and she doesn't want to miss it.	It's late and the mother tells her daughter it's time to go to bed.
(5)	(6)
The daughter is sleeping. She studies very hard and needs to rest.	It's 6:30 am. The daughter wakes up and gets dressed to go to school.
(7)	(8)
The mother heats up some steak from last night's dinner and then prepares her daughter some breakfast.	The mother serves breakfast to her daughter. She also gives her daughter some steak, toast, grapes and orange juice.
(9)	(10)
A few hours later, when the daughter is watching a theater play, at school, she starts to have a strong stomachache there.	The daughter's school teacher immediately calls the mother. She quickly gets to her daughter's school and then takes her daughter to the emergency room.

Session 8

All the illustrations of this session are available in: Ligon and Tannenbaum (1992), p.7

Going Shopping	
(1)	(2)
Two women are close friends and love eating, cooking and shopping for healthy food. They both cook very well and their meals include healthy, delicious and juicy sandwiches, vegetables and salmon.	They describe the action of cooking as art and something fascinating. One day, they decide to go to a local supermarket together.

(3) Both women have shopping baskets and immediately start doing their shopping.	(4) Although these women also love going to restaurants, they prefer to cook their own meal, as restaurants are so expensive. They attentively look at the quality, price and characteristics of all products they choose.
(5) One woman looks at all sorts of cooking oil available. There are so many different brands that she doesn't actually know which one to take. The other woman takes the box of rice she is accustomed to buying.	(6) One of the women is looking for a different kind of oil and is not sure of which one to buy.
(7) The women are in aisle three. One woman looks at the pork and doesn't know which one to buy. The other woman puts beef in her shopping basket.	(8) One of the women find it extremely difficult to choose the best pork. All brands look very similar nowadays and you need to carefully compare them.
(9) After finding all the products they need, both women proceed to the register to pay for their shopping.	(10) They quickly pay and leave the supermarket. They are in a hurry because they still need to cook dinner for tonight and they don't know what to cook.

Session 9

All the illustrations of this session are available in: Ligon and Tannenbaum (1992), p.19

A Toothache	
(1) Jack is an important businessman He starts to have a very strong toothache.	(2) His friends give him a suggestion: to go to a hospital or a dental clinic. He decides to contact and go to a dental clinic.

(3)	(4)
The dentist asks “What is your problem?” Jack says “my tooth really hurts.”	Jack is now sitting in the chair. The dentist looks in Jack’s mouth.
(5)	(6)
The dentist takes an x-ray. The x-ray machine is of high technology and starts to vibrate.	The dentist gives Jack an injection.
(7)	(8)
The dentist pulls Jack’s tooth.	The dentist holds Jack’s tooth. Jack spits in the sink.
(9)	(10)
Jack thanks the dentist for his help. Jack also emails his friends a message to thank them for their help.	Jack pays the bill and goes to the airport for a business trip. He is always busy.

Session 10

All the illustrations of this session are available in: Ligon and Tannenbaum (1992), p.91

Honesty	
(1)	(2)
A young history teacher is at a bus stop near a Roman Church, in the heart of London. London is the capital of England and the United Kingdom, in Europe.	The man gets on the bus to the Buckingham Palace, but his wallet falls out of his pocket and he doesn’t see it.
(3)	(4)
Later on that day, a poorly dressed lady goes past the bus stop. She’s sad and worried, because she needs money to pay bills and buy some clothes for herself.	Suddenly, the lady sees the man’s wallet on the sidewalk. She immediately goes pick it up.
(5)	(6)
The lady finds interesting pictures, an ID and a lot of money in the wallet.	She thinks about the sensational clothes and shoes she can buy with the money.

<p>The lady is really excited. Now she has enough money to pay her bills and also buy the clothes she needs.</p>	
(7)	(8)
<p>As the lady walks home, she passes by the huge, modern London Eye.</p> <p>Then she sees a shoe store across the street and decides to visit it.</p>	<p>The lady takes a look around and thinks about buying a pair of Italian, French or Australian shoes, as they all look beautiful and have high quality.</p>
(9)	(10)
<p>However, she doesn't know whether she should buy the shoes so she leaves the store to think about it.</p>	<p>She sees a police station next to a museum of fine architecture.</p> <p>Actually, the lady doesn't know what to do": buy the shoes or return the wallet and all the money to the police, as they certainly don't belong to her.</p>

APPENDIX E

The Textbook Activities

All the textbook activities are available in Wilson (2011) and their respective page numbers per session are informed as follows.

Session 2: Page 23

Session 3: Page 28

Session 4: Page 68

Session 5: Page 14

Session 6: Page 40

Session 7: Page 74

Session 8: Page 20

Session 9: Page 34

Session 10: Page 60

APPENDIX F

The Pre-tests and Post-tests Taken by All the Participants

PRE-TESTS

Tests on perception

Pre-test 1: Put a cross on the words you hear.

	A		B
1.	(live/leave)	11.	(think/sink)
2.	(it/eat)	12.	(sick/thick)
3.	(chip/cheap)	13.	(than/tan)
4.	(fit/feet)	14.	(free/three)
5.	(least/list)	15.	(they/day)
6.	(his/he's)	16.	(thought/taught)
7.	(slipping/sleeping)	17.	(three/free)
8.	(it's/eats)	18.	(van/than)
9.	(bitches/beaches)	19.	(tree/three)
10.	(sitting/seating)	20.	(with/wiz)

(Celce-Murcia et al., 2010, p. 309)

*In pre-test 1, the words in blue are the ones the participants heard in the test.

Pre-test 2: Listen and mark the choice that shows the syllable receiving the main stress
(**CAPITALS IN BOLD** = main stress).

1.	Favorite a. F Aavorite b. Fa V ORite c. Favor I TE	11.	Theater a. T HEater b. The A ter c. Thea T ER
2.	Vocalist a. V Ocalist b. Vo C AList c. Voca L IST	12.	Association a. As S Ociation b. Associ A tion c. Associa T ION

3.	Receptionist a. RE ceptionist b. Re CEP tionist c. Reception NIST	13.	Restaurant a. Restau RANT b. Res TAU rant c. RES taurant
4.	Temperature a. TEM perature b. Tem PE rature c. Tempera TU re	14.	Hospital a. HOS pital b. Hos PI tal c. Hospi TAL
5.	Professional a. PRO fessional b. Pro FES sional c. Professio NAL	15.	Canada a. CAN ada b. Ca NAD a c. Cana DA
6.	Animals a. Anim als b. ANIM als c. Ani MALS	16.	Celebration a. CE lebration b. Cele BRA tion c. Celebra TION
7.	Message a. MES sage b. Mes SAG e c. Messa GE	17.	Mexican a. MEX ican b. Me XIC an c. Mexi CAN
8.	Architecture a. Archi TEC ture b. Architec TU re a. Arch itecture	18.	Avenue a. Ave ue b. AVEN ue c. Ave NUE
9.	Describe a. DES cribe b. Des CR ibe c. Descri BE	19.	Fascinating a. FAS cinating b. Fas CIN ating c. Fasci NAT ing
10.	National a. NAT ional b. Na TION al c. Natio NAL	20.	Guitarist a. GUIT arist b. Guita RI ST c. Gui TAR ist

(Adapted from Celce-Murcia et al., 2010, p. 310)

Tests on production

Pre-test 3: Practice saying these words until you are comfortable with them. Then, record the words, speaking as naturally as possible.

A	B
1. It	11. Think
2. Live (<i>verb</i>)	12. This
3. Cheap	13. Them
4. Be	14. They
5. Eat	15. Three
6. His	16. Thick
7. Fit	17. Thought
8. Swim	18. Their
9. He's	19. Than
10. Feet	20. There

(Adapted from Gilbert, 2005, p. xvii)

Pre-test 4: Practice saying these words until you are comfortable with them. Then, record the words, speaking as naturally as possible.

1.	Restaurants	11.	History
2.	Vegetables	12.	Modern
3.	Difficult	13.	Palaces
4.	Different	14.	Roman
5.	Delicious	15.	Suggestions
6.	Salmon	16.	Vibrate
7.	Important	17.	Europe
8.	Airport	18.	Sensational
9.	Problems	19.	Contact
10.	Capital	20.	Message

(Adapted from Gilbert, 2005, p. xvii)

POST-TESTS

Tests on perception

Post-test 1: Put a cross on the words you hear.

	A		B
1.	(feet/fit)	11.	(three/tree)
2.	(seating/sitting)	12.	(sink/think)
3.	(he's/his)	13.	(three/free)
4.	(leave/live)	14.	(tan/than)
5.	(it/eat)	15.	(tick/thick)
6.	(list/least)	16.	(they/day)
7.	(cheap/chip)	17.	(thought/taught)
8.	(beaches/bitches)	18.	(wiz/with)
9.	(slipping/sleeping)	19.	(thick/sick)
10.	(it's/eats)	20.	(than/van)

(Celce-Murcia et al., 2010, p. 309)

*In post-test 1, the words in blue are the ones the participants heard in the test.

Post-test 2: Listen and mark the choice that shows the syllable receiving the main stress (**CAPITALS IN BOLD** = main stress).

1.	Association a. As S Ociation b. Associa T ION c. Associ A tion	11.	Vocalist a. Vo C alist b. V Ocalist c. Voca L IST
2.	Theater a. T HEater b. The A ter c. Thea T ER	12.	Favorite a. Favor I TE b. F Avorite c. Fa V ORite
3.	Professional a. P ROfessional b. Pro F ESSional c. Professio N AL	13.	Restaurant a. R EStaurant b. Res T AURant c. Restau R ANT
4.	Mexican a. M Exican b. Me X Ican c. Mexi C AN	14.	Receptionist a. R Eceptionist b. Re C EPTIONist c. Receptio N IST

5.	Hospital a. Hos P ital b. Hospi TAL c. HOS pital	15.	Animals a. Ani MALS b. AN I mals c. A nimals
6.	Canada a. Ca N Ada b. CAN ada c. Cana DA	16.	Avenue a. A V enue b. A V enue c. Ave NUE
7.	Message a. Messa GE b. Mes S Age c. MES sage	17.	Describe a. DE Scribe b. Des CR Ibe c. Descri BE
8.	Guitarist a. G UITarist b. Gui TAR ist c. Guitar IST	18.	Celebration a. CE lebration b. Cele BR ATION c. Celebra TION
9.	Temperature a. Tem P ERature b. Tempera TU re c. TEM perature	19.	National a. NA tional b. Na TIO nal c. Natio NAL
10.	Fascinating a. FAS cinating b. Fas C Inating c. Fasci NA ting	20.	Architecture a. Archi TE Cture b. Architec TU re c. AR chitecture

(Adapted from Celce-Murcia et al., 2010, p. 310)

Tests on production

Post-test 3: Practice saying these words until you are comfortable with them. Then, record the words, speaking as naturally as possible.

A	B
1. Feet	11. Their
2. Eat	12. Thick
3. Live (<i>verb</i>)	13. Thought
4. Fit	14. Than
5. He's	15. There
6. It	16. They

7. His	17. Think
8. Cheap	18. This
9. Swim	19. Three
10. Be	20. Them

(Adapted from Gilbert, 2005, p. xvii)

Post-test 4: Practice saying these words until you are comfortable with them. Then, record the words, speaking as naturally as possible.

1.	Palaces	11.	Vegetables
2.	History	12.	Airport
3.	Delicious	13.	Restaurants
4.	Vibrate	14.	Sensational
5.	Difficult	15.	Roman
6.	Europe	16.	Different
7.	Contact	17.	Salmon
8.	Modern	18.	Suggestions
9.	Message	19.	Important
10.	Problems	20.	Capital

(Adapted from Gilbert, 2005, p. xvii)

APPENDIX G

The Evaluation Questionnaire for the Experimental and Comparison Group

Evaluation questionnaire for the experimental group

1. Você gostou de realizar atividades com contos de história? Por quê?/ Por que não?
(*Did you enjoy doing storytelling activities? Why (not)?*)
_____.
2. Que atividade(s), caso haja alguma, você mais gostou de fazer? Por quê?
(*Which activity/activities, if any, did you like doing best? Why*)
_____.
3. Que atividade(s), caso haja alguma, você não gostou de fazer? Por quê?
(*Which activity/activities, if any, did you not like doing? Why?*)
_____.
4. Você acha que, em geral, as atividades com contos de história ajudaram a melhorar a sua pronúncia em inglês? Por quê?/ Por que não?
(*Do you think that, in general, the storytelling activities have helped you improve your pronunciation in English? Why (not)?*)
_____.
5. Que atividade(s) você acha que colaborou/colaboraram mais eficientemente para o desenvolvimento da sua pronúncia em inglês?
(*In your opinion, which activity/activities helped you most efficiently in the development of your English?*)
_____.
6. Que sugestão você poderia dar para que o uso de histórias em sala de aula seja mais interessante e/ou eficiente para o desenvolvimento da pronúncia em inglês?
(*What suggestions can you give to make the use of stories more engaging and/or efficient to enhance English pronunciation?*)
_____.
7. Você praticou a língua inglesa oralmente com alguém fora das sessões experimentais e das aulas de inglês da escola?
(*Did you practice English orally with anyone outside of the experimental sessions and English classes at school?*)
() Não (No). () Sim (Yes). Por quanto tempo? (*For how long?*) _____.

Evaluation questionnaire for the comparison group

1. Você gostou de utilizar atividades de livro didático em suas aulas de inglês? Por quê?/
Por que não?
(Did you enjoy using textbook activities in your English sessions? Why (not)?)
_____.
2. Que atividade(s), caso haja alguma, você mais gostou de fazer? Por quê?
(Which activity/activities, if any, did you like doing best? Why)
_____.
3. Que atividade(s), caso haja alguma, você não gostou de fazer? Por quê?
(Which activity/activities, if any, did you not like doing? Why?)
_____.
4. Você acredita que, em geral, as atividades com o livro didático ajudaram a melhorar a sua pronúncia em inglês? Por quê?/ Por que não?
(Do you believe that, in general, the textbook activities have helped you improve your pronunciation in English? Why (not)?)
_____.
5. Que atividade(s) você acha que colaborou/colaboraram mais eficientemente para o desenvolvimento da sua pronúncia em inglês?
(In your opinion, which activity/activities helped you most efficiently in the development of your English?)
_____.
6. Que sugestão você poderia dar para que o uso de histórias em sala de aula seja mais interessante e/ou eficiente para o desenvolvimento da pronúncia em inglês?
(What suggestions can you give to make the use of stories more engaging and/or efficient to enhance English pronunciation?)
_____.
7. Você praticou a língua inglesa oralmente com alguém fora das sessões experimentais e das aulas de inglês da escola?
(Did you practice English orally with anyone outside of the experimental sessions and English classes at school?)
() Não (No). () Sim (Yes). Por quanto tempo? *(For how long?)*_____.

APPENDIX H

The Participants' Individual Scores in the Perception and Production Pre-tests/Post-tests

Perception Tests

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP						
Participants	Pre-test 1A (/i/-i/)	Post-test 1A (/i/-i/)	Pre-test 1B (/ð/-θ/)	Post-test 1B (/ð/-θ/)	Pre-test 2 (word stress)	Post-test 2 (word stress)
	Maximum score per test: 10 points (1 point per minimal pair x 10 minimal pairs)		Maximum score per test: 10 points (1 point per minimal pair x 10 minimal pairs)		Maximum score per test: 20 points (1 point per word x 20 words)	
EX01	6	6	7	7	14	14
EX02	6	6	7	6	12	14
EX03	7	6	8	9	15	15
EX04	5	5	8	7	14	14
EX05	6	7	6	6	12	11
EX06	6	8	6	6	11	12
EX07	5	6	7	8	16	16
EX08	7	7	7	7	14	14
EX09	6	7	6	6	13	14
EX10	5	4	6	6	12	13
EX11	6	6	7	7	13	13
EX12	6	7	7	7	14	14
EX13	5	6	7	8	12	13
EX14	5	6	6	5	10	10
EX15	6	6	9	7	17	17
EX16	5	7	6	7	13	13
EX18	7	7	7	8	16	15
EX19	6	5	6	7	11	12
EX20	5	5	8	8	15	15
EX21	7	8	7	8	15	15
EX23	7	6	7	8	13	12
EX24	6	7	7	7	13	14
EX27	7	8	7	8	16	17
EX29	5	6	7	8	16	16
EX30	6	6	7	7	14	14

EX31	6	6	6	7	14	15
EX34	5	7	7	8	16	15
EX35	7	7	7	9	17	17

COMPARISON GROUP						
Participants	Pre-test 1A (/i/-i/)	Post-test 1A (/i/-i/)	Pre-test 1B (/ð/-θ/)	Post-test 1B (/ð/-θ/)	Pre-test 2 (word stress)	Post-test 2 (word stress)
	Maximum score per test: 10 points (1 point per minimal pair x 10 minimal pairs)		Maximum score per test: 10 points (1 point per minimal pair x 10 minimal pairs)		Maximum score per test: 20 points (1 point per word x 20 words)	
CP01	6	6	6	6	14	14
CP02	6	7	6	7	12	13
CP03	7	7	7	7	15	16
CP04	5	6	6	6	15	15
CP05	6	6	6	6	12	12
CP06	6	6	6	6	12	12
CP07	5	5	5	6	16	16
CP08	7	7	7	7	14	15
CP09	6	6	6	6	12	11
CP10	5	5	5	5	11	12
CP11	6	6	7	7	13	13
CP12	6	7	7	7	14	14
CP13	5	5	5	5	12	12
CP14	6	6	6	7	10	10
CP15	7	7	8	9	17	15
CP16	5	6	9	9	12	12
CP18	7	7	9	9	16	16
CP19	6	6	7	7	11	12
CP20	5	5	8	8	14	14
CP21	7	7	8	8	15	17
CP22	8	9	9	9	12	12
CP23	6	6	7	7	13	13
CP24	7	7	8	8	15	15
CP27	5	6	8	8	16	17
CP29	6	6	7	8	14	13
CP30	6	6	7	8	14	15

CP31	5	6	7	7	16	17
CP34	7	7	8	9	11	12
CP35	6	6	8	7	17	18

CONTROL GROUP						
Participants	Pre-test 1A (/i/-/i/)	Post-test 1A (/i/-/i/)	Pre-test 1B (/ð/-/θ/)	Post-test 1B (/ð/-/θ/)	Pre-test 2 (word stress)	Post-test 2 (word stress)
	Maximum score per test: 10 points (1 point per minimal pair x 10 minimal pairs)		Maximum score per test: 10 points (1 point per minimal pair x 10 minimal pairs)		Maximum score per test: 20 points (1 point per word x 20 words)	
CR01	6	6	7	7	11	11
CR02	6	6	7	7	13	13
CR03	7	7	8	8	15	15
CR04	5	5	5	5	14	14
CR05	5	5	7	7	11	11
CR06	7	7	7	7	11	11
CR07	4	5	7	7	16	16
CR08	7	7	6	6	15	15
CR09	6	6	7	7	13	13
CR10	5	5	4	4	11	11
CR11	7	7	8	8	13	12
CR12	6	4	6	6	12	13
CR13	6	6	6	6	13	13
CR14	6	6	8	8	10	11
CR15	7	7	7	7	16	15
CR16	4	4	5	5	14	14
CR17	7	7	7	7	17	17
CR18	6	6	7	7	10	9
CR19	5	5	6	6	12	12
CR20	7	7	9	9	15	16
CR21	7	7	7	7	13	13
CR22	7	7	8	8	13	13
CR23	8	8	7	7	14	14
CR24	4	5	8	8	15	15
CR25	6	6	8	8	13	13
CR26	6	6	7	7	13	13

CR27	5	5	8	8	16	16
CR28	7	7	9	9	12	12
CR29	5	6	8	8	18	18

Production Tests

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP						
Participants	Pre-test 3A (/i/-i/)	Post-test 3A (/i/-i/)	Pre-test 3B (/ð/-θ/)	Post-test 3B (/ð/-θ/)	Pre-test 4 (word stress)	Post-test 4 (word stress)
	Maximum score per test: 50 points (a maximum of 5 points per word x 10 words)		Maximum score per test: 50 points (a maximum of 5 points per word x 10 words)		Maximum score per test: 100 points (a maximum of 5 points per word x 20 words)	
EX01	34	38	31	31	72	72
EX02	36	38	27	27	66	67
EX03	36	39	30	30	81	82
EX04	38	41	25	27	66	71
EX05	35	35	21	22	63	68
EX06	34	34	26	26	76	76
EX07	36	36	23	23	73	76
EX08	35	38	23	26	76	76
EX09	33	34	25	25	77	79
EX10	32	34	31	31	77	82
EX11	35	36	33	33	77	79
EX12	37	38	28	28	74	75
EX13	39	39	26	26	77	77
EX14	36	39	32	33	77	80
EX15	37	39	23	26	68	71
EX16	37	38	24	26	68	72
EX18	36	37	24	26	71	72
EX19	35	35	25	27	79	80
EX20	34	34	31	31	66	72
EX21	34	36	23	27	74	77
EX23	34	35	21	24	75	76
EX24	35	36	25	25	72	74
EX27	33	33	25	26	72	73
EX29	34	37	27	27	73	77

EX30	36	38	28	28	68	69
EX31	36	37	28	28	74	75
EX34	33	34	28	28	68	71
EX35	32	33	26	26	63	72

COMPARISON GROUP						
Participants	Pre-test 3A (/i/-i/)	Post-test 3A (/i/-i/)	Pre-test 3B (/ð/-θ/)	Post-test 3B (/ð/-θ/)	Pre-test 4 (word stress)	Post-test 4 (word stress)
	Maximum score per test: 50 points (a maximum of 5 points per word x 10 words)		Maximum score per test: 50 points (a maximum of 5 points per word x 10 words)		Maximum score per test: 100 points (a maximum of 5 points per word x 20 words)	
CP01	31	33	34	34	70	72
CP02	35	37	30	30	72	74
CP03	33	33	28	28	67	71
CP04	35	35	27	27	72	75
CP05	37	37	25	25	80	81
CP06	31	32	27	27	73	78
CP07	32	32	26	26	69	70
CP08	38	38	26	26	74	76
CP09	33	35	28	28	76	80
CP10	37	37	24	24	71	75
CP11	36	36	24	26	74	77
CP12	38	38	25	25	71	77
CP13	33	35	24	26	77	80
CP14	30	30	25	28	75	77
CP15	40	40	23	24	75	80
CP16	31	35	25	28	76	76
CP18	31	36	27	28	68	73
CP19	32	32	24	24	70	75
CP20	31	32	21	22	69	74
CP21	33	33	26	28	76	78
CP22	32	33	26	26	68	71

CP23	35	35	23	23	67	71
CP24	29	30	24	25	73	78
CP27	35	35	31	31	78	78
CP29	32	33	24	25	73	75
CP 30	30	31	22	22	64	66
CP 31	36	36	32	32	70	73
CP 34	31	31	33	33	66	73
CP 35	33	34	30	30	67	72

CONTROL GROUP						
Participants	Pre-test 3A (/i/-/i/)	Post-test 3A (/i/-/i/)	Pre-test 3B (/ð/-/θ/)	Post-test 3B (/ð/-/θ/)	Pre-test 4 (word stress)	Post-test 4 (word stress)
	Maximum score per test: 50 points (a maximum of 5 points per word x 10 words)		Maximum score per test: 50 points (a maximum of 5 points per word x 10 words)		Maximum score per test: 100 points (a maximum of 5 points per word x 20 words)	
CR01	34	34	29	29	69	69
CR02	33	33	26	26	66	66
CR03	34	34	27	27	78	78
CR04	39	39	25	25	65	65
CR05	35	35	22	22	62	62
CR06	33	33	25	25	74	74
CR07	35	35	26	26	73	73
CR08	35	35	22	22	73	73
CR09	34	34	25	25	74	74
CR10	31	31	27	27	72	72
CR11	36	36	31	31	73	73
CR12	35	35	28	29	73	73
CR13	36	36	26	26	71	71
CR14	34	34	28	28	74	74
CR15	36	37	24	24	66	66
CR16	35	35	26	26	63	63
CR17	35	35	26	27	65	65
CR18	35	36	26	26	73	73
CR19	33	33	29	29	65	65
CR20	31	31	24	24	73	73

CR21	30	31	21	21	73	73
CR22	33	33	24	24	74	74
CR23	31	31	23	24	72	72
CR24	31	31	26	27	68	68
CR25	32	32	25	25	66	66
CR26	31	31	26	27	72	72
CR27	34	34	26	26	67	67
CR28	32	32	26	26	59	59
CR29	32	32	25	25	69	69

APPENDIX I

The Participants' Consent Form Approved by the Ethics Committee of the University of
Victoria

Department of Linguistics

Participant Consent Form

The role of storytelling in the development of pronunciation of Brazilian learners of English as a foreign language

You are invited to participate in a study entitled “The role of storytelling in the development of pronunciation of Brazilian learners of English as a foreign language” that is being conducted by Claudio Rezende Lucarevschi.

Claudio Rezende Lucarevschi is a graduate student in the department of Linguistics at the University of Victoria and you may contact him if you have further questions by email at clucarezende@gmail.com, or by telephone at 250 590 3171.

As a graduate student, I am required to conduct research as part of the requirements for my Doctoral degree in Linguistics. It is being conducted under the supervision of Dr. Hossein Nassaji. You may contact my supervisor at nassaji@uvic.ca and/or at 250 721 7422.

Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this research project is to investigate the role of storytelling in the development of pronunciation of Brazilian learners of English as a foreign language and also how storytelling compares to textbook activities, in effectiveness, in pronunciation enhancement.

Importance of this Research

This research represents an important advancement in Applied Linguistics, regarding L2 pronunciation development, since it will investigate whether storytelling plays a role in improving the pronunciation of Brazilian EFL learners. Furthermore, it will investigate how storytelling activities compare, in effectiveness, to textbook activities, being of special usefulness to those who do research on pronunciation/speaking skills or teach EFL in Brazil or ESL to Brazilian learners in Canada.

Participants Selection

You are being asked to participate in this study because you were born and raised in Brazil, have an elementary English proficiency level and is 15 years of age or older.

What is involved

If you consent to voluntarily participate in this research, your participation will include twelve, twenty-five minute experimental sessions, three times a week, except when there is a national holiday. The experimental sessions comprise pre-tests, post-tests and classroom activities. With respect to the classroom activities, they consist of

storytelling and textbook activities and you will be randomly chosen to participate in the experimental group (storytelling), in the comparison (textbook) group or in the control group (only take pre-tests and post-tests).

Please be advised that information about you that is gathered for this research study, such as your age, nationality, answers to pre-tests and post-tests, as well as questionnaires, uses an online program located in the U.S. As such, there is a possibility that information about you may be accessed without your knowledge or consent by the U.S. government in compliance with the U.S. Patriot Act. Nevertheless, your name will never be mentioned in the research, to guarantee your anonymity.

Inconvenience

Participation in this study may cause some inconvenience to you, since you will have to attend twelve classroom experimental sessions of twenty-five minutes each three times a week.

Risks

There are no known or anticipated risks to you by participating in this research.

Benefits

The potential benefits of your participation in this research include a consistent contribution to the state of knowledge of the effect(s) of storytelling activities on the development of pronunciation of elementary-level Brazilian learners of English as a foreign language at 15+ years of age or older.

Voluntary Participation

Your participation in this research must be completely voluntary. If you do decide to participate, you may withdraw at any time without any consequences or any explanation. If you do withdraw from the study your data will not be used.

Researcher's Relationship with Participants

The participating learners of this study do not have any relationship with the researcher.

Anonymity

In terms of protecting your anonymity your name will not be informed in the research. Codes will be used instead of the participants' names.

Confidentiality

Your confidentiality and the confidentiality of the data will be protected by storage of data in computer files and sheets of paper (i.e., questionnaires) in the researcher's private residence.

Dissemination of Results

It is anticipated that the results of this study will be shared with others in the submission of my Doctoral dissertation.

Disposal of Data

Electronic data from this study will be kept with the researcher until December 31 2015. After this date, the data will be erased.

Contacts

Individuals that may be contacted regarding this study include the researcher (Claudio Rezende Lucarevski, at clucarezende@gmail.com and/or at 250 590 3171) and his supervisor (Dr. Hossein Nassaji, at nassaji@uvic.ca and/or at 250.721.7422).

In addition, you may verify the ethical approval of this study, or raise any concerns you might have, by contacting the Human Research Ethics Office at the University of Victoria (250-472-4545 or ethics@uvic.ca).

Your signature below indicates that you understand the above conditions of participation in this study and that you have had the opportunity to have your questions answered by the researchers.

Name of Participant

Signature

Date

A copy of this consent will be left with you and a copy will be taken by the researcher.

APPENDIX J

Proof of Application to Ethics in Brazil



COMPROVANTE DE ENVIO DO PROJETO

DADOS DO PROJETO DE PESQUISA

Título da Pesquisa: The role of storytelling in the development of pronunciation of Brazilian learners of English as a foreign language (O papel do conto de histórias no desenvolvimento da pronúncia de alunos brasileiros de inglês como língua estrangeira)

Pesquisador:

Versão:

CAAE: Claudio Rezende Lucarevski

2

302896 14.6.0000.5501

Instituição Proponente:

DADOS DO COMPROVANTE

Número do Comprovante: 026339/2014

Patrocinador Principal: Financiamento Próprio

Endereço: Rua Visconde do Rio Branco, 210
Bairro: Centro **CEP:** 12.020-040
UF: SP **Município:** TAUBATÉ
Telefone: (12)3035-1233 **Fax:** (12)3035-1233 **E-mail:** cepunitau@unitau.br

APPENDIX K

The Participants' Consent form, Approved by the Ethics Committee of the University of Taubaté, SP, Brazil

COLETA DE DADOS PARA PESQUISA DE DOUTORADO

Pesquisador Responsável: Claudio Rezende Lucarevski
 Endereço: A-4396 Tyndall Avenue, Victoria, BC, V8N3S1, Canadá
 Fone: (250)5903171; (21)30796470 (Brasil)
 E-mail: clucarezende@gmail.com

TERMO DE CONSENTIMENTO LIVRE E ESCLARECIDO

O Sr. (a) está sendo convidado (a) como voluntário (a) a participar da pesquisa "The role of storytelling in the development of pronunciation of Brazilian learners of English as a foreign language" (o papel do uso de histórias no desenvolvimento da pronúncia de alunos brasileiros de língua inglesa). Neste estudo pretendo investigar o papel do uso de histórias, contadas oralmente, no desenvolvimento da pronúncia de alunos brasileiros de inglês, e compará-lo a atividades de livro didático em eficiência.

O motivo que nos leva a realizar este estudo é investigar, empiricamente, se o uso de histórias, em sala de aula, realmente contribui para o desenvolvimento da pronúncia e, caso contribua, que áreas da pronúncia são beneficiadas. Além disso, este estudo comparará o uso de atividades com história ao uso de atividades com livro didático, oferecendo informações relevantes a professores de língua inglesa, brasileiros ou estrangeiros, que trabalham com alunos brasileiros e com o ensino e/ou pesquisa voltada ao desenvolvimento da pronúncia da língua inglesa.

Para este estudo, você participará de doze sessões experimentais de vinte e cinco minutos de duração cada, três vezes por semana, totalizando uma participação de cinco horas. Durante este experimento, você participará de testes de nivelamento, para confirmar se o seu nível de proficiência na língua inglesa é adequado a esta pesquisa, e também participará de pré-testes e pós-testes de pronúncia, além de preencher questionários.

Para participar deste estudo você não terá nenhum custo, nem receberá qualquer vantagem financeira. Além disso, você será esclarecido (a) sobre o estudo em qualquer aspecto que desejar e estará livre para participar ou recusar-se a participar, e poderá retirar o seu consentimento ou interromper a sua participação a qualquer momento. A sua participação é voluntária, e a recusa em participar não acarretará em qualquer penalidade ou modificação na forma em que é atendido pelo pesquisador. Você poderá, também, entrar em contato com o pesquisador (Claudio Rezende Lucarevski) a qualquer momento, inclusive com ligações a cobrar para o número 21 97454 9576.

O pesquisador irá tratar a sua identidade com padrões profissionais de sigilo.

Os resultados da pesquisa estarão à sua disposição quando finalizada. Seu nome ou o material que indique sua participação não será liberado sem a sua permissão.

O (A) Sr (a) não será identificado em nenhuma publicação que possa resultar deste estudo.

Este termo de consentimento encontra-se impresso em duas vias, sendo que uma cópia será arquivada pelo pesquisador responsável, no Centro Colégio Cenecista Alberto Torres e a outra será fornecida a você.

Caso haja danos decorrentes dos riscos previstos, o pesquisador assumirá a responsabilidade pelos mesmos.

Eu, _____, portador do documento de Identidade _____ fui informado (a) dos objetivos do estudo “The role of storytelling in the development of pronunciation of Brazilian learners of English as a foreign language”, de maneira clara e detalhada e esclareci minhas dúvidas. Sei que a qualquer momento poderei solicitar novas informações e modificar minha decisão de participar se assim o desejar.

Declaro que concordo em participar desse estudo. Recebi uma cópia deste termo de consentimento livre e esclarecido e me foi dada à oportunidade de ler e esclarecer as minhas dúvidas.

Itaboraí, 04 de setembro de 2014.

Nome Assinatura participante Data

Claudio Rezende Lucarevschi -

Nome Assinatura pesquisador Data

Mariá Rezende Lucarevschi

Nome Assinatura testemunha Data

Em caso de dúvidas aos aspectos éticos deste estudo, você poderá consultar o Comitê de Ética em Pesquisa – Universidade de Taubaté – UNITAU.

Rua Visconde do Rio Branco, 210 - Centro - Taubaté - SP - Brasil - CEP. 12020-040

APPENDIX L

Letter of Permission to Collect Data from the Brazilian School



CAMPANHA NACIONAL DE ESCOLAS DA COMUNIDADE
SUPERINTENDÊNCIA ESTADUAL DO RIO DE JANEIRO
CNEC RIO DE JANEIRO – UNIDADE ITABORAÍ

Itaboraí, 01 de abril de 2014.

TERMO DE CONSENTIMENTO DA INSTITUIÇÃO

Pelo presente termo, e na qualidade de Diretor Geral da Faculdade Itaboraí - Rede CNEC, da faculdade Cenequista de Itaboraí – FACNEC e do Colégio Cenequista Alberto Torres – CCAT declaro que aceito a realização de coleta de dados em nossas instituições de ensino e junto aos nossos alunos e familiares, para o projeto de pesquisa de tese de Doutorado intitulado "The role of storytelling in the development of pronunciation of Brazilian learners of English as a foreign language". A coleta de dados será realizada pelo doutorando Claudio Rezende Lucarevski, da Universidade de Victoria, Victoria, BC, Canadá, e sob a orientação do Professor Hossein Nassaji.

Assinatura do responsável