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I. Introduction
I.A. English pronunciation models

- **NE (Native-like English)**
  - “conservative 1.”
    - assimilate to powerful groups’ language practices
  - “image based 2.”
    - try to perfect the image of a good speaker

- **EIL (English as an International Language)**
  - “liberal 1.”
    - emphasize that all varieties are linguistically equal
  - “intelligibility based 2.”
    - have utilitarian outlook, no desire to be mistaken for an NS

- **JE (Japanized English)**
  - “radical 1.”
    - claim that spread of English exacerbates language inequalities
  - “identity based 2.”
    - have no desire or need to change his/her identity

1. Melchers & Shaw (2003:30)
3. Melchers & Shaw (2003:30)
5. Lingua Franca Core (Jenkins 2000)
I.B. English pronunciation models

Gaps and overlaps in phonological features

What they want to do
- Image of each model
- How English learners in Japan view their acquisition target.
- Preferred English pronunciation models

What they want to be

What kind of pronunciation model is preferred among what kind of learners and teachers?
II. Method
II.A. Questionnaires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Two questionnaires conducted in 2010.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English major &amp; Non-English major University students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 questions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 question items
- (A) Preferred pronunciation models
- (B) Occupational needs
- Self-confidence in pronunciation
- (C) Two fields the participants are good at
- (D) Two fields the participants are weak at

(Handout p.4)
## II.B. Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>TOEIC M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eng. Major (A public uni.)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>776.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( n=18, SD=76.2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Eng. Major (A private uni.)</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>342.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( n=91, SD=69.1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES teacher (72 schools)</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHS teacher (32 schools)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II.C. Procedures

(A) Preferred pronunciation models
• NE=“1”, EIL=“2”, JE=“3”

(B) Occupational needs for using English
• Students (future expectation):
  “never”, “not often”, “sometimes”, “often”
• Teachers (classroom use):

(C) Self-confidence in pronunciation
• “two fields relatively good at”=“confident”
• “two fields relatively weak at”=“less confident”

(D) Students’ English proficiency
• TOEIC scores

Kruskal-Wallis Test
Mann-Whitney’s $U$ test (Bonnferroni’s correction)
Kendall’s $\tau$ rank correlation coefficient
III. Results
III.A. Studying / working environment

- Kruskal-Wallis Test \( (n=529, \chi^2=35.7, p<.001) \)
- Mann-Whitney’s \( U \) test (Bonnferroni’s correction)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eng. students</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>EIL</td>
<td>JE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Eng. students</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES teachers</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHS teachers</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Eng. students
2. Non-Eng. students \( p<.001 \)
3. ES teachers \( p<.001 \) \( n.s. \)
4. JHS teachers \( n.s. \) \( p<.05 \) \( p<.05 \)
III.B. Occupational needs (students)

Table 3. Distribution of Preferred Pronunciation Models by **Expectation of English Use.**

- **Mann-Whitney’s U test**
  \[ n=213, \ U=3749.0, \ p<.001 \]

Students in **NE** group are likely to have **higher expectation** for future English use than those in **EIL** group.
III.B. Occupational needs (teachers)

Table 4. Distribution of Preferred Pronunciation Models by Classroom English Use.

- Mann-Whitney’s $U$ test
  $n=288$, $U=10014.5$, $n.s.$

Frequency of the classroom English use is not necessarily the main factor to influence their choice of models.
**III.C. Self-confidence (students)**

Table 5. Distribution of Preferred Pronunciation Models by **Self-confidence in pronunciation**.

- **Confident**: NE - 18, EIL - 13, JE - 1
- **Neither**: NE - 69, EIL - 69, JE - 2
- **Less confident**: NE - 25, EIL - 19, JE - 1

- **Mann-Whitney’s U test**
  \( n=213, \ U=5630.0, \ n.s. \)

**Not likely** that the students chose NE/EIL just because they think they are good / weak at pronunciation.
### III.C. Self-confidence (teachers)

Table 6. Distribution of Preferred Pronunciation Models by **Self-confidence in pronunciation**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NE</th>
<th>EIL</th>
<th>JE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less confident</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Mann-Whitney’s $U$ test  
  $n=297$, $U=9959.0$, $p=.585$

Tendency that the teachers in **NE** are more likely to be **confident** in their pronunciation than those in **EIL**.
III.D. Students’ English proficiency

Means of the students’ **TOEIC scores**
by Preferred Pronunciation Models.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>488.0</td>
<td>189.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIL</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>358.7</td>
<td>148.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>349.8</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>414.1</td>
<td>176.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Kendall’s $\tau$ rank correlation coefficient
  $n=109$, Kendall’s $\tau$ b = -.33, $p<.001$

Students with **higher English proficiency**
are more likely to choose **NE**.
IV. Discussions
IV. Discussion (JE)

• Very few participants chose JE.
⇒ focus on “image of a good speaker” & “intelligibility” rather than on “language inequalities” & “identity”

• 11 ES teachers chose JE (n=18).
⇒ “Teachers should enable pupils to deepen their understanding not only of the foreign language and culture, but also of the Japanese language and culture through foreign language activities.”?

⇒ “(1) To become familiar with the sounds and rhythms of the foreign language, to learn its differences from the Japanese language, ...” (MEXT 2010)

How do ES students learn the differences?
IV. Discussion (NE)

- Similar tendencies between
  - Eng. students & JHS teachers (NE)
    Main interest in English ⇒ “correctness”?  
  - Non-Eng. students & ES teachers (EIL)
    Interest in various fields ⇒ “communication”?

- Occupational needs
  - Students (higher expectation ⇒ NE)
  - Teachers (n.s.)
    262/302 (87%) of the teachers use J > E

- Self-confidence in pronunciation
  - Students (n.s.)
    Optimistic about “learnability”? Nakanishi (2008)
  - Teachers (confident in pronunciation ⇒ NE)

- Students’ English proficiency
  - higher TOEIC score ⇒ NE
• Students with **weaker** expectation of occupational needs for speaking English
• Teachers with **less confidence** in their pronunciation
• Students with **lower** English proficiency are more likely to choose **EIL** than **NE**.

⇒ Are they really aiming at **intelligible pronunciation**?

⇒ **EIL** is **not an excuse** for avoiding pronunciation practice.

⇒ What is **intelligible / unintelligible**?

⇒ What are the roles of **contextual messages**?

⇒ How do listeners view **NE / EIL / JE** speakers?
V. Further studies
V. Further studies(1)

⇒ What are the roles of the contextual messages?

NC: Let’s take a boat.
WC: We crossed the river by boat.
FC: *We decided the matter by boat.

http://www.tm.kobegakuin.ac.jp/kyozai/ba/contents01/
V. Further studies (2)

⇒ How do listeners view NE / JE speakers?

Familiarity
Companionship
Admiration
Collaboration
Participants wanted

- Non-native speakers of English / Japanese
- Native speakers of English

Please access the URL below:
http://www.tm.kobegakuin.ac.jp/kyozai/ba/contents01/

Or, email Ms. Nakanishi at:
nakanisi@ba.kobegakuin.ac.jp

Required time: 10-20 min.
Participation is anonymous.
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III.A. Studying / working environment

- Kruskal-Wallis Test \( n=529, \chi^2=35.7, p<.001 \)
- Mann-Whitney’s \( U \) test (Bonferroni’s correction)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Eng. students</th>
<th>Non-Eng. students</th>
<th>ES teachers</th>
<th>JHS teachers</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>46 (80.7)</td>
<td>66 (41.3)</td>
<td>94 (42.7)</td>
<td>57 (62.0)</td>
<td>263 (49.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIL</td>
<td>11 (19.3)</td>
<td>90 (56.3)</td>
<td>115 (52.3)</td>
<td>32 (34.8)</td>
<td>248 (46.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>4 (2.5)</td>
<td>11 (5.0)</td>
<td>3 (3.3)</td>
<td>18 (3.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57 (100.0)</td>
<td>160 (100.0)</td>
<td>220 (100.0)</td>
<td>92 (100.0)</td>
<td>529 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Eng. students
2. Non-Eng. students \( p<.001 \)
3. ES teachers \( p<.001 \), n.s.
4. JHS teachers n.s., \( p<.05 \), \( p<.05 \)
### III.B. Occupational needs (students)

Table 3. Distribution of Preferred Pronunciation Models by Expectation of English Use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Not often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NE</strong></td>
<td>2 (20.0)</td>
<td>20 (37.0)</td>
<td>39 (47.6)</td>
<td>51 (71.8)</td>
<td>112 (51.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EIL</strong></td>
<td>8 (80.0)</td>
<td>33 (61.1)</td>
<td>41 (50.0)</td>
<td>19 (26.8)</td>
<td>101 (46.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JE</strong></td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (1.9)</td>
<td>2 (2.4)</td>
<td>1 (1.4)</td>
<td>4 (1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10 (100.0)</td>
<td>54 (100.0)</td>
<td>82 (100.0)</td>
<td>71 (100.0)</td>
<td>217 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Mann-Whitney’s $U$ test
  
  $n=213$, $U=3749.0$, $p<.001$

Students in **NE** group are likely to have higher expectation for future English use than those in **EIL** group.
III.B. Occupational needs (teachers)

Table 4. Distribution of Preferred Pronunciation Models by Classroom English Use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mainly J</th>
<th>J &gt; E</th>
<th>E &gt; J</th>
<th>Mainly E</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>38 (40.4)</td>
<td>94 (56.0)</td>
<td>12 (34.3)</td>
<td>1 (20.0)</td>
<td>145 (48.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIL</td>
<td>52 (55.3)</td>
<td>67 (39.9)</td>
<td>21 (60.0)</td>
<td>3 (60.0)</td>
<td>143 (47.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE</td>
<td>4 (4.3)</td>
<td>7 (4.2)</td>
<td>2 (5.7)</td>
<td>1 (20.0)</td>
<td>14 (4.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>94 (100.0)</td>
<td>168 (100.0)</td>
<td>35 (100.0)</td>
<td>5 (100.0)</td>
<td>302 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Mann-Whitney’s U test
  \( n=288, \ U=10014.5, \text{ n.s.} \)

Frequency of the teachers’ classroom English use is not necessarily the main factor to influence their choice of pronunciation models.
## III.C. Self-confidence (students)

Table 5. Distribution of Preferred Pronunciation Models by Self-confidence in pronunciation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less confident</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Confident</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>25 (55.6)</td>
<td>69 (49.3)</td>
<td>18 (56.3)</td>
<td>112 (51.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIL</td>
<td>19 (42.2)</td>
<td>69 (49.3)</td>
<td>13 (40.6)</td>
<td>101 (46.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE</td>
<td>1 (2.2)</td>
<td>2 (1.4)</td>
<td>1 (3.1)</td>
<td>4 (1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>45 (100.0)</td>
<td>140 (100.0)</td>
<td>32 (100.0)</td>
<td>217 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Mann-Whitney’s *U* test
  
  \[ n=213, \ U=5630.0, \ n.s. \]

**Not likely** that the students chose NE/EIL just because they think they are good / weak at pronunciation.
### III.C. Self-confidence (teachers)

Table 6. Distribution of Preferred Pronunciation Models by Self-confidence in pronunciation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less confident</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Confident</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>53 (46.1)</td>
<td>66 (44.6)</td>
<td>32 (66.7)</td>
<td>151 (48.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIL</td>
<td>56 (48.7)</td>
<td>75 (50.7)</td>
<td>15 (31.3)</td>
<td>146 (46.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE</td>
<td>6 (5.2)</td>
<td>7 (4.7)</td>
<td>1 (2.1)</td>
<td>14 (4.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115 (100.0)</td>
<td>148 (100.0)</td>
<td>48 (100.0)</td>
<td>311 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Mann-Whitney’s $U$ test
  
  $n=297$, $U=9959.0$, $p=.585$

Tendency that the teachers in **NE** are more likely to be **confident** in their pronunciation than those in **EIL**.

---

**Note:**
- **Less confident**
- **Neither**
- **Confident**
- **Total**
III.D. Students’ English proficiency

Means of the students’ TOEIC scores by Preferred Pronunciation Models.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$sd$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>488.0</td>
<td>189.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIL</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>358.7</td>
<td>148.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>349.8</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>414.1</td>
<td>176.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Kendall’s τ rank correlation coefficient $n=109$, Kendall’s $\tau_b = -0.33, p<.001$

Students with higher English proficiency are more likely to choose NE.