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Appendices
1 Introduction

Teaching the pronunciation of English was selected as the topic of this paper for reasons that are adequately illustrated by the following quote from Jenkins and Setter (2005): “pronunciation is the major contributor to successful spoken communication, and how anyone learning a language can expect to be understood with poor pronunciation skills is outside of our comprehension” (p. 13). With the above statement, Jenkins and Setter (2005) are voicing something highly relevant in teaching pronunciation: contemporary approaches to language learning and teaching emphasise such broad phenomena as social interaction and communication while teaching the pronunciation of English requires that a number of rather specific questions such as which norm to use and which sounds to teach are answered. How can we combine these aspects in a way that results in meaningful and effective teaching? The author, having been transfixed by the fascinating detail of English pronunciation and phonetics since the early stages of her subject teacher education, encountered this question when completing pedagogical studies. Both pronunciation detail and pronunciation as a facilitator of communication seemed important, and it became an increasingly attractive idea to investigate how other teacher students perceive teaching the pronunciation of English.

Progressing from personal motivation to the more general aspects of this paper, the general starting points for this study are inspected. In Finland, teaching is regulated by the Finnish national curricula. National Core Curriculum for Basic Education (2014) and National Core Curriculum for General Upper Secondary Schools (2015) are the central ones for this paper, and they are, appropriately, referred to throughout this paper. It appears that they regard the learner’s ability to communicate both in writing and orally as the aim for teaching English. Simultaneously, they include specific references to pronunciation (see National Core Curriculum for Basic Education, 2014, pp. 237–238, 240, 376, 379; National Core Curriculum for General Upper Secondary Schools, 2015, p. 259), which guide the teacher to include pronunciation in teaching. This ensures that the learner’s pronunciation skills develop throughout the learner’s educational path through elementary school and through the optional upper secondary school. However, in Finland teachers also enjoy a so-called pedagogical freedom, which means that the teacher can implement teaching as they see appropriate as long as it conforms to the national curricula. As a result, the implementation of teaching the pronunciation of English is partly dependable on the teacher. Therefore, the author thought it felicitous to focus
on teacher students’ views in this paper: as contemporary teacher students are future teachers, examining their views on teaching the pronunciation of English provides insights into how pronunciation might be showcased in future classrooms.

Internationally, the pronunciation of English is a topical subject because English is the language of global communication. In Finland, this is reflected in that people both encounter and use English in their everyday life (Leppänen et al., 2009). The fact that English has achieved the status of a global lingua franca has created a type of a chain reaction. As speaker numbers increase, so does the cultural backgrounds and nationalities of the speakers. This has given rise to the discussion of the position of different varieties of English in relation to each other as well as the discussion of intercultural communication. In the discussion of varieties, perspectives vary: while Graddol (2001) suggests that the status of native varieties of English may decrease in the future, Kachru and Nelson (2001) highlight the equality of all accents. The consideration of the relative status of different varieties lead to the question of which varieties to include in teaching pronunciation. The teacher needs to decide what is their stance towards using a given accent as a linguistic norm, that is, as a reference point, and how other varieties besides the one chosen as the norm are displayed in teaching. The global spread of English relates to intercultural communication in that it has initiated approaches which focus on the effectiveness of communication rather than specific varieties. One of these approaches is the paradigm of English as an international language (EIL), in which the possibilities for intercultural communication are underlined (Marlina, 2014; Modiano, 2009; Sharifian, 2009). Focusing on effective communication, in turn, justifies such proposals as the core feature listings of the pronunciation of English (Cruttenden, 2014; Jenkins, 2000, 2002). Core features of pronunciation are those that are considered most essential to intelligibility. Thus, teaching the pronunciation of English is intertwined with the international status of English.

As to the premises of this study, five aspects are worth mentioning here. Firstly, the terms ‘teaching pronunciation’ and ‘teaching the pronunciation of English’ are used interchangeably due to readability. Secondly, this paper is construed with referring to A-level English. In Finland, learning a language at A-level means that it is the first foreign language the learner begins to study, resulting in at least seven years of study during elementary school. In elementary school, the level of proficiency used as a reference point in assessment is grade eight on a scale from four to ten, which refers to language skills that enable the learner to communicate in everyday situations quite effortlessly if not without mistakes (National Core Curriculum for Basic Education, 2014, pp. 378–
The optional upper secondary school provides the learner with three more years of study, and the language skills are expected to progress accordingly. Therefore, Finnish learners are expected to gain quite good skills in English. The focus of this paper is not on specific school grades or the possibly linear progression of pronunciation teaching but on teaching pronunciation in general.

The third premise of this paper is that the study excludes assessment. It is reasonable to conduct assessment only after the act of teaching. Therefore, although an essential part of teaching as a process, assessment is to a limited degree a separate entity within teaching. For this reason, assessment does not feature in the study. Fourthly, the author is not aware of earlier studies on Finnish teacher students’ views on teaching the pronunciation of English although studies on pronunciation or teaching pronunciation have been conducted in Finland. For instance, Tergujeff (2010, 2012a, 2012b, 2013a, 2013b) studied teaching the pronunciation of English with a mixed method approach which included course book analysis, teacher survey, learner interviews and classroom observation. Other perspectives in earlier research on pronunciation have been transcription and its effect on learning pronunciation (Lintunen, 2004), the intelligibility of different accents of English as perceived by Finnish learners (Pihko, 1997) and Finnish children’s beliefs about learning English (Aro, 2009). The perceived lack of research employing Finnish teacher students’ perspective on teaching the pronunciation of English was a factor which inspired this paper to be written and which renders the topic an important one.

The purpose of this paper is to examine teacher students’ views on teaching the pronunciation of English. The research questions of this study are as follows. The main research question is: How do teacher students view teaching the pronunciation of English? A sub-research question is: Which topics do teacher students consider relevant within the concept of teaching the pronunciation of English?

The main findings reveal that the teacher students of this study relate the concept of learning to such terms as continuity and development. To the teacher students, the importance of pronunciation as a part of teaching English is not necessarily self-evident. However, they determine in a rather detailed manner what teaching pronunciation should include, including the abundance of varieties of English and a number of individual sounds amongst other things. They appear to consider the contents for teaching as a way to achieve the promoted learning objectives of intelligibility and willingness to speak. In general, their insights are often congruent with earlier research on the given topic and they are not a totally homogenous group in their opinions.
The structure of this paper is as follows. Firstly, sections 2 and 3 establish the theoretical framework of the study. Section 2 discusses sociocultural theory of learning and its main concepts relevant for this study such as emergence and the zone of proximal development. The communicative approach to teaching is also inspected, as is the challenge one encounters when intending to incorporate pronunciation detail into the communicative approach. Section 3 presents themes relating to teaching pronunciation: language norms, learning objectives, the contents for teaching pronunciation and the methods and tools to be employed in teaching the pronunciation of English are discussed. Following the theoretical background, section 4 introduces the data and the methodology of this study. Choosing interview as the data collection method is justified, and the progress of the content analysis of the data is depicted. After that, section 5 presents the findings of the study. The findings are ordered in a thematised sequence, so that each theme is discussed in its own subsection. Next, section 6 provides a discussion of the findings, suggestions for future study as well as evaluation of the validity of the study. Finally, section 7 concludes the paper.
2 Contemporary approaches to language learning and teaching

It has been claimed that foreign language teaching in Finland encompasses ideas and practises compatible with several learning theories because language teachers’ professional identities display the theories which influenced their respective educational paths (Riekki, 2016, pp. 21–28). Nevertheless, the present-day Finnish national curricula are founded on the view that learning happens in social interaction (National Core Curriculum for Basic education, 2014, p. 17; National Core Curriculum for General Upper Secondary Schools, 2015, p. 14). This is the central premise in the sociocultural theory of learning, which is, thus, introduced in this paper. Sociocultural theory of learning, one of the many approaches in the field of second language acquisition, derives from the work of Lev Vygotsky (1978, 1981, 1987, 1994, as presented in Lantolf, Thorne and Poehner, 2015). The aim is to present the prevailing theoretical insights of sociocultural theory relevant for this paper. In addition, the Finnish national curricula also list the development of communicative skills as a core area in learning foreign languages (National Core Curriculum for Basic education, 2014, pp. 135–136, 236–251, 374–402; National Core Curriculum for General Upper Secondary Schools, 2015, pp. 114–137). This is why this section discusses the adherence to the communicative approach in teaching languages as well. The communicative approach focuses on language skills from the point of view of how language skills can be utilised for communicative purposes rather than how language forms are best taught. It also reflects the sociocultural view of learning in that it emphasises the situated nature of language use: the communicative context and the environment define what kind of language use is appropriate and useful.

2.1 Sociocultural theory and language learning

Sociocultural theory was first introduced as an answer to the cognitivist approach to second language acquisition. Sociocultural theory wanted to bring into focus the social origins of the development of the human mind. In the following, selected central tenets of sociocultural theory are discussed. One of these, according to Lantolf (2000), is that of the mediated mind. In essence, mediation means that humans use psychological tools to construct an understanding of and a relationship with the world (Lantolf, 2000, pp. 1–3). Language is both something we need to build an understanding of and one of the psychological tools used in this process. Dufva (2013) states that in order to be learnt, language must be mediated, that is, made visible by, for example, speaking or
writing (p. 54). In addition to referring to mediating language itself, Dufva (2013) considers language learning a mediated process. In this process, different mediational means such as textbooks and teacher-guided talk are used (Dufva, 2013, p. 54.) However, as illustrated by Lantolf (2000), human action is fundamentally influenced and limited by the mediational means employed (pp. 2–3). For example, graphemic writing lacks means to indicate intonation or stress, which may have caused these prosodic phenomena to be at the margins of linguistic theorising relatively long compared to, for instance, sentence formation (Lantolf, 2000, p. 2). Therefore, the language learner’s linguistic abilities shape, on their part, the social situations the learner participates in. This is why it is important that the learner has means to compensate for lacking language skills and that their interlocutors (and teachers) participate in the negotiation of meaning when necessary.

Summarising Lantolf (2000), it can be stated that the sociocultural theory considers learning to happen via participation as well as in interaction with others and with the environment. That being so, also language learning requires active engagement in social actions that occur in different domains. Dufva (2013), considering the environment as an endless working space in a sense that it constantly requires the individual to use their (cognitive) abilities, talks about recycling the linguistic resources on offer when learning a language and claims that learning could be regarded as appropriation of linguistic resources (pp. 51–53). Therefore, instead of being a passive receiver of linguistic input, the language learner is an active participant in conducting an understanding of linguistic material and knowledge. According to Lantolf, Thorne and Poehner (2015), all learning, including language learning, happens through three stages (p. 209). The first stage, object-regulation, refers to the learner being mediated by objects such as dictionaries, and the second stage, other-regulation, refers to the learner being mediated by others, via for example corrective feedback (Lantolf, Thorne and Poehner, 2015, p. 209). Finally, the learner becomes self-regulated, which means that the individual is able to independently, without mediation, use the resources available to them (Lantolf, Thorne and Poehner, 2015, p. 209). Lantolf, Thorne and Poehner (2015) also note, however, that the stage of self-regulation is not fixed, and that in difficult communicative situations the language learner might revert into earlier stages of development (pp. 209–210). To summarise, sociocultural theory regards learning to be a gradual mediated process of active participation and reflection.

Thus, sociocultural theory considers learning a process that occurs with the aid of and within social actions. The concept of the zone of proximal development, introduced by Vygotsky (1978) and
defined as the set of tasks which the learner is able to achieve when assisted but not yet independently (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86, as cited in Lantolf, Thorne and Poehner, 2015, p. 212), captures this well. It illustrates a situation where, on the one hand, the learner needs help with a given social action and, on the other hand, the help is being granted via social action. The Finnish national curricula recognise the need to conform teaching of foreign languages to the skill level of the learner (National Core Curriculum for Basic Education, 2014, pp. 136, 236, 375; National Core Curriculum for General Upper Secondary Schools, 2015, p. 114). Moreover, Lantolf (2000) and Ohta (2000) seem to reject the idea that the assistant need necessarily be an expert and embrace the idea of equals assisting each other, which would result in shared expertise (Lantolf, 2000, pp. 16–18; Ohta, 2000, pp. 55–56). Swain (2000), referring to collaborative dialogue, suggests that language learners can together form linguistic knowledge that is beyond the skill-level of any of the individual participants. Swain (2000) continues that the individual learner can internalise this mutual knowledge into their own linguistic knowledge. It could be stated, then, that employing the zone of proximal development in teaching requires that the learner’s current abilities and the potential areas for learning are identified. A parallel argument is offered by Ohta (2000), who concludes that offering developmentally appropriate assistance is the key for effective learning within the zone of proximal development. In order to ensure developmentally appropriate assistance, the learner must signal when help is wanted and the assistant needs to be able to interpret the signals (Ohta, 2000).

Despite the implication above that learning happens via social actions with a rather limited scope, social actions may encompass the whole environment, not just a given social space shared with the learner and a given other (van Lier, 2000, 2004). Van Lier’s (2000, 2004) ecological perspective to sociocultural theory views learning as the relationship between the learner and the environment: the environment contains possibilities and encourages to meaningful (inter)action, and the learner learns to make use of these possibilities, which results in meaningful (inter)action. Two central concepts, namely affordance and emergence, further explain the learning process as understood in van Lier’s (2000, 2004) ecological perspective to sociocultural theory.

First, the term affordance is employed in order to describe the physical, social and symbolic properties of the environment relevant to the individual residing in the given environment (van Lier, 2000, p. 252; van Lier, 2004, pp. 245–253). Van Lier (2004) states that affordances are relevant because they are available to the individual to do something with (p. 91). Relating this to language learning, the learner uses and learns those linguistic structures and forms that are needed in the
creating and maintaining relationships with others in a given situation. For example, at a breakfast table, the language learner is surrounded by and talks about objects with certain names, such as food items and cutlery, and uses and hears phrases such as *Good morning* and *Could you pass me the salt*. What is more, affordances are subjective: different aspects of the environment are considered salient, useful and worth attention depending on the individual and on the situation (van Lier, 2004, p. 91). Second, the term *emergence* refers to the development of complex linguistic abilities (van Lier, 2004, p. 81). Van Lier (2004) underlines that the more complex linguistic level is undoubtedly based on the more basic one, but it has an additional element to it that cannot be derived from its parts (pp. 79–83, 86–88). When describing the emergent nature of grammar, he states the following:

“A crucial characteristic of language is the mapping of structure onto function, or the relationship between form and meaning. This relationship is constantly being interpreted and reinterpreted in every act of speaking, as part of the negotiation of meaning that accompanies every dialogical interchange.” (van Lier, 2004, p. 88)

In other words, the learner does not mimic language as they perceive it, but form their own way of using it. The emerging linguistic capability enables the learner to widen the range of structures and forms they use to communicate. This means that the learner perceives more aspects of the environment as affordances because they are able to employ them in communication in a meaningful way.

Taken together, the above suggests that learning focuses on those aspects that are displayed in the environment and in the social interaction between individuals. Hence, it is essential that teaching is compatible with the social environments of the learner and that teaching includes and encourages to social interaction. Moreover, as affordances are central for learning, it is important that teaching acknowledges their subjective nature.

2.2 Communicative approach to language teaching

Foreign language teaching adheres to a communicative approach, which essentially means that communicative situations are both one of the reasons why languages are learned and one of the ways to learn them. The Finnish national curriculum states that already in the grades two and three of basic education, during which time Finnish learners start to learn English, the learner is encouraged to communicate in authentic situations and that the emphasis of teaching should be on
developing communication skills (National Core Curriculum for Basic Education, 2014, pp. 135–136, 236–238). The centrality of communication in language teaching can be detected also in the views of Dufva, Suni, Aro and Salo (2011), who call for dialogical view of language, that is, understanding language as a dynamic entity, the usage of which is dependent on the context. Furthermore, they appear to view language as a functionalist tool and conclude that

“the functionalist commitment of dialogism seems to entail a view that language learners would learn best when they are able to do things with language in different contexts and environments that they consider personally relevant, or, in other words, meaningful in the sense that they are communicatively authentic. This, again, seems to suggest that the use of language(s) – also in the classroom – should have closer connections with the life-world of the learners --.” (Dufva et al., 2011, p. 119)

On account of this, the purpose of language teaching could be seen to lie in the learner becoming proficient in using different aspects of language appropriately in a given context and situation. In other words, it could be argued that the focus of teaching is in developing the dynamic communicative competence of the learner. Also, the individual living contexts of the learner should be taken into account in order to ensure that the learner is able to use the acquired language skills in their every-day life. This premise is in accordance with the sociocultural theory of learning discussed above.

Nevertheless, it must be noted that enhancing communication is not a new phenomenon in the field of language teaching. Already in the 1970s, an approach labelled communicative language teaching began to emerge as a response to language learning theories which focused on grammatical forms (Spada, 2007, pp. 273–275). According to Spada (2007), communicative language teaching now has many definitions and interpretations, but they all promote communicative situations as a platform for and communicative skills as a goal in learning a language (pp. 281–282). Some two decades after the initiation of communicative language teaching, Firth and Wagner (1997) proposed that second language acquisition research focuses too much on the acquisition of language as well as on the cognitivist and individualistic side of language learning. They suggested focusing more on language use as well as on social situations and communication in order to “be better able to understand and explicate how language is used as it is being acquired through interaction, and used resourcefully, contingently and contextually” (Firth and Wagner, 1997, p. 768, original emphasis). Firth and Wagner (1997) further suggest that not only the communicative defects of the learner but also the
communicative successes, often achieved with limited communicative resources, should be one of the research foci. Furthermore, Larsen-Freeman (2007), providing a summary of the responses elicited by Firth and Wagner’s (1997) proposals, concludes that although the field of second language acquisition remains theoretically multifaceted, it might be beneficial to strengthen the social paradigm within the field.

It has been argued above that communication is essential in language teaching. Consequently, one needs to consider what constitutes the learner’s communicative resources. The central theoretical concept in the aforementioned communicative language teaching is *communicative competence*, a concept already mentioned above, which essentially refers to an ability to use language in various communicative situations for different communicative purposes. The term was originally construed by Hymes (1971, as cited in Spada, 2007), and the concept theoretically further developed by Canale and Swain (1980) as well as Canale (1983). Profoundly influenced by Canale and Swain (1980), Canale (1983) theorises that communicative competence comprises of four components. First, grammatical competence refers to the knowledge of such parts of language as phonology, lexicon and syntax (Canale, 1983, p. 7). Second, sociolinguistic competence refers to the knowledge of how utterances are produced and understood appropriately depending on such contextual factors as the role of participants and the norms of interaction (Canale, 1983, pp. 7–9). Third, discourse competence refers to the knowledge of how meanings are linked coherently across sentences or utterances (Canale, 1983, pp. 9–10). Finally, strategic competence refers to the skill to use different strategies to compensate breakdowns in communication (Canale, 1983, pp. 10–12). In sum, communicative competence requires both knowledge of a language and knowledge of the ways to use language. When regarded in the light of the dialogic nature of language forwarded by Dufva et al. (2011), communicative competence could be understood as an ability that changes constantly because different situations demand different kind of language use.

The idea that communicative competence includes more than linguistic knowledge can be found from the Finnish national curricula as well, for they situate both grammatical knowledge, knowledge of culture, language awareness and understanding sociocultural factors in language use as parts of teaching English (National Core Curriculum for Basic Education, 2014, pp. 135–136, 236–240, 375–379; National Core Curriculum for General Upper Secondary Schools, 2015, pp. 117–119). To be more precise, at the end of elementary school, the pupil is expected to possess wide range of language related knowledge and skills to gain numerical grade eight (‘good’) in English (National
Core Curriculum for Basic Education, 2014, pp. 378–379). For example, the pupil is expected to have language awareness in that they are able to reflect on the status and the different varieties of English; the pupil is expected to be able to reflect on their language learning methods; the pupil is expected to know some rules of politeness and of cultural practises, and the pupil is expected to master good pronunciation and a diversity of linguistic structures (National Core Curriculum for Basic Education, 2014, pp. 378–379). While not exhaustive, the list provided portrays the range of skills expected of the learner, which comprises of more than linguistic knowledge.

As this paper focuses on teaching pronunciation, which is a linguistic skill relatively easily delineated, it is worthwhile to examine how grammar in general and pronunciation in particular are situated in a view of language as a skill that incorporates many other factors as well. Despite the fact that the communicative approach to language teaching can be viewed as a response to theories focusing on language form, the role of grammar in communicative approaches remains controversial. On the one hand, Canale and Swain (1980) seem to think that grammatical competence is important only to the extent to which it enables the completion of a given communicative function (p. 5). Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei and Thurrell (1997), moreover, criticise the early proponents of communicative language teaching for promoting the idea that linguistic forms are learned unconsciously, as a side-effect of communication (pp. 144–145). They suggest, instead, a principled communicative approach, in which sufficient attention is being devoted to the explicit teaching of language forms and the learner’s development of linguistic knowledge (Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei and Thurrell, 1997, pp. 147–148). In a rather similar manner, Spada (2007) notes that communicative language teaching was not developed to exclude form but to include communication (pp. 275–276). This could be interpreted as a suggestion that communication and grammar could be united. Similarly, Dufva et al. (2011) seem to prioritise the learner’s ability to employ their grammatical knowledge in communication. This view requires that grammar is not excluded from teaching. The challenge, then, is to incorporate grammar into the communicative approach in teaching without shifting the focus away from communication.

Consequently, finding a way to incorporate pronunciation-related issues into the communicative approach in teaching is also a challenge. As Seidlhofer (2001) suggests, the teaching of pronunciation is challenging when teaching adopts communicative approach: the learner’s attention is guided to the messages to be conveyed and understood rather than to the sounds and prosodic patterns needed in sentence formation (p. 57). Naturally, this kind of dilemma is evident
in all teaching of grammar, not just teaching of pronunciation. However, pronunciation teaching mostly deals with phonological details such as sounds which have no meaning of their own, which may render the dilemma in teaching pronunciation even more challenging than in teaching other issues of grammar. This might have prompted Celce-Murcia, Brinton, Goodwin and Griner (2010) to require that strategies for teaching pronunciation communicatively be developed (p. 9, as cited in Tergujeff, 2013a, p. 25). In the Finnish context, Tergujeff (2013a), referring specifically to communicative language teaching, suggests that since communicative approaches are adopted, the teaching of pronunciation should focus on prosody because it allegedly has a more profound impact on overall fluency and intelligibility of speech than individual sounds have (pp. 25–28). This kind of statement fails to account for the immediate question of how to combine the minute details of pronunciation to communicative approach in teaching. Collectively, the kinds of statements presented above illustrate the problems encountered when trying to fit pronunciation into the framework of communicative approach to language teaching.

In sum, sociocultural theory maintains that learning happens in social interaction as well as that language is both a skill to be learned and a way to mediate social action. Also, sociocultural theory maintains that complex language emerges as a product constructed by the learner. Furthermore, foreign language teaching aims to prioritise the development of communicative abilities of the learner. This does not, however, need to mean the abandonment of teaching linguistic forms. This is one of the things illustrated in the next section, in which the key aspects of the implementation of teaching the pronunciation of English are discussed.
3 Teaching the pronunciation of English

Teaching the pronunciation of English seems a rather controversial issue. On the one hand, pronunciation skills form the basis for speech and are, consequently, crucial for communication. Accordingly, there are studies supporting the claim that pronunciation-related issues have an effect on how interlocutors understand one’s messages (e.g., Field, 2005; Hahn, 2004). What is more, it has been shown that pronunciation instruction improves learners’ pronunciation skills (e.g., Couper, 2006; Derwing, Munro and Wiebe, 1998; Peltola, Lintunan and Tamminen, 2014). Therefore, pronunciation ought to be part of the curriculum of English. On the other hand, in the rise of communicative approaches to language teaching (see section 2.2), pronunciation has allegedly been a neglected area in teaching (e.g., Mompean and Lintunen, 2015, pp. 293–294). Also, there is no consensus as to which features of pronunciation are the most meaningful for intelligibility (see Tergujeff, 2013a, pp. 25–28). Intelligibility is a central learning objective in pronunciation teaching, as section 3.1 shows, and as such it is an important point of reference when contents for teaching pronunciation are selected.

In the following, the key aspects of teaching the pronunciation of English are discussed. First, as regards the question of what type of English to teach, the possible gradual shift from referring to native language norms to aiming at intercultural communication is discussed. Intelligibility as a learning objective in language teaching is also discussed in this context. Second, the contents for teaching pronunciation are discussed. Finally, a selection of the methods and tools that can be used in teaching pronunciation are introduced.

3.1 From native language norms to intercultural communication and intelligibility

The language norm used in teaching pronunciation offers a reference point regarding the linguistic forms used in language instruction. The Finnish national curricula (National Core Curriculum for Basic Education, 2014; National Core Curriculum for General Upper Secondary Schools, 2015) seem to make no mention as to which variety of English should be used as the language model in teaching English. However, there is some indication that Received Pronunciation (RP) and General American (GA), varieties of English associated with Great-Britain and the United States of America respectively, may be the most used language models both in Europe (Henderson et al., 2012, pp. 20–23) and in Finland (Tergujeff, 2012b, pp. 40–41). Similarly, international teachers and teacher
students of English seem to believe in the centrality of native English norms in teaching pronunciation (Jenkins, 2005, pp. 540–541; Sifakis and Sougari, 2005, pp. 475–478). One explanation for the wide usage of and preference for RP and GA might be that they are accessible and present in both teachers’ and learners’ environments. Accordingly, such factors as familiarity (Paunović, 2009) as well as personal interests and previous contacts with the language (Janicka, Kul and Weckwerth, 2008) appear to affect how students perceive different varieties of English. Taken together, the above could be summarised with stating that RP and GA are perhaps the most used varieties of English in teaching both in Europe as a whole and in Finland in particular, and as such, they are regarded as a norm to which other varieties are compared.

Despite the possible traditional bias in their favour, the status of native varieties as a reference point has been questioned. For example, Kachru and Nelson (2001) appear to underline the equality of all varieties of English. They highlight that any variety is appropriate and meaningful at least in and for the contexts in which it has developed. This seems to be a viewpoint adopted also by Crystal (2001), who further suggests that this should not mean the abandonment of the notion of linguistic standard because it is necessary for maintaining the mutual intelligibility of the different varieties of English. However, Crystal (2001) appears to question the status of native varieties of English as the linguistic standard. Furthermore, using non-native varieties as the reference point in teaching pronunciation has been suggested by Murphy (2014), who considers using non-native models useful because they are relevant for the learner and feasibly within their reach. Murphy (2014) argues that in many cases the learner interacts more often and more readily with non-native speakers and that the features that make the non-native speech intelligible and comprehensible are features that the learner should focus on as well. One could interpret this line of reasoning to mean that teaching pronunciation is more of a question of which features of pronunciation to include in the curricula (a topic inspected in the following section) rather than which language norm to use in teaching. However, the type of discussion presented above illustrates that the superiority of native language norms has been questioned and the possibility of a variety of norms has been recognised.

Finally, as was already implied above, the need to commit teaching pronunciation to any given variety of English, native or non-native alike, has been questioned. This is evidenced by the emergence of such paradigms as World Englishes (see Bolton, 2005), English as Lingua Franca (see Jenkins, 2007, pp. 1–4) and English as an International Language (EIL) (see Marlina, 2014). Accordingly, the Finnish national curricula state that the learner of English needs to be aware of the
significance of English as the language used globally in international communication (National Core Curriculum for Basic Education, 2014, pp. 237–239, 376–378; National Core Curriculum for General Upper Secondary Schools, 2015, p. 117). Moreover, Marlina (2014) argues that the EIL paradigm could be considered to encompass the most central views of the other two paradigms. To put it shortly, she claims that EIL accommodates the pluricentral view of English language promoted by World Englishes and that EIL recognises the premise of English as a Lingua Franca that native English need not be a reference point (Marlina, 2014, pp. 3–6). The width of its scope is why the paradigm of EIL is further discussed below.

According to Sharifian (2009), central to EIL are the use of English in intercultural contexts and the flexibility as regards the type of English that is used in communication. He appears to think that EIL discards the need to classify the interlocutors’ nationality or native language and highlights, instead, the possibilities for communication that the global spread and use of English creates (Sharifian, 2009, pp. 2–5). Hence, it seems that also the native speaker is expected to adapt to the language used by their possibly non-native interlocutor. Similarly, Modiano (2009) suggests that an understanding of the diversity of English as well as the readiness to use English in various contexts make one a better communicator (p. 59). He regards the requirement for situational adaptation by the interlocutors as one of the fundamental characteristics of EIL (Modiano, 2009, pp. 61–64). Thus, the EIL paradigm could be seen to prioritise the development of the learner’s ability to communicate with interlocutors of various linguistic and cultural backgrounds in situations that vary and change. Also, the English that is learned and used is not viewed as a specific monolithic variety. Instead, it is viewed as an English that best serves the communicative needs of the learner and, in the light of sociocultural theory discussed in section 2.1, reflects their sociolinguistic reality, which appears to be in accordance with the dialogical view of language presented by Dufva et al. (2011), which was introduced in section 2.2.

With the above in mind, it does not seem all that surprising to find that modern language teaching seems to regard intelligibility as the main learning objective. Levis (2005) states that the nativeness principle, the aim to acquire native-like skills in language, has gradually lost its position to the intelligibility principle, the aim to be understood by one’s interlocutors, as the guiding factor in foreign language teaching (pp. 370–371). Munro and Derwing (1995) define the concept of *intelligibility* as the extent to which the speaker is understood by the listener (p. 76). Furthermore, Munro and Derwing (1995) relate intelligibility to such terms as *comprehensibility* and *accentedness*. 
Although they seem to leave the latter two terms undefined, it can be abstracted that with *comprehensibility* they refer to the level of difficulty on the part of the listener to understand the speaker and with *accentedness* to the degree to which the speaker’s pronunciation deviates from the expected (Munro and Derwing, 1995). Perhaps the most relevant finding of Munro and Derwing’s (1995) study is that also accented speech can be perceived intelligible and comprehensible. Munro (2008) arrives at a similar conclusion in his review of several studies on the concepts of intelligibility, comprehensibility and accentedness. Therefore, one could claim that rather than focusing on decreasing accentedness, pronunciation teaching should focus on increasing intelligibility. The notion of intelligibility is in line with the EIL paradigm because both of them focus on successful communication between interlocutors.

Although intelligibility as a learning objective is congruent with the EIL paradigm, the flexibility of learning objectives should be recognised as well. This could be detected in Cruttenden’s (2001) suggestions for two possible learning goals in teaching pronunciation. The one goal is high acceptability, that is, attaining fluent and not evidently foreign English pronunciation skills, and the other goal is minimal intelligibility, that is, being able to convey one’s message to the listener in English (Cruttenden, 2001, pp. 298–299). It seems natural to view the two goals as the respective ends of a continuum rather than as separate entities. Although it has been suggested that attaining the highest standard of high acceptability is nearly impossible for those learners who learn a foreign language after early childhood (e.g., Scovel, 2000), many learners of English state that their aim is to sound native-like (e.g., Timmis, 2002). There is no reason, therefore, why learners should not be encouraged to strive for the proficiency level of high acceptability should they wish to do so.

### 3.2 Teaching sounds and prosody

It was suggested above that intelligibility is the main learning objective for teaching pronunciation. Also, it was shown that teaching pronunciation is possibly beginning to be influenced by the aspiration to guarantee the learner’s ability to communicate in intercultural contexts. It follows that the next step is to attempt to pinpoint the features of pronunciation that most adhere to these goals. The Finnish national curricula (National Core Curriculum for Basic Education, 2014; National Core Curriculum for General Upper Secondary Schools, 2015) seem not to specify the contents for teaching pronunciation. Although no consensus of the most important features of pronunciation has been achieved (see e.g., Tergujeff, 2013a, pp. 25–28), some proposals have been made as to the core features of the pronunciation of English. The proposals of Jenkins (2000, 2002) and
Cruttenden (2014) are discussed in this paper. The idea of core features of pronunciation is appealing because it aims at ensuring intelligibility even with imperfect language skills and prioritising contents for teaching pronunciation. Jenkins (2000, 2002) states that her Lingua Franca Core (LFC) includes features that enable effective communication between non-native speakers of English (Jenkins, 2000, p. 96; Jenkins, 2002, p. 123–124). Cruttenden’s (2014) Amalgam English, meanwhile, is meant for learners who aim at “easy intelligibility by native speakers” (Cruttenden, 2014, p. 335). Regarding the fact that the different starting points of LFC and Amalgam English have resulted in lists with a high degree of similarity, one could assume that the features included form a useful starting point for teaching pronunciation. Moreover, Cruttenden (2014) has compiled another core feature listing, International English (Cruttenden, 2014, pp. 341–345), as well. Comparing International English (Cruttenden, 2014, pp. 341–345) with LFC (Jenkins, 2000, pp. 96–98; Jenkins, 2002, pp. 136–156), one notices that the criteria for selecting the contents and the contents are almost identical. That being so, the focus in the following is, for the sake of contrast, on Jenkins’ LFC and Cruttenden’s Amalgam English.

First, as regards individual sounds, both Jenkins (2000, 2002) and Cruttenden (2014) include the English consonant inventory to their core feature listings almost in its entirety. The dental fricatives /ð θ/, however, are omitted because of their low functional load (Cruttenden, 2014, pp. 336–337; Jenkins, 2000, pp. 137–138; Jenkins, 2002, pp. 97–98). Jenkins (2000) also states that the dental fricatives are difficult to learn to produce correctly because of their linguistic markedness, which advocates their omission (pp. 134–135, 137). However, Dauer (2005), in reference to LFC, criticises the suggestion to omit the dental fricatives, stating that their omission does not lessen the learner’s burden significantly and that substituting them with other sounds does not necessarily work (pp. 546–547). What is more, the relevance of aspiration and correct production of consonant clusters is underlined both by Cruttenden (2014, pp. 336–338) and Jenkins (2000, pp. 140–143; 2002, p. 97).

As regards vowels, both Jenkins (2000, 2002) and Cruttenden (2014) allow more variation than in consonants. Jenkins (2000, 2002) suggests that the quantity distinction between short and long vowels ought to be maintained but vowel quality transfer from the speaker’s native language is acceptable (Jenkins, 2000, pp. 144–146; Jenkins, 2002, p. 97). However, the quantity distinction in vowels depends on the phonetic environment of the sound and is, as a result, a relative rather than an absolute variable. The possibly resulting ambiguity in quantity combined with quality transfer from the learner’s native language might result in unintelligible pronunciation of English vowels.
Dauer (2005) considers Jenkins’ treatment of vowels somewhat incongruous and argues that as the teaching effort required is equal, both vowel quantity and quality could be included in curricula (p. 547). In line with Dauer’s (2005) motion, Cruttenden’s (2014) account includes not only the quantity differences but also the quality differences between vowels /ɪ əʊ ə/ and between /iː aː oː uː/ (pp. 338–339).

Second, in addition to sounds, prosodic features are part of pronunciation as well. Prosody refers to the elements of pronunciation such as stress, intonation and rhythm that spread over larger parts of utterance than lone sounds. Because rhythm is not included in either Jenkins’ (2000, 2002) or Cruttenden’s (2014) core feature listings, it is also omitted from the discussion here.

As regards stress, it seems that neither word stress nor sentence stress are merited an automatic place among the features most essential to teach. If there was a fair amount of agreement regarding individual sounds in the core feature listings by Cruttenden (2014) and Jenkins (2000, 2002), the issue of word stress is more complex. Jenkins (2000, 2002) seems to think that rather than teach word stress placement per se, it is sufficient that the learner is made aware of the fact that word stress placement is not consistent in English (Jenkins, 2000, pp. 150–151; Jenkins, 2002, pp. 97–98). However, Field (2005) demonstrates that word stress placement affects intelligibility. What is more, word stress placement has repercussions for other features of pronunciation such as sentence stress. This is recognised by Jenkins (2000, p. 150) herself and seems to be why the omission of word stress from LFC has been critiqued (Dauer, 2005, pp. 547–548; McCrocklin, 2012). Accordingly, in his Amalgam English, Cruttenden (2014) holds word stress essential to learn (p. 340). What is more, the Finnish national curriculum states that at the end of secondary school, the learner should be able to place word stress correctly (National Core Curriculum for General Upper Secondary Schools, 2015, p. 259). Therefore, one might suggest that teachers address word stress in teaching. The word stress rules of English could be considered rather complicated (see e.g., Roach, 1991, pp. 88–91, 95–101), and that is why the learner could be encouraged to learn the stress pattern of a word as they are learning a novel word.

The case of sentence stress is slightly more straightforward. According to Cruttenden’s (2014) Amalgam English, perhaps the most essential concepts to teach relating to English sentence stress are its movability and how it highlights the most important information in the utterance (pp. 340–341). Jenkins (2000, 2002) seems to agree, as she mainly discusses ‘contrastive stress’ in her account on sentence stress in LFC (Jenkins, 2000, pp. 153–156; Jenkins, 2002, p. 97). Both Cruttenden and
Jenkins are referring to instances such as ‘I came by taxi’ versus ‘I came by taxi’, where sentence stress (marked here with underlining) indicates whether the speaker is referring to the means of arrival or to who came, respectively. In addition, Hahn’s (2004) findings indicate that sentence stress omission affects intelligibility negatively. Therefore, one might again tentatively suggest that the learner be taught the movability of sentence stress and that sentence stress may affect the meaning or tone of what is being said.

Considering intonation, the views of Cruttenden (2014) and Jenkins (2000, 2002) differ again. Jenkins (2000) considers sentence stress the most important aspect of intonation (pp. 151, 153). Otherwise, she considers intonation both difficult to teach and not central for intelligibility (Jenkins, 2000, pp. 151–153; Jenkins, 2002, pp. 97–98). Cruttenden (2014), on the contrary, maintains that the ‘basic tunes’ of English intonation should be taught to the learner and provides examples of clause types that could be associated with certain intonation patterns (pp. 340–341). The Finnish national curriculum states that at the end of secondary school the learner should be able to use some of the most typical intonation patterns (National Core Curriculum for General Upper Secondary Schools, 2015, p. 259), which could be seen as compatible with Cruttenden’s (2014) view. However, Levis (1999), discussing intonation from a pedagogical perspective, underlines the need to consider the use of specific intonation patterns as a context-dependent phenomenon rather than one that is straightforwardly linkable to given grammatical forms. Levis (2002) also demonstrates the difficulty to relate a given intonation pattern to a given meaning and the difficulty to distinguish intonation patterns from each other. Hence, the learner should perhaps be made aware of the richness of English intonation usage, if not outright teach it in its entirety.

### 3.3 Methods and tools for teaching pronunciation

As in teaching generally, there are as many ways to teach pronunciation as there are teachers. Using different methods and tools in teaching is connected to the teacher’s perceived ability to teach pronunciation. Finnish teachers of English seem to feel that they have received good education regarding their own pronunciation of English, but they lack training in how to teach pronunciation (Tergujeff, 2012b, pp. 33–34). Similar tendency has been recorded elsewhere in Europe (Henderson et al., 2012, pp. 13–15) and in Canada (Breitkreutz, Derwing and Rossiter, 2001, pp. 56–57) as well. Nevertheless, it is necessary to remember that proficiency in pronunciation does not necessarily translate into efficient pedagogy. What is more, it is not just the individual teacher’s skills and knowledge that matter in teaching: on the basis of the ecological perspective to the sociocultural
theory (see section 2.1), the environment where the skills and knowledge are applied is also meaningful. This kind of reasoning is, in fact, supported by the findings of Ruohotie-Lyhty (2015), who investigated the beliefs of newly qualified foreign language teachers. Ruohotie-Lyhty (2015) demonstrates that the school environment has a meaningful role in how teachers perceive their possibilities to carry out their pedagogical convictions. It seems that some teachers perceive the environment to be a supportive factor while others experience it as a restrictive factor (Ruohotie-Lyhty, 2015).

Nevertheless, pedagogical choices need to be made in teaching. Due to the abundance of methods and tools (see Tergujeff 2012b, p. 36; Tergujeff, 2013a, pp. 31–35), only those mentioned by the participants of the empirical part of this paper are discussed here. As a result, this section inspects the role of speaking and listening as practise, media, corrective feedback, phonetic transcription and course books. In the following, these selected methods and tools used in teaching pronunciation are discussed.

To begin with, speaking and listening as practise is examined. The roles of speaking and listening in teaching pronunciation are fundamental. Lintunen (2014) argues that pronunciation requires specific motor skills and therefore repetition is crucial in pronunciation teaching (pp. 172–173). Repetitive practise can be implemented with some of the traditional pronunciation exercise types such as imitation and drilling (see e.g., Tergujeff, 2013a, pp. 31), where learner is producing context-free speech outside a communicative situation. Iivonen and Tella (2009) seem to argue that besides repetitive practice, also practising to speak in communicative situations is important in learning pronunciation (pp. 270–273). The Finnish national curricula prioritise the learner being encouraged to use and perceive English in natural environments and authentic communicative situations (National Core Curriculum for Basic Education, 2014, pp. 135–136, 237–240, 375–379; National Core Curriculum for General Upper Secondary Schools, 2015, pp. 117–119), which could be interpreted to mean that also pronunciation teaching should prepare the learner for them. That being so, both specific attention-focusing oral and listening exercises as well as situations involving spontaneous speech can be used in pronunciation teaching.

In addition, the use of media is a potential teaching method. Luukka et al. (2008) show that using different media, especially digital media, is common amongst Finnish pupils and that they use media more outside school than at school (pp. 160–165). Therefore, integrating different media to English lessons offers a possibility to introduce a teaching method which is, at least to some extent, familiar
to the learner. Media would also provide the opportunity to incorporate real-life English of authentic communicative situations into teaching. Despite its potential advantages, media seems not to have a strong position in foreign language classrooms in Finland. Several studies show that foreign language teachers in Finland use different media such as web pages or video recordings significantly or somewhat less than course books (Luukka et al., 2008, pp. 94–96; Taalas, Tarnanen, Kauppinen and Pöyhönen, 2008, pp. 248–249; Tergujeff, 2012b, pp. 35–36). However, it seems that there are individual differences in the use of media between teachers. For instance, while Tergujeff (2012b) found that 60% of teachers of English use videos in teaching (p. 36), Taalas et al. (2008) found that 59% of foreign language teachers never use videos in teaching (p. 249).

Speaking as practice evokes the use of corrective feedback. Corrective feedback is a method in which the teacher draws the learner’s attention to the errors in the learner’s speech. Although there is more than one way to give corrective feedback (Lyster, Saito and Sato, 2012, pp. 3–5), the purpose of each is to inform the learner that an error has occurred, what the error is and to offer the learner a chance to correct the error. The different types of corrective feedback can be divided into implicit, in which the teacher only signals of an error and prompts the learner to provide the correct form themselves, and explicit, in which the teacher provides the correct form (Lyster, Saito and Sato, 2012, pp. 3–5). Lee (2013) suggests that the proficiency level of the learner determines which forms of corrective feedback are effective. The beginner level learner may benefit the most from explicit feedback whereas the advanced level learner can utilise implicit feedback as well (Lee, 2013, p. 219). A similar suggestion has been forwarded by Panova and Lyster (2002, pp. 588–589). This kind of reasoning could warrant the tentative suggestion that some level of proficiency in the language is required for the learner to be able to interpret the feedback given by the teacher. As a result, the use of corrective feedback could be related to the concept of the zone of proximal development discussed in section 2.1: explicit feedback offers more help to the learner in that it provides the correct form and, thus, it could be employed with those aspects of the language with which the learner is less confident. In other words, the level of assistance provided by the teacher varies when using different types of corrective feedback.

The next method inspected is transcription. Transcription refers to the writing of speech with phonetic symbols. Lintunen (2004) notes that transcription provides a tool for the learner to see the precise nature of the sounds that the given stream of speech consists of (p. 35). Also, writing transcription gives the learner an opportunity to think about their own pronunciation, that is, how
they would pronounce any given stream of speech (Lintunen, 2004, p. 37). Because there are profound differences in the spelling-to-sound correspondences between Finnish and English, the ability of transcription to render speech visible could be considered highly useful for the Finnish learner of English.

The possibilities to use transcription in teaching the pronunciation of English seem to be utilised to some extent in Finland. The Finnish national curriculum states that the learner should learn to recognise transcription symbols in grades three through six (National Core Curriculum for Basic Education, 2014, p. 220). Learning to produce transcription is not mentioned. Additionally, transcription seems to be an important role in pronunciation specific contents in Finnish course books. Transcription is evidenced in course books in that the phonetic symbols are explained, exercises dealing with either writing or deciphering transcription are provided and some of the individual words and words in wordlists are offered in transcription (Tergujeff, 2010). However, there is some indication that transcription is mainly taught at elementary school in Finland (Tergujeff, 2012b; Tergujeff, 2013a, p. 49; Tergujeff, 2013b). What is more, learners of English appear to consider transcription useful. Lintunen (2004) found that Finnish university level students were able to improve their pronunciation with the help of transcription and that they considered transcription a viable tool. Mompean and Lintunen (2015), in turn, found that university level students from Finland, France and Spain considered transcription useful mainly for its awareness-raising aspect and visual support. In sum, the above implies that transcription could be regarded as a useful tool in teaching pronunciation and that transcription is, in fact, employed in the Finnish educational field. However, one needs to remember that transcription should be used in relation to the skill level of the learner. The beginner level learner could focus on the more concrete aspect of transcription, namely its ability to render speech visible, whereas the advanced level learner might benefit from phonetic detail as well.

Finally, course books as a tool for teaching are discussed. In Finland, the role of course books in teaching is allegedly rather meaningful. Luukka et al. (2008) found that the vast majority (98%) of foreign language teachers use course books in their teaching ‘often’ and that the same percentage of teachers rank course books amongst the five most used materials in the classroom (pp. 94–95). Not only teachers but also Finnish learners of English seem to feel that books are important in learning the language. Aro (2009) found that elementary school level pupils relate the learning of English quite strongly to written word: reading texts and completing course book exercises were
central ways to learn for the pupils in Aro’s (2009) study. Naturally, it could be suggested that the classroom reality shapes the learner’s views: as course books are extensively used by teachers, the learner grows to view them as the predominant way to learn.

Furthermore, although course books by Finnish publishers are generally regarded as being of good quality and following the national curricula, adherence to course books may also lead to some subject matter being left out from teaching. Tergujeff (2013a) argues that this might be what has happened to prosody in English pronunciation teaching in Finland: as course books do not include prosody, it is not included in teaching either (pp. 52–53; see also Tergujeff, 2010, 2012a, 2012b). Of course, it must be noted that teaching materials, including course books, can be utilised in different ways. Moreover, in the study of Luukka et al. (2008), a quarter of foreign language teachers thought that not all necessary topics are found in course books (pp. 97–98). This could lead to the conclusion that the rest of the necessary topics would be included in teaching by some other means. The lack of a topic in a course book does not, therefore, automatically exclude the topic from teaching.

To summarise section 3, it needs to be decided which, if any, language norms are followed in teaching pronunciation, what are the contents of teaching, and which methods and tools are used in teaching. The traditional bias may be towards native language norms, but the emerging view of the centrality of intercultural communication skills and overall intelligibility is challenging it. Also, no certainties can be offered about specific pronunciation-related content being more important than others in teaching. However, some proposals have been made in order to provide teachers of English with a core feature syllabus.

The next two sections present the empirical part of this paper. Section 4 illustrates the data and methodology of this study, and section 5 presents the findings.
4 Data and methodology

The purpose of this paper is to examine teacher students’ views on teaching the pronunciation of English. The main research question, *how do teacher students view teaching the pronunciation of English*, was formed on the basis of the overall purpose of the study. The aim is to find out which phenomena they consider relevant within the topic. The intention is to examine the topic from their point of view and to formulate an overall understanding of what they think about the topic as well as to restrain from quantitative analysis, all of which situates this study into the qualitative paradigm.

The data comprise of three interviews, two of which were pair interviews and one of which was a group interview with three people. Two of the interviews were conducted during the spring 2017 and one of the interviews was conducted during the spring 2016 for an earlier study on the same topic by the author. All participants were university students majoring in English and all were to be qualified as subject teachers of English. Three participants were in the final stages of their studies and had completed the 60 ECTS pedagogical studies that are the requirement for a subject teacher qualification in Finland. Two participants were approximately halfway of their studies and had completed approximately half of the pedagogical studies. Two participants had completed less than half of their studies and had not yet started the pedagogical studies. Two participants had some experience of teaching English as substitute teachers or tutors. The interviews were recorded, which resulted in total of two hours fifteen minutes of audio data. The recordings were then transcribed verbatim with the exclusion of some irrelevant parts in one of the interviews, which resulted in total of 25 pages of transcribed text.

Interview was chosen as the data collecting method because it enables the participants to voice their own opinion about a subject matter they are conscious of and that is not too personal (cf. Kvale 2007, pp. 45–46). To further encourage as natural a discussion about the topic as possible, the interview was conducted in Finnish. The interview was a semi-structured interview. Semi-structured interview is here understood, following Kvale (2007, p. 57), as an interview with pre-set themes and suggested questions. The themes were presented to the participants one by one by the interviewer, and in the first interview they were also presented as PowerPoint slides. The themes were learning, pronunciation as part of language skills, which English to teach, learning objectives, contents as well
as methods and tools. The participants got to talk about a given theme freely, and when a theme had been exhausted or the participants signalled that the next theme could be brought forward, this was done. In the latter two interviews, the suggested questions were used only in one instance to encourage discussion. The interviewer preferred to forward the discussions when needed by inserting a comment or asking for a clarification to something brought up by the participants. At some points the interviewer guided the discussion back to the theme at question. This approach rendered the suggested questions planned in advance nearly redundant. The first interview deviated from this pattern: a few suggested questions were used in order to facilitate discussion. The themes and suggested questions actually used during the three interviews are presented as appendices A and B. The appendices A and B show the respective wording of the themes in the first and the latter two interviews being partially different. As the interviewees talked about similar topics in all interviews, it was concluded that the wording did not affect their perspectives.

According to Marshall and Rossman (2011), semi-structured interview is most typically used in qualitative research because it enables the phenomenon under investigation to be approached from the participants’ point of view (p. 144). The themes and the suggested questions of the interview were based on the theoretical framework of the study. The researcher needs to familiarise with the subject of study in order to be able to form relevant themes and suggested questions about it, or as Kvale (2007) says, one needs to establish the “conceptual and theoretical understanding of the phenomena to be investigated in order to establish the base to which new knowledge will be added and integrated” (p. 39). Hence using a semi-structured interview enabled the systematisation of the talk while giving precedence to the participants’ views.

Finally, the resulting data was analysed using the method of content analysis. The content analysis for this study was done with progressing through the stages of analysis suggested by Tuomi and Sarajärvi (2009, pp. 108–111, 117–118). Before the analysis, the transcriptions of the data were read through multiple times in order to form a basic understanding of the contents of the data. It was determined that the unit of analysis was to be a thought unit. The progression of the analysis from this point forward is illustrated in figure 1 (see also appendix C for an example of the progression of the analysis from stages one through five and appendix D for the analysis as a whole from stage three onwards). Although the analysis is depicted as a linear process, the author’s thinking process was partly circular, as well. For example, main classes were formed of classes, but also the content of
the individual utterances was referred to when forming main classes to ensure the trustworthiness of the classifications made.

Figure 1. The stages of the content analysis of the data.

The content analysis progressed as follows. First, all the individual utterances relating to the main research question of this paper were detected. Second, the utterances were simplified so that the main information in them was preserved. At this stage, the simplified expressions were translated into English by the author. Third, similar simplified expressions were grouped together. Also, the groups were named according to their contents. Fourth, groups relating to a same topic were organised into classes, and classes relating to a same topic were organised into main classes. Fifth, the main classes were situated under the themes mentioned above and the themes were situated under the unifying class titled ‘Teacher students’ views on pronunciation teaching’. The analysis was initially guided by the data in that the abstraction of data into groups, classes and main classes was done on the basis of what was found in the data. The theoretical background of this paper guided the latter stages of the analysis in that the themes and the unifying class were formed on the basis of the theoretical background. Tuomi and Sarajärvi (2009) refer to this type of analysis as teoriaohjaava sisällönanalyysi (p. 117) (theory-guided content analysis, translation to English by the author).

Tuomi and Sarajärvi (2009) note that content analysis offers a tool to find meanings from the data and present them in a compact and general way (pp. 103–104). For this reason, content analysis was judged as an appropriate analysing method for this study: content analysis made the participants’ views visible and helped to form a coherent picture of the data. Coherence was an especially relevant factor because the participants talked about same topics from different perspectives and under more than one theme. Moreover, Marshall and Rossman (2011) write that qualitative research is fundamentally interpretative (pp. 2–3). Hence, it is crucial that the interpretations made from the data are trustworthy. During the analysis, it was mandatory both to
examine the meaning of the utterances when taken out of context and to reflect the interpretations made of the utterances back to the context they were extracted from. This could be taken as a factor that further justifies the interpretations made of the data.

As a final note on the data and methods of this study, the ethical issues of conducting research must be reflected on. The present study has conformed to good ethical conduct as outlined by the Finnish Advisory Board of Integrity (2012, p. 30) in that, first, the anonymity of the participants has been guaranteed because their identities are not disclosed in this paper or elsewhere. Second, an informed consent was obtained from the participants either in writing or orally. The participants were told the purpose of the study, the interview procedures and what was expected of them in the interview. Third, it was emphasised that participation was voluntary. Fourth, the recordings and transcriptions of the data were destroyed at the completion of the paper. Finally, good ethical conduct has been followed in that relevant references to the work of others are provided, accuracy has been followed in every stage of compiling this paper and that the findings of the study have been openly disclosed.

This section has introduced the data and the methodological choices made in the course of conducting the study. The next section examines the findings of the study at length.
5 Teacher students’ views on teaching the pronunciation of English

This section presents the findings of the study. Hereafter, the participants of the study are referred to as ‘the teacher students’. Overall, the teacher students’ views on teaching the pronunciation of English are discussed through six following themes: learning, pronunciation as part of language skills, which English to teach, learning objectives, contents as well as methods and tools. The subsections below investigate the themes individually in the abovementioned order. The beginning of each subsection provides the relevant part of the table constructed during the analysis for clarification. What is more, excerpts from the data illustrate the findings. The author has translated the original Finnish utterances into English so that they can be presented in this section, and the original Finnish utterances are offered in appendix E. The translated excerpts used in this section are provided with numbers: the original utterances in Finnish are provided in appendix E with equal numbering. The excerpts have been extracted from separate points of the flow of discussion, which means that a sequence of excerpts is not to be read as a dialogue. In order to keep the excerpts as informative as possible, some irrelevant content may have been removed. Any removals of material has been indicated by ‘--’. Also, it should be noted that in the excerpts, commas are not used grammatically but to signal pause. The next six subsections explore the teacher students’ views on teaching the pronunciation of English.

5.1 Considering learning a continuous process

When inspecting the theme of learning, the teacher students employed two perspectives, namely the nature of learning and development. The teacher students discussed the nature of learning with reference to the characteristics of learning and where learning occurs. In general, they perceived learning as a process that can occur in many types of environments. Development, in turn, was examined through discussing the possibility of development and taking the learner into account. Overall, the teacher students thought that development is possible and that the learner’s notions should be accounted for in teaching. Table 1 presents the teacher students’ views on learning. In the following, the theme of learning, as perceived by the teacher students, is explored.
To begin with, the teacher students inspected learning from the perspective of its nature. They discussed the nature of learning with references to the characteristics of learning and to where learning occurs. First, in relation to its characteristics, learning was considered by the teacher students to be a continuous and unnoticeable process. The following extracts show that the teacher students addressed these characteristics when they were discussing learning.

(1) I think [learning happens] all the time.
(2) --you don’t even notice that now I’m learning something--
(3) --it’s something that kind of little by little ticks away in the brain.

The teacher students’ views on the characteristics of learning appear to be compatible with the sociocultural theory of learning. Sociocultural theory maintains that learning happens via interaction with other people and with the environment (Lantolf, 2000; van Lier, 2000, 2004), as section 2.1 illustrates. As other people and the environment are more or less omnipresent in one’s life, it follows that learning could be viewed as a continuous phenomenon. Also, the very omnipresence of the environment and other people may render learning unnoticeable: the learner may need to focus on the interaction itself rather than what they are learning as a result of the interaction.

Second, in relation to where learning occurs, the teacher students thought that learning can take place both in everyday environments and in formal education. As regards the latter, they thought that completing exercises would be one of the ways to learn. The following examples illustrate these opinions.

(4) --if you think about like learning English that happens during day-to-day life really much too -- so it’s not just at school.
In stating that learning can occur in different environments, the teacher students appear to further underline the continuity of learning and again seem to conform to the ecological view of the sociocultural theory of learning. The ecological approach considers all the environments where the given individual resides as spaces where learning occurs (van Lier, 2000, 2004). It seems that the occurrence of learning is not dependent on the type of the environment and, as such, the teacher students’ contemplations on this topic seem to be in line with the ecological approach.

Furthermore, the teacher students consider exercises as a type of affordance in learning. As section 2.1 explains, affordances are properties of the environment which the learner can utilise in the learning process (van Lier, 2000, p. 252; van Lier, 2004, pp. 91, 245–253). Exercises are, similarly, regarded by teacher students as a possibility for the learner to learn the language. The teacher students mentioned that exercises need to be checked, as well. This opinion reflects sociocultural theory in two ways. On the one hand, the checking of exercises refers to affordances in that the learner needs someone or something, be it a fellow learner, a teacher, a book or a computer, to provide the correct answers or at least to help the learner notice the errors and correct the errors themselves. On the other hand, the checking of exercises relates to the second stage of learning called other-regulation (see section 2.1 for the three stages of learning proposed by Lantolf, Thorne and Poehner (2015, p. 209)), where the learner is trying to understand and process the topic at hand with the help of others.

It is interesting that the teacher students introduced exercises when they were discussing school as a learning environment even though they voiced contradictory opinions about using course books when they were contemplating the methods and tools for teaching pronunciation (see section 5.6). Perhaps this is suggestive of their stances to these two topics: they may be regarding learning on the basis of their own experiences as learners and explore the implementation of teaching from the perspective of how they see themselves acting as future teachers. This line of reasoning appears reliable because while learning in school environments has been considered rather exercise and text centered (e.g., Aro, 2009), contemporary Finnish teacher students have been shown to aspire towards using other methods, too (e.g., Riekki, 2016).

To continue, in addition to the nature of learning, development was the other perspective through which the teacher students examined learning. Referring to either learning pronunciation or to
learning in general, they argued that everybody has an opportunity to improve their skills, as the examples below demonstrate.

(6) And if you’re not able to pronounce that well yet it doesn’t mean that you never can but that it’s possible to learn.

(7) --pronunciation is something you need to practise yourself that nobody can do it for you--

(8) --everybody starts from their own level but that everybody can develop--

With stating that everybody can improve their skills, the teacher students appear to echo the concept of emergence. Introduced in section 2.1, emergence can be understood as the gradual development of linguistic abilities (van Lier, 2004, p. 81). As emergence can be taken to underline that the learner constructs an understanding of a language, so are the teacher students voicing a view that development is dependent on the individual. More generally, the concept of development seems to be in accordance with the idea of learning as a continuous process. This is because both ‘development’ and ‘continuity’ suggest that learning occurs throughout a certain period of time rather than at one point in time.

Still within the perspective of development, the teacher students introduced the viewpoint of taking the learner into account. They thought that the goals and the motivation of the learner should be accounted for in teaching. The excerpts presented next illustrate the way with which the teacher students put this opinion into words.

(9) But that the pupils’ own motivation is something that should be used to motivate yourself as well so that if pupils don’t want to learn this at all so then in a way you can try to make it more fun somehow or don’t focus on it so much and sometime later approach it again if they then are in a better mood to do it.

(10) --that everyone would have like goals and motivation for themselves as well and that the teacher is then encouraging everybody.

The teacher students suggest that teaching should aim at incorporating those issues which the learner finds relevant and which are motivating for the learner. This kind of thinking is in accordance with both the Finnish national curriculum and the dialogical view of language (Dufva et al., 2011). The Finnish national curriculum for elementary school mentions that the contents and the objectives in teaching English should be influenced by the interests and needs of the learner and that the language learned should be meaningful for the learner (National Core Curriculum for Basic Education, 2014, pp. 238, 376–377). Similarly, dialogical view of language maintains that language learning is motivated by the appropriateness of what is being learned (Dufva et al., 2011). Thus, the
teacher students’ views correspond to a number of ideas presented in the field of foreign language teaching.

The teacher students thought that in addition to the goals and motivation of the learner, the skill level of the learner should be taken into account in teaching as well. One instance of this opinion being voiced by the teacher students is forwarded by the following example.

(11) But then I think that maybe it is also the responsibility of the teacher that if you know your students well--that you can somehow predict it that you can offer more challenging exercises for those who are better--and then at the same time you can focus on those--who don’t have the same kind of abilities than those like more advanced students have.

The teacher students voice an opinion that it is a responsibility of the teacher to know the skill level of the learner and act accordingly when teaching, which is in line with the idea of the zone of proximal development (see section 2.1). The zone of proximal development refers to the tasks that the learner is not yet able to do independently (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86, as cited in Lantolf, Thorne and Poehner, 2015, p. 212). The teacher students seem to see the learner as someone who needs assistance in some aspects of language use. Also, they suggest that the teacher should recognise the skill level of the learner. This way, they think, the teacher can provide the learner with tasks which are of an appropriate level of difficulty. When operating within the zone of proximal development, the learner needs to work with those aspects of a language that are neither too easy nor too difficult for them, the importance of which is highlighted by the teacher students.

In conclusion, the teacher students consider learning to be a continuous process that takes place both in everyday environments and in formal education. Moreover, the teacher students consider development a part of learning. They think that development is possible and that the skill level and goals of the learner need to be taken into account in teaching.

5.2 On the position of pronunciation in teaching English

The teacher students inspected the theme pronunciation as a part of language skills from two perspectives. On the one hand, they talked about the importance of pronunciation as a part of language skills. They brought up contrasting views as to whether or not pronunciation is important. On the other hand, the teacher students talked about pronunciation as a part of teaching language skills. They approached this topic by discussing whether or not pronunciation could be taught simultaneously with other linguistic skills. The teacher students’ understanding of pronunciation as
a part of language skills is illustrated in table 2. This section discusses in depth the importance of pronunciation and pronunciation as a part of teaching English as construed by the teacher students.

Table 2. The teacher students’ views on pronunciation as a part of language skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRONUNCIATION AS A PART OF LANGUAGE SKILLS</th>
<th>Importance of pronunciation</th>
<th>Pronunciation is important</th>
<th>Pronunciation not an important part of language skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pronunciation is important</td>
<td>Pronunciation as important part of language skills as any other language-related skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pronunciation important because affects understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pronunciation important because affects the readiness to speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation as a part of teaching</td>
<td>Pronunciation can be taught together with teaching other language skills</td>
<td>Teaching pronunciation can be a part of teaching other language skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pronunciation a separate area in teaching</td>
<td>Pronunciation a separate part in language skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pronunciation can be taught only after teaching other language skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First, contrasting views emerged in how the teacher students view the importance of pronunciation as a part of language skills. Some of the teacher students voiced the opinion that pronunciation is not an important part of language skills. To be more specific, they stated that pronunciation is only a small part of language skills as a whole and that teaching a language in school should not emphasise pronunciation. Nevertheless, some of the teacher students expressed the opinion that pronunciation is as important as any other language skill. They stated that pronunciation is an important part of language skills because it is essential for speaking and using the language in general. The contrast in the teacher students’ views is illustrated by the following two examples.

(12) --if you think about teaching at school, I wouldn’t emphasise pronunciation. I think it’s such a small part of language skills as a whole.

(13) I think pronunciation is after all such a big part of speaking and using English--because it’s such a big part of language use after all in the end.

The fact that the teacher students express contradictory views as regarding the importance of pronunciation reflects the contradictory position of pronunciation in general in the field of teaching English. For example, although pronunciation instruction has been shown to improve learners’ pronunciation (e.g., Couper, 2006), pronunciation is perhaps a neglected area in teaching (e.g.,
Mompean and Lintunen, 2015). The relative importance of pronunciation has been examined by Tergujeff (2012b), who found that Finnish teachers of English consider pronunciation relatively important in relation to other language skills (p. 34). Nevertheless, the relative importance of pronunciation could well depend on how one interprets the theoretical framework of communicative competence introduced in section 2.2. According to the framework, communicative competence is construed from four components, one of which is grammatical competence (Canale, 1983, pp. 6–12). On the one hand, then, pronunciation could be viewed as only a very small component in communicative competence: it is only a part of grammatical competence, which, in turn, is only a part of communicative competence. On the other hand, one could think that communicative competence as a whole is only as functional as its weakest element, which would render also pronunciation rather crucial in the achievement of good communicative competence.

In relation to the importance of pronunciation as a part of language skills, the teacher students justified the importance of pronunciation with the effect that pronunciation has on understandability and on the readiness to speak. The excerpts below demonstrate the teacher students’ argumentation on the topic.

(14) I myself have always been annoyed when people say that it doesn’t matter much how you pronounce—as long as you’re understood that’s the most important thing. But it’s that people don’t realise that it’s the pronunciation—that makes the understanding.

(15) --even if you know the language well otherwise like, grammar and vocabulary is good but if pronunciation is weak then you might feel unsure to speak.

As a side note, one needs to point out that here the teacher students are referring to understandability. Because intelligibility could be defined as the extent to which the speaker is understood by the listener (Munro and Derwing, 1995, p. 76), the teacher students’ references to understandability are construed through the concept of intelligibility. In other words, understandability remains a term occurring in the teacher students’ speech while the term intelligibility is employed when providing the conclusions made of their talk. This position is adopted henceforth. To return to the issue at hand, with stating that pronunciation affects intelligibility, the teacher students address what is, in fact, one of the central tenets of this paper, namely that pronunciation-related issues are relevant for interlocutors in understanding each other. What is more, the Finnish national curriculum seems to maintain that the development of interaction skills and pronunciation skills is parallel. For example, at the end of grade six the learner should be able to exchange thoughts or information in everyday situations and to apply some basic rules of
pronunciation (National Core Curriculum for Basic Education, 2014, pp. 239–240), whereas at the end of grade nine the learner should be able to communicate, take part in discussions and express their opinions quite effortlessly in everyday situations and to apply a number of basic rules of pronunciation (National Core Curriculum for Basic Education, 2014, pp. 378–379). Thus, without making any assumptions about the order of acquisition, it seems that the learner is expected to have more abilities to interact while their skills in pronunciation develop. This, in turn, is echoed in the teacher students’ views because they link pronunciation with being understood and with willingness to speak, both of which are prerequisites for interaction.

In addition to talking about the importance of pronunciation, the teacher students introduced the topic of pronunciation as a part of teaching a language when they were exploring pronunciation as part of language skills. Firstly, the teacher students thought that pronunciation could be integrated into teaching other things about English. More specifically, they stated that pronunciation skills should develop simultaneously with other language skills, as can be seen from the following extracts.

(16) And then pronunciation as well would occur like during ordinary lessons together with all other learning that it wouldn’t need to be perhaps like so like maybe separated but that it is belongs to like in ordinary lessons too.

(17) --when learning a language kind of goes so far, that you know the language very well but your pronunciation is poor then the, the imbalance is so great that then it’s difficult kind of start to force pronunciation to emerge from there. That they should emerge more or less simultaneously--

The teacher students are expressing a point of view that pronunciation should be taught and practised simultaneously with other aspects of language proficiency. This could be taken to imply that the teacher students consider language skills as a coherent entity the components of which should be balanced. Furthermore, the examples (12) and (13) illustrated how the teacher students voiced contradictory views about the importance of pronunciation. With this in mind, in the light of the present data it remains unclear whether the teacher students underlined the need for teaching pronunciation simultaneously because they considered pronunciation as important as other language skills or because they did not consider pronunciation important enough to be taught separately.

Nevertheless, the teacher students also contemplated that pronunciation is a somewhat separate area compared to other language skills. They regarded pronunciation as a skill that does not
necessarily relate to other linguistic skills. The next example shows how the teacher students presented this opinion.

(18) --pronunciation is kind of the last stage, or when you compare to those other parts of English language that pronunciation is a little like kind of, like, superficial, like the sort that it doesn’t necessarily relate to your skills in English like overall. But then it’s kind of the last cherry on top of the cake--

Here the teacher students express a view contrary to the one presented above, according to which pronunciation can be taught simultaneously with teaching other language skills. This kind of thinking seems to suggest that the teacher students consider pronunciation a skill that can be practised only after learning other areas of English. In other words, it could be interpreted that the teacher students think that language skills can be considered good even without pronunciation skills. This may relate to the concept of communicative competence presented in section 2.2: as pronunciation is only one component in communicative competence, the overall language skills could be regarded good if all the other components are mastered. Also, as they are referring to pronunciation as the last stage in the development of skills in English, the teacher students seem to think that English in general could be taught without including pronunciation. This could be taken as a contradiction to the Finnish national curriculum, which states that from grade three onwards “the pupils observe and get plenty of practise in pronunciation” (National Core Curriculum for Basic Education, 2014, p. 238).

Considering pronunciation a separate stage in learning a language is also in contrast to the underlying perspective adopted in this paper of pronunciation as an essential part in carrying out the communicative approach in teaching (see section 2.2) and in reaching the ability to communicate in intercultural contexts with intelligible English (see section 3.1).

In addition to viewing pronunciation as a skill that does not necessarily relate to other linguistic skills, the teacher students expressed the view that pronunciation skills could be practised only after gaining some knowledge of vocabulary and grammar. The next excerpt illustrates this view.

(19) --vocabulary builds up and the grammar builds up so in that stage you should little by little start to play up the pronunciation.

It seems plausible to suggest that the underlying idea here is that at least some knowledge of a language is mandatory before speaking in that language is possible and pronunciation-related issues become relevant. As such, this kind of thinking appears not to sit well with the premise of sociocultural theory about language being learned within situated social action (see section 2.1). Speaking is a natural way for us to initiate and maintain social action, which is why it would seem rather unrealistic to neglect speaking or pronunciation skills for any length of time in teaching.
In sum, the teacher students inspected pronunciation as a part of language skills with reference to the importance of pronunciation and its role in teaching English. Both of these topics portray the teacher students as a heterogeneous group. The teacher students hold diverse opinions on the importance of pronunciation, portraying pronunciation either an important or an unimportant part of language skills. They also forward insights which present pronunciation either as a part of teaching other language skills or as a separate entity in teaching.

### 5.3 Addressing the different accents of English

In regarding which English to teach, that is, what kind of English to use as a norm in teaching, the teacher students approached the subject from two perspectives. On the one hand, the teacher students discussed the given accent to be chosen as the norm for teaching pronunciation. They expressed opinions that only one norm should be used in teaching and the norm used should be intelligible. Moreover, they discussed the nativity of the norm as well as the learner’s own accent. On the other hand, the teacher students discussed the abundance of accents. They thought that the abundance of accents should be addressed in teaching. The teacher students’ views on which English to teach while teaching the pronunciation of English are presented in table 3.

**Table 3. The teacher students’ views on which English to teach while teaching pronunciation.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHICH ENGLISH TO TEACH</th>
<th>Accent to be taught</th>
<th>Nativity of accent</th>
<th>One given accent</th>
<th>One accent to be used as a norm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understandable accent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Native accent to be used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The accent of the learner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Native accent not necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abundance of accents</td>
<td>Abundance of accents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Understandable accent to be used as a norm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral accent to be used in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accent considered the most natural by the learner to be taught</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accents as indicators of the spread of English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Understanding non-native accents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>British accent traditionally used as a norm in teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following discussion on the teacher students’ views is ordered in such a fashion that their insights relating to the given accent to be taught is explored first and their thoughts about the abundance of accents is examined second. To begin with, the teacher students’ viewpoints on the
given accent to be chosen as the norm for teaching the pronunciation of English are discussed. First, the teacher students thought that in teaching pronunciation, only one given accent should be used as a norm, as is shown by the next two extracts.

(20) I think it’s quite smart that if you teach English you should more or less stick to a certain accent--
(21) --you need to have a model, that you can’t throw in a mix, that you should have a consistent model there.

The idea that only one accent should be adhered to in teaching pronunciation seems plausible when it is taken into account that the teacher students named intelligibility as a learning objective for teaching pronunciation (see section 5.4). This is because adhering to one norm in speech makes the learning process more straightforward and, thus, intelligibility can be reached more easily. All in all, the teacher students’ wish to adhere to one norm reflects the current reality of teaching the pronunciation of English in Finland, which leaves relatively little room for using different accents as norms in teaching pronunciation (Tergujeff, 2012b, pp. 40–41).

Second, the teacher students also discussed whether or not the accent taught should be native or not. This topic elicited opposing views, which are illustrated in the following two extracts.

(22) I think it [the model] doesn’t always have to be a native one, as long as it’s a kind that’s understandable.
(23) But then if you think that English is being taught--somehow it just feels like it should be English or the American one, one of these native accents.

The teacher students are presenting different opinions about using a native accent as a norm in teaching pronunciation. The first excerpt above appears to include the unstated belief that non-native varieties are more likely unintelligible than native varieties. However, the usage of non-native varieties as the norm in teaching the pronunciation of English has been defended by stating that they are more relevant for the learner because the learner more probably interacts with other non-native speakers of English and also because the features that render non-native speech intelligible are the features most essential to learn (Murphy, 2014). Using a native variety as a norm has been defended, for example, by Kuo (2006), who argues that “[a] native-speaker model -- would appear to be more appropriate and appealing in second language pedagogy than a description of English which is somewhat reduced and incomplete” (p. 220). Hence, by voicing contradicting views about the nativity of the language norm used in teaching pronunciation, the teacher students appear to be echoing a division present more generally in the field.
Third, the teacher students thought that the given accent chosen as the norm should be widely understood. The understandability of the norm to be used in teaching was introduced already in the excerpt (22), where a teacher student stated that the norm used need not necessarily be a native one as long as it is understandable. Understandability features also in the example below.

(24) --I don’t think it matters what kind of accent it [the one used as a model] is as long as it’s the sort that’s understood by everybody.

Above it was stated that the idea of using only one accent in teaching is congruent with regarding intelligibility as a learning objective. Similarly, promoting the intelligibility of the norm is compatible with promoting intelligibility as a learning objective. What is more, with underlining the use of a pronunciation norm that is intelligible and, as a result, widely understood, the teacher students are promoting the learner’s ability to communicate with a range of people from different backgrounds. Hence, the teacher students are presenting a viewpoint which is in accordance with the view presented in section 3.1, namely how teaching pronunciation may be influenced with the aim to enable the learner to communicate in intercultural contexts.

The teacher students thought that in addition to being understandable, the accent chosen as a norm for teaching pronunciation should be neutral. To be more precise, they stated that the learner should be taught English that does not highlight features of any specific accent. The next example gives a form to this statement.

(25) [What kind of English to teach when teaching the pronunciation of English?] Probably the kind probably what you said a sort that’s somewhat neutral that it doesn’t show like any great British or American influence, but sort of a middle ground.

In itself, the idea that a specific accent is used as a norm together with the idea that a norm should not portray features of any given accents appears paradoxical. Nevertheless, in expressing a view that the language norm used in teaching pronunciation should not have specific characteristics of any given accents, the teacher students are establishing a stance similar to Jenkins (2000, 2002) and Cruttenden (2014). Jenkins (2000, 2002) and Cruttenden (2014, pp. 326–345) appear to think that rather than learning a specific accent, the learner of English should learn those aspects of pronunciation that are most relevant for communication (see section 3.2).

In relation to the topic of the accent to be taught when teaching pronunciation, the teacher students introduced the topic of the learner’s own accent. On the one hand, the teacher students thought that it is not of a much significance which accent the learner is using when speaking English. Also,
they stated that foreign accent is nothing to be ashamed of. The following excerpts demonstrate these opinions.

(26) Speak, with your own style that feels best for yourself no matter what it sounds like accent wise as long as you’re understood.

(27) Or there’s nothing to be ashamed of if your speech gives away that you’re from Finland.

Here the teacher students are relating the use of accents to intelligibility. Examples (22) and (24) show that the teacher students think that the norm used in teaching should be intelligible, and here they are voicing a view that the learner can choose any kind of accent to speak with as long as their speech is intelligible. As a result, the teacher students appear to voice opinions in agreement with those of Kachru and Nelson (2001) as well as Crystal (2001), who argue for the equality of accents. Moreover, the teacher students’ view presented here echoes the central premise of the paradigm of English as an international language (EIL), which holds that many types of English can be used for communication (Marlina, 2014, pp. 3–6; Sharifian, 2009).

On the other hand, the teacher students thought that the accent which the learner considers the most natural for them to speak with should be taken into account when the norm for teaching pronunciation is chosen. The example below shows how they presented this opinion.

(28) Maybe it would be good like to talk with the pupils too about it that--what kind of English they’ve heard and what they then use the most themselves and what feels like kind of their own.

The teacher students are saying that it would be good to find out what kind of English the learner is exposed to or is using. In other words, the teacher students consider it important to know how English is present in the sociocultural environment of the learner. This kind of view is compatible with the sociocultural theory of learning discussed in section 2.1. It is also compatible with the dialogical view of language introduced by Dufva et al. (2011) (see section 2.2), which underlines the need to connect teaching to things that are personally relevant for the learner.

Finally, in addition to the given accent to be chosen as the norm for teaching the pronunciation of English, the teacher students discussed the abundance of accents. They thought that the abundance of accents should be addressed in teaching because it illustrates the global spread of English. They stated that it would be important that the learner hears and learns to understand non-native accents of English. The following extracts illustrates how the teacher students forwarded these thoughts.
(29) Well sure it [using all native accents] would provide a bigger picture that it isn’t just British and America where it is used. But maybe precisely from the perspective that there are nowadays more those non-native speakers that, more probably you will hear it if you go travelling so you won’t hear those native accents so much that. You could maybe understand them better too if you heard them.

(30) That you could tell them apart at least somewhat if you hear, to do little listening test that someone talks which accent of these it is--

Here the teacher students are addressing the topic of introducing different accents to the learner. They consider accents as a way to demonstrate the global spread of English. In effect, the teacher students are following the guidelines set by the Finnish national curricula, which state that the global significance of English need to be addressed in teaching (National Core Curriculum for Basic Education, 2014, pp. 237–239, 376–378; National Core Curriculum for General Upper Secondary Schools, 2015, p. 117). Also, understanding the diversity of English and the division of English into different accents is one of the things that belong to the EIL paradigm (Modiano, 2009).

Furthermore, the teacher students consider familiarising the learner with different accents important because it helps the learner to understand accented speech. Pihko (1997) found that Finnish learners find familiar accents more intelligible than unfamiliar accents. Although a rather unsurprising result, Pihko’s (1997) findings support the teacher students’ view that different accents should be included in teaching. Pihko (1997) also found that Finnish learners’ attitudes towards non-native accents tend to be rather negative compared to their attitudes towards native accents. Familiarising the learner with different accents might make the learner view them more positively. Also, encouraging the learner to understand different accents could be taken as a way to help the learner form the ability to communicate in intercultural situations, a skill prioritised in EIL (Modiano, 2009; Sharifian, 2009; see also Marlina, 2014). Finally, it should be noted here that the topic of introducing different accents to the learner also belongs under the theme contents for teaching pronunciation, which section 5.5 discusses. However, as the teacher students rather clearly associated this topic with using only one accent as the norm in teaching, the abundance of accents is included in the discussion here.

In discussing the abundance of accents, the teacher students expressed the opinion that British accent would be the norm traditionally used in teaching the pronunciation of English, as can be seen in the next two examples.

(31) But the English used in Europe is British English isn’t it, the model.
(32) But well, traditionally it has always been British that it’s quite a new thing that the American has entered the scene.

The context of the two excerpts above reveal that the teacher students are using interchangeably the respective terms ‘British English’ and ‘RP’ as well as ‘American English’ and ‘GA’. Thus, the teacher students recognise the strong position of RP both in Europe, which has been confirmed by Henderson et al. (2012, pp. 20–23), and in Finland, which has been confirmed by Tergujeff (2012b, pp. 40–41). In addition, the teacher students mention an American norm as an option to a British norm. In doing so they identify a tendency discovered by Tergujeff (2012b), namely that besides RP, GA is another main norm used in teaching the pronunciation of English in Finland (pp. 40–41).

To summarise this section, it can be concluded that the teacher students consider the theme which English to teach to include two main perspectives. The first perspective is which accent to use as a norm in teaching. The teacher students think that teaching should adhere to one accent, the accent used as a norm should be intelligible and that the learner can choose to speak with any kind of accent. The second perspective is the abundance of accents. The teacher students think that the abundance of accents ought to be illustrated in teaching and that RP is the norm traditionally used in teaching the pronunciation of English.

5.4 Intelligibility, willingness to speak and awareness as learning objectives

The teacher students consider the learning objectives for teaching the pronunciation of English to comprise of issues relating to speaking and awareness. They approached the former topic from the viewpoints of intelligible speech and willingness to speak. The latter topic, in turn, they approached from the viewpoint of being aware of pronunciation. Table 4 illustrates the teacher students’ views on learning objectives for teaching pronunciation.

Table 4. The teacher students’ views on learning objectives for teaching pronunciation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEARNING OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>Intelligible speech</th>
<th>Intelligibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Being aware of pronunciation</td>
<td>Noticing pronunciation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Courage to speak</td>
<td>Producing fluent speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>No need for native-like pronunciation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Knowing how to apply pronunciation-related knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The teacher students’ understanding of learning objectives is explored in the following by discussing the viewpoint of speaking first and the viewpoint of awareness after that. Regarding speaking as part of learning objectives for teaching pronunciation, the teacher students depicted it as being formed of two components, which were intelligible speech and willingness to speak. Intelligible speech was construed by the teacher students as, first, including intelligibility and, second, excluding the need to acquire a native-like accent. The teacher students stated that intelligibility should be highlighted in teaching pronunciation and that the acquisition of native-like accent is not necessary. The following examples illustrate these opinions.

(33) Well I would say that it’s maybe definitely understandability that needs to be highlighted in there.

(34) You don’t need to have a perfect British accent--

Underlining intelligibility as a learning objective is compatible with the view generally adopted in foreign language teaching today. Foreign language teaching has traditionally been guided by the aim to achieve native-like proficiency in pronunciation but is today guided by the aim to be understood by one’s interlocutors (Levis, 2005, pp. 370–371). Moreover, section 5.3 illustrates that the teacher students think that it would not matter if the learner spoke with an accent that could be identified non-native. This kind of reasoning together with promoting intelligibility as a learning objective is in line with Munro and Derwing’s (1995) as well as Munro’s (2008) conclusion that accented speech can be intelligible.

In addition to intelligible speech, the teacher students introduced the willingness to speak as a learning objective in teaching the pronunciation of English. The teacher students presented the ability to produce fluent speech and the courage to speak as the components of the willingness to speak. Specifically, they stated that the learner should not stop to think about their speech and that mistakes are allowed, as the examples below demonstrate.

(35) --that it would be sort of fluent speaking and you didn’t need to stop and think about and worry that oh my what if I pronounce this wrong or if this isn’t fluent enough but that it would be kind of fluent and understandable and sort of so that you’re feeling comfortable in speaking the language.

(36) And then exactly kind of courage to pronunciation and otherwise to like communication so that the pupils would feel that this language can be spoken and mistakes don’t matter--

This kind of view is compatible with the Finnish national curricula, which consider the focus of teaching English to be the development of the learner’s communicative abilities (National Core
Curriculum for Basic education, 2014, pp. 135–136, 236–251, 374–402; National Core Curriculum for General Upper Secondary Schools, 2015, pp. 114–137). Also, the fact that the teacher students are addressing the willingness to speak under the theme of learning objectives for teaching pronunciation could be interpreted as compatible with the sociocultural theory of learning. This interpretation seems justifiable because sociocultural theory maintains that learning happens via active participation in social actions with others (Lantolf, 2000; see section 2.1). If the learner is unsure of their linguistic abilities, participation in social action is may be hindered and, as a result, learning opportunities may be compromised.

In addition to speaking, awareness was considered another part of learning objectives for teaching the pronunciation of English. The teacher students regarded noticing pronunciation as one of the two components in awareness. They stated that the learner should notice the pronunciation of speech they hear around them. The excerpts presented next illustrate how the teacher students put this opinion into words.

(37) Maybe then just that the awareness of pronunciation would emerge that there’d be kind of more active listening maybe that you’d learn to listen in like spoken language that how it is pronounced.

(38) So that exactly that you’d be more aware that now they’re pronouncing and how they are pronouncing and the like.

It appears that here the teacher students are conceptualising the learner residing in different spaces, which contain certain aspects (in this case, speech) useful for the learner. This, again, seems a viewpoint compatible with the sociocultural theory of learning, according to which the environment contains affordances, which somehow aid learning (van Lier, 2000, p. 252; van Lier, 2004, pp. 245–253, 291). The teacher students see authentic spoken language as an affordance which helps the learner to form an understanding of pronunciation. Accordingly, they consider active listening as a method to be used in pronunciation teaching (see section 5.6), which could be seen as a way to develop language awareness. Furthermore, in underlining the need to notice pronunciation, the teacher students appear to be in agreement with scholars who think that paying attention to and noticing linguistic phenomena benefit language learning (see van Lier, 2001).

Apart from noticing pronunciation, the other component in awareness as construed by teacher students was knowing how to apply pronunciation-related knowledge. The teacher students said that the learner should apply the knowledge they have about pronunciation when they come into
contact with a word or an expression which is new to them. Two instances of them voicing this opinion are offered in the following examples.

(39) And maybe the sort that you have such a good set of basic skills that then if you come across a novel word so that you know how to find out that how it’s pronounced and.

(40) And you could throw in a guess that ok there’s that kind of a little bit longer and a more unfamiliar sentence that you’d have a look at where there possibly are stresses, and then you’d try to pronounce it that way.

Here the teacher students are highlighting the learner’s abilities to use English that they have not practised beforehand. They are, in fact, quoting the Finnish national curriculum for elementary school: the curricula states that to earn grade ‘good’ at the end of elementary school, the learner should be able to “apply a number of basic rules of pronunciation also in expressions that have not been practised” (National Core Curriculum for Basic Education, 2014, p. 379). The ability to apply pronunciation-related knowledge to linguistic material could be connected with some of the other concepts the teacher students brought up within the theme of learning objectives for teaching pronunciation. For example, the intelligibility of speech and the courage to speak could be seen to depend, at least partly, on the learner’s ability to produce speech that conforms to the rules of pronunciation. Also, it is not reasonable to expect that every possible way to use linguistic structures can be addressed in teaching. Therefore, the learner’s ability to apply linguistic knowledge becomes paramount.

In conclusion, this section has shown that the teacher students’ views on learning objectives for teaching the pronunciation of English comprise of the concepts of speaking and awareness. The teacher students appear to think that teaching pronunciation should aim at intelligible speech rather than native-like accent. They also think that the learner should acquire the courage to speak English. Moreover, the teacher students consider noticing pronunciation in the environment and the ability to apply pronunciation-related knowledge to be important skills.

5.5 Teaching practical pronunciation

In discussing the contents for teaching the pronunciation of English, the teacher students applied three viewpoints. One was the practical uses of pronunciation, in relation to which the teacher students discussed the significance of pronunciation in real life and sound-to-spelling correspondence. The other two viewpoints were prosody and sounds. The teacher students portrayed prosody as a contradictory topic. As regards sounds, they thought it important to take
the specific needs of the Finnish learner into account. They also named a number of individual sounds which should be included in teaching. Table 5 presents the teacher students’ views on the contents for teaching pronunciation. In the following, their insights of the topic are presented so that the discussion progresses from practical uses of pronunciation to prosody and finally to sounds.

Table 5. The teacher students’ views on contents for teaching pronunciation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTENTS</th>
<th>Practical uses of pronunciation</th>
<th>Significance of pronunciation</th>
<th>Prosody to be taught</th>
<th>Prosody not to be taught</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practical uses of pronunciation</td>
<td>Pronunciation is useful</td>
<td>Sounds affect meaning</td>
<td>Intonation</td>
<td>Prosody not important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound-to-spelling correspondence</td>
<td>Sound-to-spelling correspondence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosody</td>
<td>Prosody to be taught</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sounds</td>
<td>Important sounds for Finns</td>
<td>Sounds difficult for Finns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual phonemes</td>
<td>Differences in sounds between English and Finnish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Distinguishing similar sounds from one another</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sibilants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dental fricatives</td>
<td></td>
<td>v – w</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teacher students consider the practical uses of pronunciation to be in connection with the significance of pronunciation and sound-to-spelling correspondence. The two topics are next presented in an orderly sequence. First, considering the significance of pronunciation, the teacher students thought that the learner should feel that learning pronunciation is useful for real life and that it prepares one to use language in authentic situations. The excerpts below demonstrate the teacher students’ arguments on the matter.

(41) So that you then know that it [learning pronunciation] is useful for real life as well and--you get the feeling that it really is like, the language is somewhere there and you can use it elsewhere too not just the classroom.

(42) --[one should address in teaching] this kind of like real life where you really need the language so that it’s not just like the kind that I’m now at school and I get good grades when I know this well and, that it’s the kind of like useful for real and of the sort that you need--

Similarly to the teacher students thinking that the learner should have the possibility to choose which accent they learn (see section 5.3), the idea of the usefulness of pronunciation is compatible
with the dialogical view of language (Dufva et al., 2011) introduced in section 2.2. Similarly, the Finnish national curricula stresses that foreign languages are learned for real life (e.g., National Core Curriculum for Basic Education, 2014, p. 238).

Still in relation to the significance of pronunciation, the teacher students thought that the learner should be made aware that sounds can affect the meaning of the word. Specifically, they stated that the sounds most likely to cause misunderstanding should be addressed in teaching, as can be seen from the following extracts.

(43) --that you then understand these different sounds which may then change the word and.

(44) Yeah well those [sounds] that leave the biggest chance for misunderstanding. Underline those.

It seems that the teacher students are here referring to sounds occurring in minimal pairs, that is, such pairs as *pin/bin* that differ only by one sound. Levis and Cortes (2008) argue that minimal pair exercises are not very useful because the possibility to actual misunderstanding to occur is rather small. Therefore, approaching sounds from the viewpoint that they may cause misunderstandings in some words in some context should not perhaps be in the core of teaching pronunciation. It may be, however, that there is a connection between the teacher students promoting the teaching of sounds which cause misunderstanding and stating that it is important that the learner gains the ability to differentiate similar sounds, an issue introduced by the teacher students which is examined later in this section. Accordingly, despite their general reservation towards minimal pair exercises, Levis and Cortes (2008) do acknowledge that minimal pairs may be beneficial in teaching the learner to distinguish sounds.

In addition to introducing issues that underline the significance of pronunciation, the teacher students thought that sound-to-spelling correspondence should be addressed in teaching the pronunciation of English. The next example demonstrates how they expressed this stance.

(45) --well those kinds of things that it’s written but then pronounced in a totally different way or that it is written in a different way than it is then pronounced.

Here the teacher students are referring to the opaque sound-to-spelling correspondence of English. The suggestion that the sound-to-spelling correspondence of English should be taught for the Finnish learner seems to be justified. In English, there are many sound-to-grapheme and grapheme-to-sound correspondences. In Finnish, however, a given sound is nearly always represented in writing by a certain grapheme. Moreover, there is some indication that orthography affects
learners’ pronunciation of English (Bassetti and Atkinson, 2015; Damian and Powers, 2003). Hence, it might be useful, as the teacher students suggest, to draw the learner’s attention to the difference between the two languages in this matter.

Additionally to the practical aspects of pronunciation, the teacher students discussed prosody when contemplating the contents for teaching the pronunciation of English. Similarly to the importance of pronunciation as a whole (see section 5.2), the teacher students expressed contradictory views as to whether or not prosody should be included in teaching. To be more precise, while those against including prosody justified this with stating that prosody does not affect understanding, those in favour of including prosody mentioned teaching both intonation and stress as well as how they affect meaning. The next three excerpts illustrate these views.

(46) But I don’t think they need it [prosody] because it’s not at all relevant for understanding.

(47) --intonation and such and how intonation may in some sentences change the meaning for natives.

(48) --that if it lacks kind of all stress that gives the sentence meaning, so it kind of, renders the studying of pronunciation incomplete.

In expressing contradictory views about the importance of prosody, the teacher students reflect a division present in the research field of teaching the pronunciation of English. For example, Levis (2005) illustrates how there is no consensus about the relative importance of prosody and sounds or the absolute importance of prosody in teaching pronunciation. Cruttenden (2014) and Jenkins (2000, 2002), whose respective core feature listings as to the contents for teaching pronunciation were inspected in section 3.2, disagree on which aspects of prosody are important for the learner of English. For instance, Cruttenden (2014) promotes the teaching of word stress (p. 340) while Jenkins (2000, 2002) does not regard word stress a priority in teaching pronunciation (Jenkins, 2000, pp. 150–151; Jenkins, 2002, pp. 97–98). Despite this kind of discrepancy in the field, the studies of Field (2005) and Hahn (2004) indicate that prosody affects intelligibility. An idea of this kind is, perhaps, to be seen to influence the teacher students’ promotion of prosody: it can be seen from the last two excerpts above that they think intonation and stress affect the meaning of the utterance. Comparing the teacher students’ view to the findings of Field (2005) and Hahn (2004) is justified because although the teacher students refer to ‘meaning of the utterance’ while Field (2005) and Hahn (2004) refer to ‘intelligibility’, they all refer to conveying the intended message.
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Finally, in addition to the practicality of pronunciation and prosody, the teacher students discussed individual sounds as part of the contents for teaching pronunciation. Firstly, they explored individual sounds from the Finnish learner’s perspective. They thought that sounds difficult for Finns as well as sounds different in Finnish and English should be addressed in teaching. The following examples illustrate these opinions.

(49) I think maybe you could go through those typically difficult for Finns, sibilants and.

(50) And those that are then way different from Finnish, that when there is a lot of differences then exactly those that you dare let go of the Finnish pronunciation and really exaggerate a little as well so then it sounds better in English.

The teacher students are advocating teaching those sounds that could be considered typically difficult for the Finnish learner. In doing so, they seem to regard some sounds as more difficult to learn than others. This is a central thought in Flege’s (1987) work, where the sounds of the language to be learned are grouped into three categories relative to the learner’s native language, namely same, similar and different, the latter two of which pose different challenges for the learner (p. 48). What is more, it seems that in referring to the difficulties experienced by the Finnish learner, the teacher students are referring to difficulties in production. It has, in fact, been suggested that in learning the similar and different sounds of the target language, production could cause difficulties to the learner (Lintunen, 2014, pp. 178–180).

Apart from the general statement that sounds important for Finns should be taught, the teacher students identified a number of individual sounds which should be addressed in teaching. The individual sounds in question were sibilants, dental fricatives and the sounds / v / and / w /. In naming these precise sounds, the teacher students have, indeed, identified the potential problem areas for the Finnish learner. Lintunen (2004) found that sibilants are the most difficult group of English consonants for the Finnish learner to master (pp. 164–165). Dental fricatives have also been identified as sounds that Finnish learners have problems with (Lintunen, 2004, pp. 174–175). Finally, as regards the sounds / v / and / w /, it appears that problems in one cause problems in the other (Lintunen, 2004, pp. 176–177). What is more, the typical Finnish mistake in the English / v /, producing it without friction noise, has been identified as poorly tolerated by native speakers of English (Morris-Wilson, 1999, pp. 132–143). All in all, the teacher students advocate the explicit teaching of individual English sounds that have been identified as problematic for Finns.

In addition to discussing individual sounds, the teacher students expressed a view that distinguishing similar sounds, in general, should be taught when teaching pronunciation. They also stated that
comparing the differences of sounds would be more meaningful than practising a lone sound on its own. The following excerpts demonstrate these opinions.

(51) How to distinguish similar sounds and.

(52) So that there, that now there is a difference here. This is the difference, in this word it’s like this and in this word like this. So that it’s not just this one sound but that then you’re comparing. Comparing simultaneously that what’s the difference between these. Preferably something like that than just this one sound now--

Although it appears that they are here referring to the similarities between different English sounds rather than to those between English and Finnish sounds, it can be deduced that the teacher students consider the general ability to distinguish similar sounds important. Returning to the division of sounds into same, similar and different (Flege, 1987, p. 48), the sounds of a foreign language which are similar to some of those of the native language could be considered the most difficult for the learner (Lintunen, 2014, pp. 179–181). It follows that similar sounds should be included in teaching. Also, as Flege (1987) states, there is always some systematic difference in the similar sounds of two languages (p. 48). Thus, as the teacher students propose, the similar sounds of English and Finnish as well as those of English could be addressed in teaching by comparing them with each other in order to pinpoint the differences. This could aid in learning the correct way to produce them.

In sum, it has been shown that the teacher students contemplate the contents for teaching the pronunciation of English from three major perspectives, namely practicality, prosody and sounds. The teacher students think that teaching pronunciation should prepare the learner for using the language in real life. However, they are not uniform as regards the importance of prosody, and they consider some sounds more important to teach than others.

5.6 Utilising speaking and listening, transcription and course books

The topic ‘my own abilities to teach the pronunciation of English’ was included in the data collection interviews as its own theme. It is incorporated into this section because the ability to teach is closely linked to the implementation of teaching, as are the methods and tools used in teaching. Because the topic regarding one’s abilities was introduced by the author on the basis of the theoretical background of this study, not the teacher students themselves, it is marked on the tables illustrating the findings of the study (appendix D, table 6) with capitals (as are the themes, which were also formed on basis of the theoretical background of this study). The teacher students inspected their abilities to teach pronunciation from the viewpoints of pronunciation skills and pedagogical skills.
Considering the methods and tools for teaching pronunciation, the teacher students introduced three main types of methods and tools, which were speaking and listening as practise, transcription and course books. Utilising transcription and course books elicited contrastive views. The following discussion progresses as indicated by table 6, so that the teacher students’ perceived abilities to teach pronunciation are discussed first. After that, the methods and tools introduced by the teacher students are examined.

Table 6. The teacher students’ views on the methods and tools to be used in teaching pronunciation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METHODS AND TOOLS</th>
<th>ABILITIES TO TEACH PRONUNCIATION</th>
<th>Pronunciation skills</th>
<th>Pronunciation skills important to teachers because they forward their skills to the learner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Own pronunciation skills sufficiently good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedagogical skills</td>
<td>Pedagogical skills also needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedagogical skills</td>
<td>Pedagogical skills not taught enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking and listening as practise</td>
<td>Speaking and listening facilitate learning</td>
<td>Learning happens by speaking</td>
<td>Learning happens by listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practising pronunciation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Practising pronunciation</td>
<td>Active listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>Corrective feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcription</td>
<td>Using transcription</td>
<td>Transcription aids independent learning</td>
<td>Transcription too scientific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course books</td>
<td>Using course books</td>
<td>Would not use course books</td>
<td>Course books can be utilised</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teacher students approached their own abilities to teach the pronunciation of English from the perspectives of pronunciation skills and pedagogical skills. Firstly, in relation to pronunciation skills, the teacher students thought that they are important for teachers because teachers forward their skills to the learner. The teacher students considered their own skills in pronunciation sufficiently good, and they thought their skills enable them to teach pronunciation. Nevertheless, they stated that prosody would be difficult topic for them to teach. The next extracts represent their opinions.

(53) Pronunciation is really important for us [teachers], because we then forward the pronunciation onwards too.
Yeah, I think I can provide a model of some kind. But then I’m thinking just that like teaching intonation, that I probably wouldn’t know how to teach any prosodic stuff.

The teacher students are expressing a view of the teacher as someone who transfers skills to the learner. This insight, in such, is contradictory to the argument developed in section 2 of this paper: the learner is an active participant in the learning process instead of someone who receives skills from someone else. However, if the insight of the teacher as someone that transfers skills is considered in connection to the teacher students’ other views on teaching pronunciation, the picture that emerges is rather less one-directional. The teacher students proclaim that listening to English is a good way to learn the language and that English should, therefore, be used in the classroom. This is discussed later in this section. Regarded in this light, then, excerpt (53) could be taken to refer to the teacher providing the learner with a chance to listen to English and to learn by listening.

Moreover, in stating that they are able to provide a model to the learner, the teacher students are seemingly relating this to having good skills in pronunciation. This appears a justified interpretation since they are then contrasting their ability to provide a model with their inability to teach prosody. In stating that they have pronunciation skills good enough for them to teach English, the teacher students are echoing the results obtained by Tergujeff (2012b). Tergujeff (2012b) found that Finnish teachers of English think that they have received good education as regards their own pronunciation skills (p. 34). It is interesting that the teacher students singled out prosody as the one area that would be difficult to teach. While the data does not clarify why exactly they might think so, one could tentatively suggest that prosody is viewed difficult to teach because it is a skill that teacher students themselves are less proficient in. This interpretation seems justified because teacher students are relating difficulties in teaching prosody to their overall ability to provide the learner with a pronunciation model, as was stated above.

Second, in relation to pedagogical skills, the teacher students forwarded the view that pedagogical skills in general are important part of one’s abilities to teach pronunciation. What is more, they thought that they had not received enough education on the pedagogical aspects of teaching pronunciation. The next two extracts demonstrate these views.

And then your own good pronunciation and skills combined to pedagogical skills that you know how to like teach it too--
there’s been so little of it in the end even if you’ve completed the one course, but even there we didn’t talk about how to teach pronunciation, there was just that how you are able to pronounce yourself.

Again, the teacher students are presenting opinions similar to those voiced by the participants in Tergujeff’s (2012b) study. Tergujeff (2012b) found that Finnish teachers of English have received good amount of education regarding their pronunciation skills, as was stated above, but little education in how to teach pronunciation (p. 34). Similar results have been reported internationally as well (Breitkreutz, Derwing and Rossiter, 2001, pp. 56–57; Henderson et al., 2012, pp. 13–15). In the Finnish context, it has been suggested that the discrepancy between the education that teachers receive in the subject matter, in this case pronunciation, and in pedagogy may be due to the fact that language teacher education consists of two parts, namely studies in the given language and pedagogical studies (Tergujeff, 2012b, p. 34). Hence, it might be that the bipolar nature of language teacher education causes the contents of pedagogy and subject matter to be imbalanced. However, they both need to be accounted for. For example, Burgess and Spencer (2000) argue that pedagogy, pronunciation skills and pronunciation theory need to be combined in teacher training programmes.

As regards the actual methods and tools to be used in teaching the pronunciation of English, the teacher students maintained that speaking and listening are effective methods and that they facilitate learning. They also mentioned that it is important that English is used in the classroom. The examples below demonstrate these opinions.

If there was more the using of the language and discussion and kind of freer, possibilities to speak the language for real and practice and such, other things too than repeating after the tape and reading out loud so there you might then get a kind of confidence for pronunciation too--

Well but so it’s all the time when you’re studying or teaching a language so all the time you’re hearing the language and the pronunciation, so that they are all methods in it.

And then the thing that in teaching like as much as possible you should stick to English language because then you’re learning like really well--

The teacher students are presenting speaking and listening as methods for teaching pronunciation. They are focusing on the significance which producing and listening to English in real communicative situations have for the learner. In doing so, they are establishing a stance similar to that of livonen and Tella (2009), who state that listening to and producing natural speech is important in learning pronunciation (pp. 270–273). The Finnish national curriculum, as well, mentions that “*abundant practise in communication support the development of the pupil’s language proficiency*” (National
Core Curriculum for Basic Education, 2014, pp. 238, 377). Although it refers to language proficiency as a whole instead of pronunciation skills in particular, the curriculum seems to advocate the use of English as one of the main ways to learn it. Furthermore, section 5.1 presents the teacher students’ perspectives on learning, which included the possibility of development at least as long as the learner is willing to work for it. This kind of view on learning seems congruent with the view presented here: the teacher and the learner can together adopt English as the language to be used during English classes, after which it is up to the learner to strive to communicate in English. The omnipresent nature of speech further highlights that possibilities for learning through speech and listening exist and that the learner needs to utilise speaking and listening to enhance learning.

Besides referring to speaking and listening in general, the teacher students introduced two specific methods through which speaking and listening could be employed. The methods in question were active listening and listen-and-repeat, as is shown by the examples below. Teacher students mentioned active listening also in connection with awareness of pronunciation (see excerpt (37)).

(60) The sort of is also pretty good that where he [someone in a video] is pronouncing badly if he has some kind of bad pronunciation or at which point he pronounces this kind of word or something like that.

(61) Well if you’re teaching sounds so I think is there anything else than to repeat it. Now I will say it or you hear it from the tape.

On the one hand, the fact that the teacher students regard active listening as a method appears to be connected to them promoting awareness as a learning objective. Section 5.4 demonstrates that the teacher students think the learner should be aware of the language they hear around them. Active listening as a method seems to respond to this need. What is more, similarly to the aspect of awareness as a learning objective, utilising active listening appears to be congruent with the suggestion that noticing linguistic phenomena helps learn it (see van Lier, 2001). On the other hand, with promoting listen-and-repeat as a teaching method, the teacher students allocate for practising pronunciation with the focus on how to produce individual sounds. Accordingly, it has been argued that pronunciation is a skill that requires motor skill in producing the sounds, which makes repetitive practise important in learning pronunciation (Lintunen, 2014, pp. 172–173). All in all, the teacher students are accommodating both productive and perceptive aspects of language learning when they maintain that both speaking and listening can be employed in teaching pronunciation.

The teacher students also introduced the use of different kind of media as part of learning pronunciation through speaking and listening. The two excerpts below exemplify this.
(62) I would always encourage the pupils like to find, like media, different well different sounding media such as English TV-programs or American TV-programs or some Australian podcasts or something that.

(63) That in doing it [recording a vlog] you can sort of like talk away and it’s not so like precise that what you need to say but then sort of to record everyday speech and.

The teacher students are stating that media can be used in teaching the pronunciation of English. They think that media offers a way to practise pronunciation by speaking and listening. The first excerpt above is referring to listening different types of media. This can be concluded from the fact that it was extracted from a context that related to practising by listening and that it includes reference to how the media content sounds like. Luukka et al. (2008) note that teaching materials guide teaching to some extent (p. 90). The fact that the teacher students are referring to using media in teaching has two points of contact to their other views on teaching pronunciation. The first point of contact is that the teacher students mention both English, American and Australian media as examples what the learner should listen to. This is in line with the fact that they promoted the inclusion of different varieties of English in teaching pronunciation (see section 5.3). The excerpt (63) offers the second point of contact: the excerpt is referring to using media to encourage the learner to produce everyday English. Highlighting everyday English is congruent with the teacher students’ view that the learner should feel that learning pronunciation is useful for real life (see section 5.5). Therefore, in media they are introducing a teaching tool the usage of which is congruent with the contents they deem important in teaching pronunciation. Nevertheless, media is not employed to a vast extent by Finnish teachers of English (Luukka et al., 2008, pp. 94–96; Taalas, Tarnanen, Kauppinen and Pöyhönen, 2008, pp. 248–249; Tergujeff, 2012b, pp. 35–36).

The teacher students considered also corrective feedback a method to be used when practising pronunciation. They expressed the opinions that it would be important for the learner to get feedback on their problem areas and that correction must not feel like punishment. The examples below demonstrate these opinions.

(64) --yeah it’s good that you can fix your own mistakes and if you don’t notice them then the teacher corrects them. That repeating after the tape although it surely helps too but in doing it you may not notice the mistakes especially if everybody is pronouncing together so that you don’t get like help for the problematic parts.

(65) And you should kind of remember too that if you start correcting someone’s pronunciation it can’t sound like punishment-- punishment that you didn’t pronounce properly now pronounce after me that--it should be like careful that it shouldn’t be like, vehement.
The teacher students hold important that the learner is informed of the mistakes they make in their speech. The teacher students think that listen-and-repeat exercises in a group may leave mistakes unnoticed. The central idea in corrective feedback is that the learner is made aware of a mistake they have made and that they are given the chance to correct the mistake themselves (see Lyster, Saito and Sato, 2012, pp. 3–5). Lyster, Saito and Sato (2012) provide a summary of a number of international studies and conclude that often learners prefer having corrective feedback to being ignorant of the mistakes they make (p. 7). Therefore, the teacher students’ aspiration to use corrective feedback might resonate well in the classroom. Moreover, the fact that they introduced corrective feedback as a method for teaching pronunciation may be connected to them promoting intelligibility as a learning objective: reducing mistakes in speech results in more intelligible speech.

As to the teacher students’ insight that corrective feedback should be encouraging rather than depressing, the Finnish national curricula state that teaching should increase the learner’s confidence in their skills to use and to learn English (National Core Curriculum for Basic Education, 2014, pp. 136, 236, 375; National Core Curriculum for General Upper Secondary Schools, 2015, p. 114). It seems plausible that pedagogical choices should aim for supporting the learner’s confidence in their language skills.

In addition to speaking and listening as practice, the teacher students mentioned transcription as a possible method to use in teaching the pronunciation of English. Similarly to the role of pronunciation in teaching as well as to the importance of prosody, using transcription elicited contradictory views. The first excerpt below illustrates that those against using transcription regarded it as too scientific a method. The second excerpt below illustrates that those for using transcription thought transcription helps the learner study the pronunciation of words independently.

(66) But I wouldn’t, I mean if we’re talking about school so I wouldn’t teach those phonetic symbols yet. I think it’s nonsense to teach those to them. They don’t, they don’t like, they don’t need the information yet. ‘Cause in the end they aren’t they don’t study it as a branch of science or anything.

(67) --introduce those symbols of pronunciation that how you mark how words are pronounced and then learn how to read them aloud--. That it helps if you yourself find a new word so then you see the transcription and from that you know how to pronounce it that you don’t necessarily need to listen to some tapes or just plain pronounce it wrong.

The teacher students are voicing contradictory views as regards whether or not to use transcription in teaching. As the excerpts show, they explicitly refer only to reading transcription as opposed to
writing it. Along similar lines, Tergujeff (2012b) found that although a majority (72.8%) of Finnish teachers of English teach how to recognise all the symbols, only a small minority (5.4%) teach how to write them (pp. 37–38). Noteworthy here is that also those teacher students who would not use it in teaching addressed transcription during the discussion about teaching methods. This could be taken to indicate that they are aware that such a teaching method exists and that they have formed an educated opinion about employing it in their teaching. In saying that they would not teach transcription ‘at school’ because the learner at that level ‘does not need the information yet’, the teacher students appear to suggest that transcription is perhaps more important to the advanced level students. Correspondingly, in the Finnish context, studies on transcription often include university level students (Lintunen, 2004; Mompean and Lintunen, 2015).

Nevertheless, the teacher students also voiced the opinion that transcription would be a useful method in teaching pronunciation. Section 3.3 illustrates that transcription is used in Finland in teaching English at least to some extent in elementary school (e.g., Tergujeff, 2013a, p. 49) and that the Finnish national curriculum mentions that the learner should learn to recognise the symbols used in transcription (National Core Curriculum for Basic Education, 2014, p. 220). Therefore, the teacher students’ argument for including transcription in teaching seems justified. Moreover, the proponents of transcription relate it to the learner’s ability to study independently. This appears to be a parallel argument to the teacher students underlining the learner’s ability to apply pronunciation-related knowledge, which was discussed in section 5.4.

Finally, the teacher students discussed using course books in teaching. Similarly to transcription, using course books elicited contradictory opinions. Some of the teacher students said that they would not go through the pronunciation exercises in course books, and some of them stated that course books could be utilised in teaching. The following two extracts illustrate these two views.

(68) But I wouldn’t go into that, is there pronunciation in upper secondary school books I’ve been wondering? I think there is a little something, but that I wouldn’t go through them that much.

(69) Well to some extent there is in books what I’ve seen for myself so pronunciation exercises are included too which is good, but, then again I don’t know how much they are used. There could always be more of them.

In the first extract above, the teacher students are referring to course books used in upper secondary school when they are expressing a view that they would not go through the pronunciation exercises in course books. In the second extract, the teacher students are stating that there could
be more pronunciation exercises in course books. Both of these views, although contradictory per se, are suggestive of a critical stance towards the contents of course books. Luukka et al. (2008) seem to be encouraging teachers to evaluate the contents of course books (pp. 64–65), and Finnish teachers of foreign languages appear, in fact, to do so (Luukka et al., 2008, pp. 97–98).

In sum, it can be concluded that the teacher students consider several methods and tools suitable for teaching the pronunciation of English. Amongst these are speaking and listening, transcription and course books. Nevertheless, it is evident that some methods and tools elicit contradictory views, as is the case with transcription and course books.

This section has presented the findings of the study in depth. The following section discusses the findings and the conclusions to be drawn from them.
6 Discussion

The purpose of this paper was to examine teacher students’ views on teaching the pronunciation of English. More specifically, the aim was to inspect which topics teacher students find relevant within the theme of teaching the pronunciation of English. The preceding section presented the findings of the study; this section discusses the findings and the conclusions to be drawn from the findings. The discussion also relates to the theoretical background of this study, established in sections 2 and 3. The main findings are first discussed individually, and then more general observations made from the findings are addressed. Finally, a number of suggestions for future study are provided and the validity of the study is evaluated. Next, the main findings of the study are inspected.

Considering learning, section 5.1 illustrates that the teacher students who participated in this study see learning as a continuous process during which development is possible. Their views on learning are thus compatible with van Lier’s (2000, 2004) ecological perspective to sociocultural theory (see section 2.1). One central concept in the ecological perspective is that of emergence, which refers to the gradual development of linguistic abilities (van Lier, 2004, p. 81). The teacher students relate learning with the concepts of continuity and development, which can be understood as a parallel conceptualisation with emergence. Furthermore, the teacher students think that learning occurs both at school and in everyday environments. This view is congruent with the ecological perspective, which regards all the environments in which the individual resides as potential places for learning (van Lier, 2000, 2004). However, the significance of the everyday environments as places for learning is not strongly evident in the teacher students’ contemplations about teaching pronunciation as a whole. Of course, this may be due to the fact that the subject matter of the study is teaching pronunciation, which quite naturally could be conceptualised to happen at school. Nevertheless, it is surprising that the teacher students did not inspect the role of informal learning, that is, learning that happens outside school environment, in more depth. The Finnish national curricula, for instance, notes that the learner’s skills accumulated outside school need to be taken into account in teaching English (National Core Curriculum for Basic Education, 2014, pp. 236, 375; National Core Curriculum for General Upper Secondary Schools, 2015, p. 114).

Although consistent with the ecological perspective, the teacher students’ perceptions on learning seem to only implicitly include social interaction, which sociocultural theory sees as the basis for
learning. There are some aspects in the teacher students’ explorations of teaching the pronunciation of English that somehow point to the direction of social interaction. Amongst these were highlighting the intelligibility of speech, the importance of pronunciation and speaking as a learning objective. Intelligibility was a pervasive topic in the teacher students’ contemplations, as is discussed later in this section. The importance of pronunciation was based on the argument that it affects understanding. Speaking as a learning objective included the willingness to speak and aiming to speak fluently without looking for mistakes in one’s speech. These aspects relate to the fluency of communication and to social interaction because they provide the learner with more possibilities for social action. Moreover, the aim to make the learner feel comfortable in speaking the language emerged from the teacher students’ contemplations on teaching pronunciation. It was mentioned in connection to choosing a given variety of English as the norm to be used in teaching: the teacher students thought that the norm should be a variety that the learner wants to speak. Also, being comfortable in speaking a language relates to the willingness to speak, which was named above as one of the learning objectives identified by the teacher students.

Nevertheless, the teacher students did not refer to social interaction when they were conceptualising learning. Sociocultural theory maintains that learning happens via social interaction (Lantolf, 2000). Social interaction remaining in the margins of the teacher students’ contemplations on learning may be due to the fact that learning and teaching at school have often been associated with examining written text rather than with immersing in social interaction (e.g., Aro, 2009; Luukka, 2008). Accordingly, completing exercises was the only method the teacher students referred to when they discussed learning. They referred to social interaction per se during only one of the topics they discussed within the general theme of teaching the pronunciation of English. This was when they discussed speaking and listening as methods to be used in teaching pronunciation. In this context the teacher students forwarded the view that they regard authentic communicative situations as platforms for learning.

In general, then, the teacher students did not provide many explicit references to social interaction when discussing learning but were implicitly contemplating social interaction as a factor when discussing teaching pronunciation. Perhaps this is suggestive of their respective personal histories: their views on learning may be influenced by the way they have been taught at school while their opinions on teaching pronunciation reflect their view on what kind of teachers they wish to be.
After learning, the second theme discussed by the teacher students was the position of pronunciation in relation to other language skills in teaching English. Section 5.2 demonstrates that the teacher students are a heterogeneous group regarding the importance of pronunciation: some of them deem it important while others do not. The importance of pronunciation is a contradictory topic more generally in the field of teaching pronunciation in English (e.g., Levis, 2005, p. 369). This is why the teacher students’ contradictory views on the matter are not that surprising.

An altogether different aspect in the discussion of the position of pronunciation is what it reveals about how the teacher students view language skills as a whole. One the one hand, the discussion of the position of pronunciation portray language skills as an entity which comprises of separate pieces. The teacher students appear to conceptualise pronunciation as a part of language that is quite easily separated from other aspects of language. This kind of conclusion seems justified for two reasons. First, they discussed pronunciation as a part of teaching English, leaving the option to teach pronunciation separately from other language skills and to teach other language skills without teaching pronunciation (see section 5.2). Second, those teacher students who argued pronunciation to be unimportant justified their stance with stating that pronunciation is unimportant because it is only a small part of language skills as a whole. They appear to consider it possible to teach English without teaching pronunciation.

On the other hand, the discussion the teacher students had of the position of pronunciation portray language skills also as a flexible entity. Those teacher students who argued that pronunciation is important justified their stance with stating that pronunciation affects intelligibility and the readiness to speak. Noteworthy here is that the teacher students in question did not portray pronunciation as the only entity affecting intelligibility and the readiness to speak. On the contrary, they seem to be pointing to the direction of pronunciation as a part of the linguistic repertoire of the learner, which is utilised as needed. As such, this kind of view is similar to how section 2.2 presents communicative abilities as a whole. Although communicative competence consists of different components (Canale, 1983; Canale and Swain, 1980), the language user is employing the components in a flexible manner depending on their communicative needs (Dufva et al., 2011).

It must be noted that the way how the theme concerning the position of pronunciation was presented for the teacher students in the interviews may have influenced their responses to it. In the first interview, the theme carried a title ‘pronunciation in linguistic competence as a whole’ whereas in the second and the third interview, the theme was titled ‘pronunciation as a part of
language skills’. The latter wording may have guided the teacher students to conceptualise pronunciation as a separate part of language. However, the responses guiding towards the interpretation of pronunciation as a part of flexible language skills were forwarded during the latter two interviews. This provides a reason to assume that the teacher students were able to sidestep the wording of the theme title and forward their genuine opinions on the matter.

Moving on to the theme of which English to teach, the teacher students approached the theme from the perspective of the different varieties of English, as section 5.3 shows. They expressed a solid opinion about using only one norm in teaching. This kind of view is contradictory to the paradigm of English as an international language (EIL) introduced in section 3.1, which highlights that any type of English can be used in communication (Modiano, 2009; Sharifian, 2009; see also Marlina, 2014). However, the teacher students also think that the learner should have a possibility to influence the decision as to which variety of English they are taught. Of course, learners’ opinions on this may vary. This would imply that the teacher students are prepared to include many varieties of English in teaching pronunciation provided that the learner adheres mainly to one given variety when learning English. Thus, the teacher students seem to be underlining the need to be consistent in teaching rather than excluding all varieties but one from teaching English. This kind of interpretation is reinforced by the fact that the teacher students deem it important to illustrate the abundance of accents in teaching. Addressing the abundance of accents is justified because it has been shown that familiar accents are more intelligible to learners (Pihko, 1997). Learning about accents may also affect the learner’s attitudes towards them. Moreover, the teacher students are being congruent with highlighting intelligibility as a learning objective: adhering to one norm in learning the pronunciation of English makes the learning process more straightforward and thus helps the learner achieve intelligibility more easily.

More generally, the teacher students seem to be reflecting the argument presented in section 3.1, namely that native accents are traditionally used as norms but they might be giving room to enhancing intercultural communication. On the one hand, some of the teacher students think that a native norm should be employed in teaching. Section 3.1 illustrates that native varieties are traditionally adhered to in teaching the pronunciation of English (Henderson et al., 2012, pp. 20–23; Tergujeff, 2012b, pp. 40–41). Therefore, it is natural that the teacher students should promote the use of native varieties. Also, the traditional status of native varieties makes it probable that when the teacher students themselves were at school, native language norms were used in teaching.
English. This may explain, on its part, why the teacher students think that native varieties should be used in teaching pronunciation. On the other hand, some of the teacher students highlight the intelligibility and neutrality of the norm instead of its nativity. Neutrality can be taken to refer to teaching the most important aspects of pronunciation rather than characteristics of a certain accent, as was argued in section 5.3. Accordingly, the aforementioned EIL paradigm prioritises the abilities to communicate in intercultural contexts (Modiano, 2009; Sharifian, 2009; see also Marlina, 2014). The teacher students were not referring to EIL as such, but in referring to intelligibility and neutrality, they were promoting qualities that enhance communication in general and, hence, also intercultural communication.

Considering the theme of learning objectives for teaching pronunciation, the teacher students forwarded the view that awareness and speaking are the central learning objectives (see section 5.4). As regards awareness, they thought that the learner needs to notice pronunciation and know how to apply pronunciation-related knowledge. As regards speaking, they underlined the willingness to speak and intelligibility as learning objectives. Willingness to speak is one of the entities which was earlier in this section associated with adhering implicitly to sociocultural theory: willingness to speak makes it easier to interact with others and participate in social action. Intelligibility, that is, being understood by one’s interlocutors, is recognised as the contemporary learning objective in teaching pronunciation (Levis, 2005, pp. 370–371).

Furthermore, while highlighting the importance of intelligibility as a learning objective, the teacher students expressed the opinion that achieving native-like accent is not necessary. When this idea is examined in the light that some of the teacher students promoted using a native variety as the norm in teaching pronunciation, one could conclude that the teacher students conceptualise norms and learning objectives to be separate entities. In this they are conforming to the approach seemingly adopted in the Finnish national curricula as well. Although the curricula make no mention as to which norm should be used in teaching, they do identify the learning objectives for teaching pronunciation (National Core Curriculum for Basic Education, 2014, pp. 237–238, 240, 376, 379; National Core Curriculum for General Upper Secondary Schools, 2015, p. 259). Also, it is interesting that although they were specific enough to name a number of individual sounds when discussing the contents for teaching pronunciation, the teacher students inspected the learning objectives on a more general level. In other words, they did not state the learning objectives to be learning certain
individual sounds. Thus, the teacher students seem to regard the contents for teaching pronunciation as a means to achieve the learning objectives.

When discussing the contents for teaching pronunciation, the teacher students were referring to practical uses of pronunciation as well as prosody and sounds. The teacher students feel that the pronunciation issues addressed in teaching should be those that are useful for the learner in real life. Also, they think that the learner needs to be made aware that pronunciation can affect meaning. Focusing on these aspects of pronunciation enhance the learner’s communicative abilities and intelligibility. In this respect, as they regard intelligibility and speaking as learning objectives, the teacher students’ views on the contents for teaching pronunciation are in line with the learning objectives they promoted.

As regards prosody, the findings reveal both a view underlining the importance and a view focusing on the unimportance of teaching prosody. Similarly to the importance of pronunciation in general, the importance of prosody evokes mixed responses in the field of teaching the pronunciation of English (e.g., Tergujeff, 2013a, pp. 25–28). As a result, it is not surprising that the teacher students’ views are divided in this matter. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that although the teacher students identified such prosodic phenomena as intonation and word stress as possible contents for teaching pronunciation, they did not specify which aspects of these phenomena should be taught. For example, as regards intonation, they stated that intonation should be taught because it affects meaning. Thus, they provide a reason why they think intonation should be taught but do not inspect further which aspects of intonation should be focused on in teaching. Section 3.2 argues that perhaps the learner should be made aware of the complexity of the English intonation system rather than to teach it in its entirety. This kind of thinking may have resulted in the teacher students’ views on teaching intonation to be rather unspecific. As the findings do not either support or deflate this suggestion, it remains speculative. Perhaps a more appealing line of thought is to suggest that the teacher students remained unspecific about teaching intonation because they are not confident in their own skills in intonation. This suggestion appears justified because, as section 5.6 demonstrates, the teacher students stated they would not know how to teach intonation. Because they introduced this statement as a contrast to their otherwise good abilities to provide the learner with a pronunciation model, it can be concluded that they think their skills in intonation not good enough for teaching intonation. This may be the reason why the teacher students did not specify which aspects of intonation should be included in teaching pronunciation.
Continuing from prosody to sounds, the teacher students think it is important to include the sounds difficult for Finns and the sounds different in Finnish and English in teaching pronunciation. This indicates that the teacher students are approaching the topic from the learner’s perspective. The findings concerning the teacher students’ understanding of learning, presented in section 5.1, indicate that the teacher students think that taking the learner into account is important. The teacher students’ opinion that the sounds difficult for Finns should be taught demonstrate that they are, in fact, implementing the idea of taking the learner into account. This is perhaps indicative of their ability and willingness to take the learner’s needs into account in other aspects of teaching as well.

In addition to stating that sounds difficult for Finns should be addressed in teaching, the teacher students were actually identifying some of the sounds that have been identified as difficult for Finns. Section 5.5 demonstrates the teacher students naming the sibilants, dental fricatives and the sounds /v/ and /w/ as the individual sounds to be taught. Accordingly, Lintunen (2004) found that these sounds are amongst the most difficult consonant sounds for Finns to learn to produce correctly (pp. 164–170, 174–178, 180–181). A major observation relating to sounds is that the teacher students did not discuss vowels as they were addressing the sounds to be taught. In this, too, their views appear to be supported by those of researchers. Although not excluding vowels entirely, Cruttenden (2014) and Jenkins (2000, 2002) allow more variation in the pronunciation of vowels than in that of consonants (see Jenkins, 2000, pp. 137, 144–145; Jenkins, 2002, pp. 96–97; Cruttenden, 2014, p. 336). Lintunen (2004) first states that English vowels are more difficult for Finns to learn than English consonants are but then relates the difficulty to factors other than the quality of the phonemes, namely the nature of phonetic symbols and the sound-to-spelling correspondence of English, which is more opaque in vowels than in consonants (pp. 112–113). All in all, then, the teacher students appear to have quite specific knowledge about which English sounds are important to teach to a Finnish learner. Of course, this may result from the difficulties they themselves have encountered when learning English sounds. Nevertheless, it seems propitious that the teacher students have such exact knowledge about which sounds to include in teaching pronunciation.

As regards the final theme of the study, the methods and tools for teaching pronunciation, the first aspect discussed by the teacher students was their abilities to teach pronunciation. The author introduced this aspect in the interviews as its own theme. In section 5.6 as well as here it is discussed together with the methods and tools for teaching pronunciation because both are closely connected
to the practical implementation of teaching. The teacher students think that pronunciation skills are essential if one is to teach pronunciation. They consider their skills in pronunciation sufficiently good. They think that also pedagogical skills are needed in teaching pronunciation. Contrary to being satisfied with their pronunciation skills, the teacher students think that their language teacher education has not included enough pedagogical training. This kind of finding have been obtained by other researchers as well (Breitkreutz, Derwing and Rossiter, 2001, pp. 56–57; Henderson et al., 2012, pp. 13–15; Tergujeff, 2012b, pp. 33–34). In the Finnish education system for foreign language teachers, studies in the given language and pedagogical studies are provided separately by different university departments. Tergujeff (2012b) forwards the dual structure as a possible reason for teachers perceiving a difference in their skills in the respective areas (p. 34). A plainer explanation would be that in Finland, foreign language teachers actually receive more education in the given language than in pedagogy. The given languages they are majoring in are the main subjects of language teachers resulting in at least 150 ECTS credits, whereas the pedagogical studies comprise of 60 ECTS credits. One should also remember that the teacher students of this study were not qualified teachers yet and had little teaching experience, which may have created an air of insecurity about their pedagogical skills.

Continuing to the methods and tools to be used in teaching the pronunciation of English, the teacher students considered speaking and listening as effective methods. This is congruent with them promoting intelligible speech as well as the willingness to speak as learning objectives. The teacher students underlined that speaking and listening as practise should somehow relate to authentic communicative situations. This, in turn, is consistent with them discussing the practicality of pronunciation in reference to the contents for teaching pronunciation. The authenticity of language is important in the communicative approach to language teaching as well (see section 2.2). In addition to practising via speaking and listening to authentic language, also such mechanical a method as listen-and-repeat was deemed an appropriate teaching method by the teacher students. Taken together, these findings indicate that the teacher students think that authentic language is one of the main elements in how pronunciation is taught but that practising pronunciation detail is important, too. A similar argument has been forwarded by Iivonen and Tella (2009, pp. 270–273).

While discussing speaking and listening as practice, the teacher students also contemplated using media in teaching pronunciation. They think that media offers a way to practice pronunciation by speaking and listening. What is more, they connect media with instances of authentic language use,
which justifies further the claim presented above that they consider authentic language as one of the main elements in how pronunciation should be taught. As section 3.3 mentions, it has been shown that Finnish teachers do not necessarily use different media extensively in teaching (Luukka et al., 2008, pp. 94–96; Taalas et al., 2008, pp. 248–249; Tergujeff, 2012b, pp. 35–36). Taalas et al. (2008) connect the lack of media in classrooms to teachers’ limited knowledge of and noncommittal attitude towards media (pp. 250–253). Therefore, the teacher students of this study, having revealed a positive attitude towards using media in teaching pronunciation, may well employ media in their classrooms in the future.

Although the teacher students mentioned using media in teaching pronunciation, the role of technology remained less significant in their contemplations than the author expected. The trend has for some time been and continues to be towards digitalisation, and the Finnish national curricula considers information and communication technology (National Core Curriculum for Basic Education, 2014, p. 32) as well as digital materials and tools (National Core Curriculum for General Upper Secondary Schools, 2015, p. 15) central working methods in teaching in general. Moreover, it has been shown that contemporary Finnish teacher students of English consider technology as a viable tool in teaching. Riekki (2016), for example, found that teacher students can envision themselves employing technology when working as teachers. An illustrative instance of this is that for a teacher student working as a substitute teacher, the question was not whether Facebook could be used in teaching but rather how to use it in a pedagogically effective way (Riekki, 2016, p. 98). It could be that the teacher students of this study, having little teaching experience and proclaiming their pedagogical skills to be insufficient, are having difficulties in seeing technology from the pedagogical perspective. Appropriately, Jalkanen and Laakkonen (2012) note that teacher education should support language teacher students’ abilities to employ technology in a meaningful way.

Finally, the teacher students also discussed using transcription and course books in teaching. Utilising transcription elicited contradictory views, for some of the teacher students would use it in teaching while others would not. Also, although they included course books into the discussion, the teacher students seem not to regard course books as the most important or most useful tool in teaching. In fact, some of them actually stated that they would not utilise course books in teaching pronunciation. This is a surprising finding given that section 3.3 demonstrates course books being used rather extensively in foreign language teaching in Finland (Luukka et al., 2008, pp. 94–95; see also Aro, 2009; Tergujeff, 2013a, pp. 52–53, 2010, 2012a, 2012b). Moreover, it is interesting to note
that although they think that learning at school happens, at least partly, by completing exercises (see section 5.1), the teacher students do not highlight course books as tools. This may be suggestive of them having been taught via exercises when at school but being willing to use different tools in their own teaching.

Until now, this section has focused on discussing the findings of this study at a quite specific level. Also a few more general observations can be inferred from the findings, which are presented next. First of all, intelligibility was a pervasive theme in the teacher students’ contemplations on teaching the pronunciation of English. They mentioned intelligibility in relation to the learning objectives, the norm to be used in teaching, the importance of pronunciation and the practical aspects of pronunciation. When inspecting these topics, the teacher students were using intelligibility as the point of reference. For example, they think that the norm for teaching pronunciation should be chosen on the premise of whether it is intelligible or not. The centrality of intelligibility in the teacher students’ contemplations shows that they are foregrounding the learner’s ability to communicate when they are considering teaching pronunciation as a whole.

The second general observation made from the findings is that a learner-led approach to teaching pronunciation was a pervasive theme in the teacher students’ contemplations as well. The learner-led approach was explicitly employed when the teacher students were discussing learning, for they stated that the motivation and goals of the learner need to be taken into account in teaching. Also, they think it is the responsibility of the teacher to utilise the zone of proximal development in teaching. In other words, they think the teacher needs to recognise the skills and the potential areas for development of the learner. The learner-led approach was, however, brought forward in more ways as well. The teacher students stated that the learner should have the chance to influence the decision about which variety of English is taught to them and that teaching pronunciation should focus on those aspects that are useful for the learner in real life. Moreover, the teacher students focused on the learner’s independent study skills. The findings show that the teacher students consider the learner’s awareness of pronunciation an important learning objective. This could be taken as a first step towards learning a language independently (see van Lier, 2001). Independent learning was also given as the reason why transcription should be used in teaching and taught to the learner. Section 5.6 presents the teacher students as arguing that the ability to read transcription enables the learner to check the pronunciation of a given word from a dictionary. It seems that the teacher students see one of the purposes of teaching to lie in helping the learner to
develop into the stage of self-regulation, in which the learner is able to independently use their linguistic resources (Lantolf, Thorne and Poehner, 2015, p. 209). The arguments presented here justify the claim that the teacher students acknowledge the importance of learner-led approach and are able to apply it when they contemplate teaching pronunciation. Focusing on the learner implies that the teacher students’ general aim in teaching pronunciation is making the learner feel comfortable in speaking the language.

The third general observation concerns the cohesion between learning objectives and teaching methods in the teacher students’ contemplations. For example, they see intelligibility as a learning objective. Accordingly, they promote the intelligibility of the norm to be used in teaching and the teaching of sounds difficult for Finns, which could be taken as means appropriate in achieving intelligibility. Similarly, they see speaking as another learning objective and, accordingly, the role of speaking in practising the language was enhanced when they discussed the methods and tools to be used in teaching pronunciation. Moreover, the teacher students consider the abundance of accents as an area to be included in teaching pronunciation. Suitably, they would use media highlighting different accents as a tool in teaching. These instances point towards a conclusion that the teacher students are capable of thinking about teaching pronunciation as a whole while examining individual aspects of it.

Despite displaying general cohesion, the teacher students occasionally presented contradictory views with each other. Such instances occurred during the discussion of the importance of pronunciation, the nativity of the pronunciation norm and the position of prosody in teaching. What is more, the teacher students’ views were often congruent with the theory or earlier research on the given topic. For example, as was shown earlier in this section, their identification of sounds difficult for Finns finds support in earlier research and their views on learning are largely compatible with the sociocultural theory of learning. These two aspects imply that the teacher students do not only have relevant theoretical knowledge about teaching pronunciation but are also capable of making their own judgements about it. Teachers’ abilities to make informed decisions about teaching are important since the profession comes with a pedagogical freedom, which refers to the freedom to plan and implement teaching freely within the limits posed by the national curricula.

This section has inspected the findings of this study. As for future study, it would be interesting to investigate the themes of this study in more depth. This study, including several aspects of teaching pronunciation, provides an overall introduction of the teacher students’ views on teaching
pronunciation. In order to gain more detailed information about, for instance, teacher students’ thoughts on learning objectives for teaching pronunciation, it would be useful to inspect the theme independently. Furthermore, conducting a follow-up study of the teacher students of this study when they progress into work life would provide valuable information about how they apply their views presented here in teaching. This topic appears inspiring because Ruohotie-Lyhty (2015) has shown that newly qualified foreign language teachers do not always feel they can conduct ideal teaching. It would be important to find out which aspects of the working environment influence teaching either negatively or positively because it would aid teachers to exploit all their professional resources in teaching. Yet another research approach would be to inspect the effect that pedagogical studies have on teacher students’ views on teaching the pronunciation of English or English in general. The teacher students of this study reported a lack of pedagogical studies: for gaining insight about the effectiveness of university teacher education, it would be worthwhile to examine if teacher students perceive teaching English differently before and after pedagogical studies.

Finally, the validity of this study is inspected. Marshall and Rossman (2011) discuss a number of factors when referring to the validity of research, of which most central appear to be the appropriateness of the research method, the trustworthiness of the interpretations made of the data and the acknowledgement of all the aspects that emerge from the phenomenon under scrutiny (pp. 39–42). The research method of this study comprised of semi-structured interview for collecting data and content analysis for analysing the data. These methods have been discussed in section 4. It is restated here that these methods were judged appropriate for this study. Interview provided the participant teacher students with the freedom to speak about those aspects of teaching pronunciation which they considered important, and it facilitated approaching the research topic from their perspective. Content analysis enabled the author to form a coherent overall understanding of the data, find the central meanings from the data and present them in an orderly fashion. In other words, content analysis rendered the teacher students’ views visible. Content analysis also relates to the trustworthiness of the interpretations made of the data. The cyclical nature of the analysis enhanced the trustworthiness of the interpretations: the data was inspected first at the level of individual utterances and the categories the author organised them in, and then the categories were reflected back to the individual utterances. Also, the author regularly consulted the context of the data from which the individual utterances were extracted. These steps ensure
the truthfulness of the interpretations made. Lastly, the author acknowledged all the aspects that emerged from the phenomenon under scrutiny in that all findings have been openly disclosed in this paper. Therefore, this study has been conducted with following procedures that help ensure validity.

Despite the study conforming to the demands of validity, the analysis and findings do reveal that the data is partly deficient. One indication of this is that two questions emerged during the analysis which the author was unable to answer on the basis of the data. The first question is about how the teacher students conceptualise the importance of everyday environments in learning. They mentioned everyday environments when discussing learning but did not inspect the topic further. The second question relates to how the teacher students conceptualise the importance of pronunciation. Section 5.2 shows that the teacher students forwarded the opinion that pronunciation can be taught simultaneously with other language skills. In the light of the present data, it remains unclear whether the teacher students forwarded this view because they consider pronunciation as important as other language skills or because they do not consider pronunciation important enough to be taught separately. It appears that there is a rather meaningful difference between these two stances. It could be taken as a mistake made in the data collection stage that the author did not urge the teacher students to discuss these two issues any further. However, the author made the decision to inspect the data as it was rather than acquire additional data from the participant teacher students.

The other indication of the data being deficient is that during the content analysis, the contents of a number of groups and classes remained the same while the stages of abstraction progressed. For instance, under the theme ‘methods and tools’ the classes titled ‘using transcription’ and ‘using course books’ were respectively abstracted into main classes titled ‘transcription’ and ‘course books’ (see appendix D). In other words, these classes were abstracted into main classes on their own, without merging them together with any other class when the level of classification changed. This may be an indication that the data was not rich enough to ensure that the abstraction could have progressed without the content remaining solid. Despite the abovementioned shortcomings of the data collection and analysis, the study remains a valid and comprehensive entity, which answers the set research questions and provides valuable insights into how teacher students view teaching the pronunciation of English.
This section has discussed the findings of the study, offered suggestions for future research and inspected the validity of the study. Next, the final section of this paper provides the conclusive remarks.
7 Conclusion

The purpose of this paper was to examine teacher students’ views on teaching the pronunciation of English. More specifically, the intention was to discover which topics teacher students find relevant in teaching the pronunciation of English. The study is a qualitative study: the aim was to form a comprehensive understanding of teacher students’ views on the topic. Interview was chosen as the data collection method, and the data was analysed with the method of content analysis.

The findings reveal that the teacher students of this study consider learning a continuous process during which development is possible. They hold it important to employ only one pronunciation norm while addressing the abundance of English accents in teaching, and they regard the willingness to speak and awareness of pronunciation as central learning objectives for teaching pronunciation. Moreover, the teacher students think it is important that teaching focuses on those aspects of pronunciation that are useful for the learner. Speaking and listening emerged from their contemplations as central methods to be used in teaching pronunciation. Furthermore, the findings show that the teacher students are not a unanimous group in their opinions on teaching pronunciation. The position of pronunciation in teaching English, the nativity of the language norm as well as teaching prosody elicit contradictory views amongst the teacher students. Finally, the findings indicate that the teacher students’ views on different topics within the broader theme of teaching pronunciation are to a great extent inherently cohesive. In many instances their insights are also congruent with those presented in the research field of teaching pronunciation, which is indicative of the teacher students having relevant theoretical knowledge about teaching the pronunciation of English.

In conclusion, this paper has examined teacher students’ views on teaching the pronunciation of English. It seems that in Finland, there is a lack of studies focusing on teacher students in relation to teaching pronunciation. This paper has been inspired by and has drawn from the studies which have investigated pronunciation of English in the Finnish context from different perspectives. Focusing on teacher students’ views on teaching the pronunciation of English has facilitated combining multiple aspects of teaching pronunciation, which could form the subject matter of a number of future studies as well. Because they are the teachers of the future, teacher students’ views are worth investigating.
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Appendix A.
The themes and suggested questions used in the first interview

The themes are marked with bullets (•) and the suggested questions are marked with an asterisk (*).

Interview

• **Miten ja missä oppimista tapahtuu?** How and where does learning happen?
  • **Ääntäminen kielitaidon kokonaisuudessa.** Pronunciation in linguistic competence as a whole.
  • **Englannin ääntämisen opettamisen tavoitteet.** The objectives for English pronunciation teaching.
  • **Englannin ääntämisen opettamisessa käytettävä kielellinen malli.** Language model used in English pronunciation teaching.
    *Ei-natiivin kielellisen mallin käyttäminen.* Using non-native language models.
  • **Englannin ääntämisen opettamisen sisällöt.** The contents of English pronunciation teaching.
    *Äänenteiden opettaminen.* Teaching sounds.
    *Suomalaisille vaikeat englannin äänteet.* English sounds difficult for Finns.
    *Prosodisten ilmiöiden opettaminen.* Teaching prosody.

• **Miten opettaa englannin ääntämistä?** How to teach English pronunciation?
• **Omat valmiuteni opettaa englannin ääntämistä.** My own abilities to teach English pronunciation.
• **Miten oppijan mielipiteet voi ottaa englannin ääntämisen opettamisessa huomioon?** How can the learner’s opinions be taken into account?
  * ... kun valitaan kielellistä mallia? ...as you are choosing the language model?
  * ... kun valitaan opettamisen sisältöjä? ...as you are choosing the contents of teaching?
  * ... kun valitaan opettamisen menetelmä? ...as you are choosing the methods of teaching?
Appendix B

The themes and suggested questions used in the second and the third interview

The themes are marked with bullets (●) and the suggested questions are marked with an asterisk (*).

Interview

- Missä ja miten oppimista tapahtuu? Where and how does learning happen?
  *Informaalin oppimisen ja kouluopetuksen suhde. Relation between informal and formal learning.

- Ääntäminen osana kielitaitoa. Pronunciation as a part of language skills.

- Mitä englantia opettaa silloin kun opettaa englannin ääntämistä? Which English to teach when teaching English?

- Ääntämisen opettamisen tavoitteet. Objectives for teaching pronunciation.

- Ääntämisen opettamisen sisällöt. Contents for teaching pronunciation.

- Ääntämisen opettamisen menetelmät ja välineet ja tekniikat. Methods and tools and techniques in pronunciation teaching.

- Omat valmiuteni opettaa ääntämistä. My own abilities to teach pronunciation.

- Oppijan näkökulman huomioon ottaminen. Taking the learner’s views into account.
Appendix C

A table exemplifying the stages of the analysis from the original utterances to one of the themes. Capitals mark stages of analysis guided by the theoretical background of the study, lower case letters mark stages of analysis guided by the data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORIGINAL UTTERANCE</th>
<th>SIMPLIFIED EXPRESSION</th>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>MAIN CLASS</th>
<th>THEME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;--intonation and such and how intonation may in some sentences change the meaning for natives. And then of course intonation--&quot;</td>
<td>Intonation and how it affects meaning.</td>
<td>Intonation</td>
<td>Prosody to be taught</td>
<td>Prosody</td>
<td>CONTENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;--that you understand the meaning of intonation--&quot;</td>
<td>Meaning of intonation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;--that if it lacks kind of all stress that gives the sentence meaning, so it kind of, renders the studying of pronunciation incomplete. And precisely the stressing I think. --how to use stress. --that you could stress the sentence in a right way--&quot;</td>
<td>Excluding stress renders pronunciation incomplete.</td>
<td>Word stress and sentence stress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Word stress is important to learn--&quot;</td>
<td>Stress.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;But I don’t think they need it [prosody] because it’s not at all relevant for understanding. Yeah maybe prosody isn’t the most important thing in it. No, at school no way [need to teach prosody]. That it’s [prosody] not worth paying attention to. That it’s [prosody] not worth paying attention to ‘cause people understand you anyways.&quot;</td>
<td>Prosody not important because not relevant for understanding.</td>
<td>Prosody not important</td>
<td>Prosody not to be taught</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prosody not important. No need to teach prosody at school. No need to teach prosody. No need to teach prosody because does not affect understanding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

A table illustrating the stages of the analysis as a whole from the stage three onwards. Capitals mark stages of analysis guided by the theoretical background of the study, lower case letters mark stages of analysis guided by the data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>MAIN CLASS</th>
<th>THEME</th>
<th>UNIFYING CLASS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning is continuous</td>
<td>Characteristics of learning</td>
<td>Nature of learning</td>
<td>LEARNING</td>
<td>TEACHER STUDENTS’ VIEWS ON TEACHING THE PRONUNCIATION OF ENGLISH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning is unnoticeable</td>
<td>Where learning occurs</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning in everyday environments</td>
<td>Possibility of development</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning at school</td>
<td>Taking the learner into account in teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development is possible</td>
<td>Pronunciation is not important</td>
<td>Importance of pronunciation</td>
<td>PRONUNCIATION AS A PART OF LANGUAGE SKILLS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking into account the goals and motivation of the learner</td>
<td>Pronunciation is important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking into account the skill level of the learner</td>
<td>Pronunciation can be taught together with teaching other language skills</td>
<td>Pronunciation as a part of teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation not an important part of language skills</td>
<td>Pronunciation as an important part of language skills as any other language-related skill</td>
<td>Pronunciation is important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation as important because affects understanding</td>
<td>Pronunciation important because affects the readiness to speak</td>
<td>Pronunciation as a part of teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation important because affects the readiness to speak</td>
<td>Teaching pronunciation can be a part of teaching other language skills</td>
<td>Pronunciation a separate area in teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching pronunciation can be a part of teaching other language skills</td>
<td>Pronunciation can be taught only after teaching other language skills</td>
<td>Pronunciation a separate part in language skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation as an important part of language skills</td>
<td>One accent to be used as a norm</td>
<td>WHICH ENGLISH TO TEACH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation as a separate part in language skills</td>
<td>Native accent to be used</td>
<td>Nativity of accent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation can be taught only after teaching other language skills</td>
<td>Native accent not necessary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One accent to be used as a norm</td>
<td>Understandable accent to be used as a norm</td>
<td>Understandable accent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native accent to be used</td>
<td>Neutral accent to be used in teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native accent not necessary</td>
<td>Learner’s accent not significant</td>
<td>The accent of the learner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understandable accent to be used</td>
<td>Accents as indicators of the spread of English</td>
<td>Abundance of accents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral accent to be used in teaching</td>
<td>Accents as indicators of the spread of English</td>
<td>Abundance of accents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner’s accent not significant</td>
<td>Accents as indicators of the spread of English</td>
<td>Abundance of accents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accents as indicators of the spread of English</td>
<td>Understanding non-native accents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding non-native accents</td>
<td>British accent traditionally used as a norm in teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligibility</td>
<td>Intelligible speech</td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>LEARNING OBJECTIVES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No need for native-like pronunciation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producing fluent speech</td>
<td>Willingness to speak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courage to speak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noticing pronunciation</td>
<td>Being aware of pronunciation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing how to apply pronunciation-related knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation is useful</td>
<td>Significance of pronunciation</td>
<td></td>
<td>CONTENTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sounds affect meaning</td>
<td>Sound-to-spelling correspondence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound-to-spelling correspondence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intonation</td>
<td>Prosody to be taught</td>
<td>Prosody</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word stress and sentence stress</td>
<td>Prosody not to be taught</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosody not important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sounds difficult for Finns</td>
<td>Important sounds for Finns</td>
<td>Sounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences in sounds between English and Finnish</td>
<td>Individual phonemes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguishing similar sounds from one another</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibilants</td>
<td>Dental fricatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v − w</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation skills important to teachers because they forward their skills to the learner</td>
<td>Pronunciation skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>ABILITIES TO TEACH PRONUNCIATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own pronunciation skills sufficiently good</td>
<td>Pedagogical skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical skills also needed</td>
<td>Pedagogical skills not taught enough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning happens by speaking</td>
<td>Speaking and listening facilitate learning</td>
<td>Speaking and listening as practise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning happens by listening</td>
<td>Practising pronunciation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active listening</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>Corrective feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen-and-repeat</td>
<td></td>
<td>Media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcription aids independent learning</td>
<td>Transcription</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcription too scientific</td>
<td>Transcription</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not use course books</td>
<td>Using course books</td>
<td>Course books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course books can be utilised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The original Finnish utterances extracted from the interviews

(1) Mun mielestä [oppimista tapahtuu] ihan koko ajan.
(2) -- ei sitä ees tuu huomattua että nyt mää opin jotakin--
(3) --se on semmosta mikä tavallaan pikku hiljaa raksuttaa siellä aivoissa. (3)
(4) --jos ajattelee silleen niinkö englannin oppimista niin sitä tapahtuu silleen arkenakin tosi paljon -- että se ei oo pelkästään vaan koulussa.
(5) No ehkä just se että tää sulle tehtävät ja nyt sä teet ja sitte ne tarkistetaan ja sitte mennään uuteen aiheeseen.
(6) Ja se että jos ei ossaa vielä ääntää hirveen hyvin niin se ei tarkoita ettet sä ikinä osais että sen voi kyllä oppia.
(7) --ääntäminen on just semmonen että sitä pittää ite harjotella että sitä ei voi kukkaan sun puolesta tehän--
(8) --kaikki lähteet siltä omalta tasoltaan mutta että kaikki voi kehittyä--
(9) Mutta että kyllä sitä että oppilaiten omasta motivaatiosta niinkö kannattaa ottaa semmosta motivaatiota itellekki että jos oppilaat ei ehtään halua oppia täätä niin sitte tavallaan joko yrittää sitte saaha sihien joku keino millä se ois hauskeampa tai sitte jättää se vähän vähemmälle ja ottaa vaikka sitte joskus myöhemmin sitä kiinni jos niillä on silloin parempi fiilis sitä tehän.
(10) -- että jokaiselle osi niinku silleen itelleenki tavoitteita ja motivaatiota ja että opettaja sitte rohkasee kaikkia.
(11) Mutta mun mielestä ehkä se on sitte myös opettajan vastuulla että jos tuntee hyvin ne omat opiskelijat--että pystyy jotenki ennakoimaan sitä että että laittaa haastavampia tehtäviä niille jotka on parempia--ja sitten sinää samalla voi keskittyä sitte niinhen -- joilla ei ole sitte samanlaisia valmiuksia ku sitte naïllä niinkö edistyneenmillä opiskelijoiilla.
(12) --jos ajattelee ihan kouluopetusta, niin niin mää en painottais ääntämistä kyllä siinää. Se on mun mielestä niin pieni osa kieltäidoon kokonaisuutta.
(13) Mun mielestä se ääntäminen on kuitenki niin iso osa sitä englannin kielen puhumista ja käytämistä -- koska se on niin iso osa sitte kielenkäyttöä kuitenki loppujen lopuksi.
(14) Mulla on itelle aina ärssyttä se ku ihmiset sannoo että ei silä ol niin väliä miten näätä -- kuhan sut ymmärretään niin se on tärkeintä. Mutta ku ihmiset ei ajatteleet että se ääntäminen siellä -- tekee sen ymmärtämisn.
(15) -- vaikka osais hyvin sen kielen muuten niinku, kielioppi ja sanavarasto ois hyvä mutta jos se ääntäminen on sitte heikkoja niin voi tuntua siltä epävarmalta puhua.
(16) Ja sitte se ääntäminenki tulis siinä niinku ihan tavallisilla tunneilla kaiken muun oppimisen yhteydessä että sen ei tarvis ehkä olla semmosta niin semmosta ehkä erillistä vaan että se kuuluu niinku siihen ihan tavallisiinki tunteihin.
(17) --sitte ku tavallaan kielen oppiminen menee niin pitkälle, että osaa kieltä tosi hyvin mutta osaa ääntää tosi huonosti niin se tavallaan se, epätasapainois on niin iso että sitä on sitte vaikeaa alkaa tavallaan repimään sieltä sitä ääntämistä. Että niitten pitäisi tulla suurin piirtein yhtä aikaa--

(18) --ääntäminen on tavallaan viiminen vaihe, tai sitte ko vertaa niihin muihin englannin kielen osa-alueisiin että ääntäminen on vähän niinkö semmosta tavallaan, niinkö, superficial, niinkö tämmöstä että se ei välttämättä liity niinkö sun englannin kielen taitoihin niinkö muuten. Mutta sitte se on tavallaan niinkö se viiminen kirsikka siihen kakun päälle--

(19) --sanasto karttua ja tuo kieliruoppa karttua niin sinä vaiheessa pitäis sitä ääntämistä pikkul hiljaa alkaa sieltä nostaan esille.

(20) Kyllä se on mun mielestä ihan fiksua että jos sitä opetta siitä englantia niin pysyis suurin piirtein jossain tietyssä aksementeissa--

(21) --pitää aina joku malli, että et sää voi nakella sinne niinkö sekasin, että pitäis olla niinku consistent malli siellä.

(22) Ei sen [mallin] tarvi minusta olla aina nativiivi, kuhan se on semmonen ymmärrettävä.

(23) Mut sit jos aateelee et opeteta englantia -- jotenki vaan tuntuis et sen pitäis olla enkkui tai se Amerikan, joku näistä äidinkielen aksementeista.

(24) --ei sillä ole mun mielestä väliä semmnen ääntäminen aksementti se [mitä käytetään mallina] on kuhan se on semmonen että kaikki ymmärätään sitä.

(25) [Minkäläista englantia opetta kun opetetaan englannin ääntämistä?] Varmaan just semmosta varmaan mitä sää sannoit semmesta suht neutralia että siitä ei kuultais läpi mitkään semmoset mitkäänä virve Britti- tai Amerikkavaikutteet, vaan jotenki keskitie.

(26) Puhut, sillä omalla tyylillä mikä tuntuu itelle parhaalta sama kuulostaa suku ja tultais miltä aksemit puolesta kuhan kuhaan ymmärretyksi.

(27) Tai eihän sinä oo mitään häpeää jos sun puheesta kuulee että sää oot Suomesta katosin.

(28) Ehkä siitä ois hyvä niinku jutella vaikka oppilaittenki kanssa että -- minkäläista englantia ne on kuullu ja mitä ni sitte puhuu eniten ja mikä tuntuu semmoselta omalta.


(30) Että ossais ainaki vähän erottaa niitä suurin piirtein jos kuulee, tekkee pieniä kuulotesteitä että joku puhuu että mikä aksemttie se näistä on--

(31) Mut eiks se Euroopassa käytettävä englanti ooo brittienglantia, se malli.

(32) Mutta tuota, perinteisesti se on ollu aina Britti että se on aika uus juttu että on tuullu se Amerikan.

(33) No mää sanosin että se on ehkä ehottomasti se ymmärrettävyys mikä sinä on että pitäis painottaa.
(34) Ei tarvi olla mitään täydellistä brittiaksenttia--
(35) --että se ois semmosta sujuvaa puhumista eikä tarttis jäähän miettimään ja pelkäämään että apua jos mää lausun tän väärin tai jos tää ei oo tarpeekselkeä vaan sitä että se ois semmosta sujuvaa ja ymmärrättävää ja semmosta että on itellä niinkö mukava olo puhua sitä kieltä.
(36) Ja sitte just semmosta rohkeutta siihen ääntämiseen ja muutenki niinkö viestintään että tulis niinkö oppilaille sellanan että tätä kieltä voi puhua ja virheet ei haittaa--
(37) Ehkä sitte vaan että tulis sitä tietosuutta siitä ääntämisestä että olis sitte semmosta aktiivisempaa kuuntelua ehkä että oppis kuuntelemaan niinkö sitte puhutussa kielessä että miten äännetään.
(38) Että just silleen että ois tietosempi siitä että nyt siellä äännetään ja miten siellä äännetään ja näin.
(39) Ja ehkä semmonen että on niin hyvät semmoset perustaidot että sitte jos tullee joku uus sana vastaan niin ossaa silleen ottaa selvää että miten se lausutaan ja.
(40) Ja ossais vaikka heittää jonku semmosen arvauksen että okei tossa on tommonen vähän pitempi ja oudompi lause että kattois missä siellä ois mahollisesti niinkö painotukset, ja sitte kokkeilis lausua sitä silleen.
(41) Että tietää sitte että oosni hyvät semmoset perustaidot että sitte jos tullee joku uus sana vastaan niin ossaa silleen ottaa selvää että miten se lausutaan ja.
(42) --[opetuksessa pitäisi käsitellä] tämmä oikeat oikeassa elämässä ja -- tulee semmonen tunne että se on niinkö oikeesti, se kieli on jossakin tuolla ja sitä voi käyttää muuallakin ku siellä luokkahuoneessa.
(43) -- että ymmärtää sitte nämä eri änteet mitkä saattaa sitte muuttaa sitä sanaa ja.
(44) Niin no ne [äänenteet] missä on eniten mahollista siihen väärinymäärkyseen. Niitä painottaa.
(45) --siis tollasia asioita että ku se kirjotetaan mutta sitte lausutaan ihan eri tavalla tai sitte että kirjotetaan eri tavalla ku sitte sanotaan.
(46) Mutter ei e no mun mielestä tarvi sitä [prosodiaa] ku se ei oo ymmärryksen kannalta mitenkaan oleellista.
(47) --iplinaatio ja nämä ja miten se saattaa sitte intonaatio joissain lauseissaki sitte muuttaa sitä merkitystä natiivin korvaan.
(48) --että jos sitä puuttuu tavallaan täysin kaikki semmonen paino mikä antaa merkityksen sille lauseelle, nii se tavallaan, jättää sen vajaaksi sen lausumisen opiskelun.
(49) Kyllä niitä vois ehkä minusta käyä just niitä suomalaisille tyyppillisesti vaikeita, suhuäänteet ja.
(50) Ja semmosta mitkä on sitte hirveen erilaiset ku suomessa, että ku niitä eroja on paljon niin sitte just ne että silleen uskaltaa irtaantua siitä suomen ääntämisestä ja oikeesti vähän liiotellaki niin sitte se kuulostaa paremmalta englanniksi.
(51) Miten erottaa samantyyppiset änteet toisistaan ja.
Nii että siinä, että tässä on nyt niinkö ero. Tämä on se ero, tässä sanassa on näin ja tässä näin. Että ei oo vaan että tää åänne vaan että sitte vertailaan. Vertailaan sammaan aikaan että mikä se ero nyt on näissä. Mieluummin ehkä semmonen ko että nyt tätä åännettä vaan—

Ääntäminen on tosi tärkeää meille [opettajille], ko me sitte jatketaan sitä ääntämistä sitte myös etiäpäin.

Joo, kyllä musta tuntuu että osaan antaa jonkunlaisen mallin. Mutta sitten mietin just sitä että joku intonaation opettaminen, että en mää varmaan ossais opettaa mittään prosodiahomma.

Ja sitte se oma hyvä lausuminen ja taidot yhistettynä pedagogisiin taitoihin että osaa myös niinkö opettaa sen--

Sitä on ollu niin vähän loppujen lopuksi vaikka on sen yhen kurssin känyyikki, mutta sielläkään ei puhuttu sitä että miten sitä ääntämistä sitte opetetaan, siellä oli vain että miten ite ossaa ääntää.

Jos olis enemmän sitä kielen käyttöä ja keskustelua ja semmosta vapaampaa, mahollisuuksia oikeasti puhua sitä kieltä ja harjotella ja vähän silleen, mutta sitten se nähän että sitä ääntämistä sitte opettaan hautapäivänä niin siinä saattais tulla semmonen varmuus kans sitte siihen ääntämiseen--

No mut siis sehän on koko ajan ku opiskelle tai opettaa kieltä niin koko ajan kuulee sitä kieltä ja sitä ääntämistä, niin nehan on kaikki menetelmiä siinä.

Ja sitte se että opetuksessa niinkö niin pitkälle ku mahollista niin pysyttäis siinä englannin kielessä koska silloin oppii niinkö tosi hyvin--

Semmonenki on ihan hyvä että missä kohti se [henkilö videolla] tavallaan ääntää huonosti jos sillä on joku huono ääntäminen tai missä kohti se ääntää tämmösen sanan tai jottain tämmöstä.

No jos äänteitä opettaa niin ei kai siinä oo muuta ko että toistakaa perässä. Nyt minä sanon tai nauhalta kuuluu.

Mää aina kannustaisin oppilaita niinkö ettimään, siis mediaa, eti tota eri kuulosta mediaa vaikka englantilaisia tv-ohjelmia tai amerikkalaisia tv-ohjelmia tai jotain australialaisia podcasteja tai jottain että.

Että siinä [vlogin kuvaamisessa] saa vähän silleen vaan puhua menemään ja ei oo niin semmosta tarkkaa että mitä pitää sanoa mutta semmosta ihan arkipäivänä huhetta sitte nauhottaa ja.

On kyllä silleen hyvä että voi niittä omia virheitä sitte korjata ja jos ei huomaa niin opettaja korjaa niittä. Että se nauhan perässä toistaminen vaikka kyllähän seki varmasti auttaa mutta siinä ei ehkä huomaa niitä virheitä varsinko jos yhessä åännetään että niihin ongelmakohtiin ei sitte saa semmosta apua.

Ja siinä tavallaan pitäis muistaa kans että jos alkaa korjaamaan jonku ääntämistä niin se ei saa kuulostaa semmoselta rangais-, rankaisemiselta että sät ääntäyn kunnolla nyt åännä mun perässä että--seän pitäis olla semmosta varovaista että se ei sais olla semmosta, vakevää.

Mutta en, siis jos puhutaan kouluainmasta niin en lähtis opettaan niitä foneettisia merkkejä vielä. Musta se on ihan hönöhömmää niille alkaa sitä opettaan. Ei ne, ei ne siis, ei ne mun mielestää tarvi sitä tietoa vielä. Ko ne ei oo kuitesaan ne ei opiskele sitä vielä tieteenalana tai mitenkaään silleen.
(67) --esitellään ne ääntämisen ne merkit että miten merkitään että miten mikäkin sana äännetään ja opetellaan lukemaan niitä ääneen sitte-- Että se auttaa sitte jos itekki löytää jonku uuen sanan niin näkkee siitä sitte sen transkription niin osaa sen perusteella sitte ääntää sen itte että ei tarvi vältämättä kuunnella mittään äänitteitä tai ääntää sitä vaan väärin.


(69) No jonku verran kirjoissa on mitä oon ite nähny niin ihan ääntämisharjotuksiakin tehty mikä on kyllä hyvä, mutta, en sitte tiää miten paljon niitä hyödynnetään. Ainahan niitä vois olla enemmän.