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**Abstract**: The current study aimed to investigate the effectiveness of Quiz-Demonstration-Practice-Revision (QDPR) in improving university students’ pronunciation of English labiodental fricative consonants: //f/ and /v/. To achieve the goal, the present researchers conducted a one-group pretest-posttest design. The experimental group was selected using a cluster random sampling. As the treatment, the group was taught using QDPR the second step of which the students were explained how to produce the target phonemes in Bahasa Indonesia as their national language. Before and after the treatment, the participants were given oral and written tests related to the target phonemes. Additionally, after the treatment, a questionnaire on QDPR was administered to the participants. The collected data were submitted to a paired-sample t-test to determine whether QDPR was significantly effective in improving students’ pronunciation. Moreover, the data were submitted to simple regressions to examine the contribution of QDPR to students’ pronunciation. The results of data analysis have revealed that (1) QDPR was significantly effective in improving students’ pronunciation, and (2) QDPR significantly helped the students to improve students’ pronunciation. One of crucial pedagogical implications of the study is that QDPR can be an alternative model to English pronunciation instruction in EFL classrooms.
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The nature of language as a system implies that a language is composed of two systems: a system of sounds and a system of meaning. The relationship between those two systems is very important because in human verbal communication meaning or message is conveyed or received primarily through sounds or vocal symbols. These vocal symbols are expressed in the form of words (vocabulary) and arranged in certain grammatical structures (grammar). In terms of oral language, there must be message (meaning), grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation. Additionally, another feature of human communication is that language is a cultural transmission. It denotes that a communication system must be discovered through communicative interaction with other users of the language. This suggests that not only features of a language can be totally acquired, but also some parts of the language should be learnt. Thus, language learning is also needed.

The consequence of both features of human language above is that in any language programmes, including English language education, pronunciation as a part of system of sounds should be propositionally treated as two other dominant components of language, grammar and vocabulary. However, the current situation shows that most people who are involved directly or indirectly in English language teaching and learning programmes only concentrate on their attention to the last two components. This situation actually contrasts with the nature of language itself which requires a balanced deal of language system and meaning (Tudor, 2001). We shall, therefore, include pronunciation as a part of our language teaching programmes because paying no or less attention to pronunciation teaching does eventually affect students’ language mastery and the process of the whole communication, particularly when they utilize the target language in real situations later. At the beginning level, the insufficient capability of pronunciation, of course, does not always have a significant impact on the process of communication but at higher levels it does.

Based on the above discussion, it is necessary for us to find a learning model of pronunciation teaching that is suitable to our goal, that is, global intelligibility (Moedjito & Ito, 2008). Regarding the priority and techniques for teaching pronunciation in EFL classrooms (Celce-Murcia et al., 1996; Dalton & Seidlhofer, 1994; Moedjito, 2016b), the present researcher proposed a learning model of pronunciation teaching named Quiz-Demonstration-Practice-Revision (QDPR). Basically, the overall step of QDPR is similar to the step of common language learning, especially related to pre-activity, whilst-activity, and post-activity. However, compared with other models of pronunciation teaching, QDPR has distinctive steps, particularly in whilst-activity.

However, we do not have any information if QDPR is significantly effective as learning model in pronunciation teaching. We do not know if QDPR can improve EFL learners’ knowledge of English pronunciation. Finally, we do not know of QDPR can improve EFL learners’ oral performance. Thus we really need this information so that QDPR may become an alternative learning model in pronunciation teaching. To provide this missing information, the current researcher tried to examine the effectiveness of QDPR in improving university students’ knowledge of English labiodental fricative consonants and their ability to produce these phonemes. The present researcher intentionally chose the English labiodental fricative consonants because they do not exist in the mother tongue of the present participants so that both of the phonemes were categorised as serious and common mispronunciations (Moedjito, 2008). The current research was aimed at answering the following questions:

1. Is QDPR significantly effective in improving EFL learners’ knowledge of the English labiodental fricative consonants?
2. Is QDPR significantly effective in improving EFL learners’ ability to produce the English labiodental fricative consonants?
3. Does QDPR contribute significantly to EFL learners’ knowledge of English labiodental fricative consonants?
4. Does QDPR contribute significantly to EFL learners’ ability to pronounce English labiodental fricative consonants?

**Method**

*Participants*

The participants of the present study were 31 Indonesian university students enrolling Department of English Language Education at a private university in the regency of Lombok Timur, the province of Nusa Tenggara Barat, Indonesia. The participants of the study were selected regarding the following inclusion criteria: (1) they had attended the course of English Pronunciation Practice offered by the Department of English Language Education, Hamzanwadi University, (2) they still had difficulties in English vowels and consonants, and (3) they participated voluntarily in the study which was designed for 11 sessions. Thus, if a participant was absent for one session or more, they would be excluded.

*Data Collection*

To solve the proposed research questions, the data of the study was collected by three different instruments: a questionnaire on QDPR learning model, an oral reading test, and a paper-and-pencil pronunciation test. The questionnaire was distributed to the participants to provide information on their opinion on QDPR learning model. The oral reading test was administered to measure the participants’ oral performance while the paper-and-pencil pronunciation test was conducted to assess their knowledge of English labiodental fricative consonants.

*Data Analysis*

The data collected from the questionnaire and tests were quantitatively analysed. In addition to descriptive statistics, the data were submitted to paired-sample t-test to examine whether QDPR is significantly effective in improving EFL learners’ knowledge of English labiodental fricative consonants and their ability to produce them. Moreover, the Pearson’s correlation coefficients were calculated for QDPR learning model to each dependent variables (i.e., EFL learners’ knowledge of English pronunciation and their ability to pronounce English pronunciation of the target consonants). If the coefficient of each correlation had at least a modest correlation (r ≥ .40), the data were then submitted to a simple regression analysis using IBM Statistics 22 for Windows.

**Results and Discussion**

*Descriptive Statistics and Correlations Coefficients*

Table 1 depicts the summary of the descriptive statistics of the investigated variables in the current study, mean scores (M) and standard deviations (SD). Moreover, it shows the correlation coefficient of the independent variable (QDPR Learning Model) to each dependent variables (EFL learners’ knowledge of English labiodental fricative consonants and their ability to pronounce English labiodental fricative consonants).

As shown in Table 1, the mean scores of the investigated variables are 89.71 for QDPR learning model, 83.39 for EFL learners’ knowledge of English labiodental fricative consonants, and 83.26 for EFL learners’ ability to pronounce English labiodental fricative consonants. Submitting the collected data to two-sample independent t-test, we found that there was no significant difference in the mean scores between these two variables, t(df=30) = .80 at *p* = .26, meaning that the mean score of EFL learners’ knowledge of English labiodental fricative consonants was relatively the same as that of EFL learners’ ability to pronounce English labiodental fricative consonants.

After performing a series of paired-sample t-tests for the data of pretest and postest, the results have shown that there was a significant difference in the mean scores between the pre-test and the post for both of EFL learners’ knowledge of English labiodental fricative consonants and EFL learners’ ability to produce these phonemes, t(df =30) = 30.47 at *p* < .01 and t(df =30) = 37.93 at *p* < .01 respectively. This implies that QDPR is significantly effective in improving EFL learners’ knowledge of English labiodental fricative consonants and EFL learners’ ability to produce these phonemes.

Table 1 *Summary of the Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Coefficients of the Investigated*

*Variables*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Investigated Variables | *Mean Score* | | *Standard Deviation* | | *r* |
| Pre | Post | Pre | Post |
| QDPR Learning Model |  | 89.71 |  | 3.49 |  |
| EFL Learners’ KPELFC1 | 52.28 | 83.39 | 7.08 | 7.11 |  |
| EFL Learners’ APEFVC2 | 56.23 | 83.26 | 5.40 | 6.52 |  |
| QDPR Learning Model – EFL Learners’ KPELFC |  |  |  |  | .63\*\* |
| QDPR Learning Model – EFL Learners’ APELFC |  |  |  |  | .57\*\* |

*Notes: EFL Learners’ KPELFC = EFL Learners’ Knowledge of English labiodental fricative consonants*

*EFL Learners’ APELFC = EFL Learners’ Ability to Pronounce English labiodental fricative consonants*

Regarding the association between the independent variable and the dependent variables, the results of the study have disclosed that the correlation coefficient between QDRP learning model and EFL learners’ knowledge of English labiodental fricative consonants was .63 at *p* < .01 while the correlation between QDPR learning model and EFL learners’ ability to pronounce English labiodental fricative consonants was .57 at *p* < .01. This implies that QDPR was highly correlated to EFL learners’ knowledge of English labiodental fricative consonants and their ability to pronounce the investigated English labiodental fricative consonants respectively.

Although these correlation coefficients show the relationship between QDPR Learning Model to each dependent variables, they cannot tell us much about the predictive power of the independent variable, namely QDPR to the dependent variables. In order to show the causal-effect relationship between QDPR learning model and their dependent variables, simple regression tests were subsequently performed to each set of data because the results of Pearson’s correlation have disclosed that both correlation coefficients were significantly at moderate level as they were more than .40. So, we could perform simple regression tests to examine the contribution of QDPR learning model to the investigated dependent variables. The results of the simple regression test can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2 *Summary of Simple Regression Analyses of QDPR Learning Model for the Investigated*

*Dependent Variables*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Dependent Variables* | B | SE B | *β* | *R2* |
| EFL leaners’ knowledge of English labiodental fricative consonants | | -30.90 | 0.30 | .63 | .39\*\* |
| EFL learners’ ability to pronounce English labiodental fricative consonants | | -12.84 | 0.29 | .57 | .33\*\* |

The results of the data analyses have disclosed that 39% of EFL learners’ knowledge of English pronunciation can be explained by the implementation of QDPR learning model. Meanwhile, 61% can be predicted by other factors that were not investigated in the current study. Similarly, 33% of EFL learners’ ability to pronounce the investigated English consonants might be explained by the existence of QDPR learning model whereas 61% can be predicted by other factors that were not investigated in the current study.

As stated in Introduction section, we proposed four research questions. The first two research questions are related to the effectiveness of QDPR learning model in improving EFL learners’ knowledge of English labiodental fricative consonants and their ability to produce the consonants. Meanwhile, the last two research questions are related to the contribution of QDPR learning model to EFL learners’ knowledge of English labiodental fricative consonants and their ability to produce the consonants. The results of data analyses have discovered that QDPR is significantly effective in improving EFL learners’ knowledge of English labiodental fricative consonants and their ability to produce the consonants. Additionally, the results have disclosed that QDPR contribute significantly to EFL learners’ knowledge of English labiodental fricative consonants and their ability to produce the consonants. Thus, the findings are consonant with the previous study conducted by Moedjito (2016b) unveiled that the step of Demonstration in QDPR gives a positive effect on students’ knowledge of English pronunciation and their ability to produce them. This is due to the use of students’ national language, in this case Bahasa Indonesia, as the medium of instruction. After demonstrating how to produce the speech sounds, the teacher explained how to produce them in Bahasa Indonesia. This process makes them easy to understand how to produce them and finally they can produce themselves. Thus, although both /f/ and /v/ do not exist in their mother tongue, namely Sasak language, they can produce easily.

**Conclusion**

The current study investigated the effectiveness of Quiz-Demonstration-Practice-Revision (QDPR) as alternative learning model in pronunciation teaching, focusing on the English labiodental fricative consonants. These consonants became the foci of the study because both /f/ and /v/ do not exist in the students’ mother tongue; consequently, they became serious and common mispronunciations. The findings of the study are evidence to suggest that QDPR can be an alternative learning model in pronunciation teaching because empirical data have shown its effectiveness and contribution to improve EFL learners’ knowledge of English labiodental fricative consonants and their ability to produce them. However, we also have some limitations of the current study, such as the participants were limited to university students’ majoring in English Language Education and the choice of phonemes /f/ and /v/ which are actually only the two out of 44 phonemes. In further investigation, the participants should be expanded to university students who do not major in English Language Education or maybe secondary school students. Also, other serious and common mispronunciation as discovered by Moedjito (2008) should be the focus of further research.
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