International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation
ISSN: 2617-0299 (Online); ISSN: 2708-0099 (Print)
DOI: 10.32996/ijllt
Journal Homepage: www.al-kindipublisher.com/index.php/ijllt

IJLLT
AL-KINDI CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The effects of explicit pronunciation instruction on Chadian EFL speakers' errors

Ernest MBAIORNOM
(M.A), Postgraduate School/DTU: Literatures, Languages and Language Sciences, The University of Maroua, Maroua, Cameroon
Corresponding Author: Ernest MBAIORNOM, **E-mail**: mbai_ernest@yahoo.fr

| ABSTRACT

Though several SLA areas of interest hold the attention of considerable research in the 21st century, error correction strategies remain an area that received little attention. This study on *the effects of explicit pronunciation instruction on Chadian EFL speakers' errors* aims at examining whether the explicit pronunciation instruction is an effective strategy to correct segmental errors made by learners in spoken English. To this end, the quasi-experimental research was adopted. Therefore, tests were used to gather data. Pre- and post-tests were completed by two experimental groups from two high schools. Each group selected through the convenience sampling technique consists of six participants. Participants received pronunciation treatment on segmental features through the analytic-linguistic teaching approach along with audio-lingual teaching techniques and phonetic transcriptions. Data were analyzed following Mbaiornom's (2026) pronunciation instruction effects and Bobda and Mbangwana's (2004) principles for pronunciation. The analysis of data revealed that the explicit pronunciation instruction was the effective corrective strategy, as it significantly correlated with the improvement of learners' performance in the pronunciation of the back vowel /a:/, the post-alveolar /r/, the central vowel /ɜ:/, and an insignificant effect on the sounds /eɪ/, and the silent letters 'a, o, e,' The study recommends the use of the Integrative Pronunciation Instruction Approach along with combined error correction strategies to boost intelligibility in Chadian EFL learners' speech productions.

| KEYWORDS

error, correction, pronunciation, instruction

| ARTICLE INFORMATION

ACCEPTED: 02 September 2026 **PUBLISHED:** 31 October 2026 **DOI:** 10.32996/ijllt.2026.9.11.3

1. Introduction

The analysis of errors associated with the learning of a second language has become an area of interest that attracts the attention of considerable research in the 21st century. Over the past 50 years, considerable attention of researchers was given to various aspects of L2 errors, notably, the description of error analysis' models (Brown, 2007; Corder, 1974; Rutsipa, 2011), the categorization of L2 errors (Corder, 1974; Dulay, Heidi, Burt, Marina & Krashen, 1982; Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005), and the explanation of error (Brown, 2007; Corder, 1967; Lado, 1957; Richards & Schmidt, 2010; Selinker, 1972; Sompong, 2014). Nevertheless, error correction remains an area that received little attention from researchers. Though researchers such as Amara (2019), Brown (2007) and Lee (1990) made a significant contribution to knowledge in putting forward correction approaches such as peer correction and teacher correction, studies associated with Chadian EFL learners' errors (Kouega, 2017; Kouega & Tao, 2017; Ngaidandi & Apuge, 2020; Ngaidandi, 2021; Ngaidandi & Issa, 2022; Safotso, 2018) did not investigate in-depth ways to correct learners' deviations. Hence, this study was set to explore whether the explicit pronunciation instruction is an effective strategy to correct segmental errors made by learners in spoken English**.**

2. Literature review

Though a handful of studies (Amanda, Yeak & Hiep, 2022; Derwing & Munro, 2014; George, 2013) revealed that pronunciation instruction did not significantly correlate with learners' improvement in pronunciation performance, denoting that pronunciation

Copyright: © 2026 the Author(s). This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) 4.0 license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). Published by Al-Kindi Centre for Research and Development, London, United Kingdom.

instruction is not an effective strategy to correct L2 errors, findings of considerable research (Ali, 2018; Darcy, 2018; Fucile, 2017; Gilakjani, 2017; Gordon, Darcy, & Ewert, 2013; Imamesup, 2011; Kang, 2013; Kayaoglu & Caylak, 2013; Lee, Jang & Plonsky, 2014; Muamar, 2022; Silveira, 2013) instead made a sound contribution to the existing knowledge in showing that pronunciation instruction significantly improved learners' performance in pronunciation.

More specifically, considerable research revealed that the significant effect of the pronunciation instruction is highly subject to the teaching methods used. Karina's (2011) experiment showed a significant influence of formal L2 English instruction (FEI) on the pronunciation's accuracy of the vowel /ɛ/. In addition, Imamesup (2011), and Kayaoglu and Caylak's (2013) experiment through the Audio Articulation Model yielded a similar result, as findings indicated that all participants who received pronunciation instruction through Audio Articulation Model significantly improved their pronunciation of fricative sounds. More so, Beltran-Herrera, Andrade-Chavez, Alvarez-Rojas (2016) revealed that students who received pronunciation instruction through phonics instruction, improved the pronunciation of the sounds /θ, ð, i: /. Furthermore, Ali's (2018) experiment showed that pronunciation instruction significantly improved the experimental group's pronunciation performance, which received pronunciation instruction through YouTube video clips and the textbook. In the same vein, Dandee and Pornwiriyakit's (2022) experiment indicated that students who received pronunciation instruction through English phonetic alphabet drills significantly improved their performance in pronunciation. More recently, Nguyen and Tran's (2026) experiment revealed that learners who received segmental and suprasegmental pronunciation instruction through Artificial Intelligence (AI) significantly improved their performance in segmental pronunciation. Other studies (Gordon, Darcy & Ewert, 2013; Kane, 2025; Silveira, 2013) showed that the effect of the pronunciation instruction depends on the group who received the instruction and the content of the instruction. In this regard, Silveira's (2013) investigation revealed that the experimental group who received pronunciation instruction performed better than the control group.

Another trend of research revealed that the pronunciation instruction which focused on suprasegmentals through explicit phonetic instruction produced more a significant effect than the instruction focused on segmental features. More specifically, Gordon, Darcy and Ewert (2013) investigated how explicit phonetic instruction influences the acquisition of L2 phonological features. To achieve this goal, three groups of ESL learners received pronunciation instruction during three weeks, using the same teaching sequence within a communicative methodology. Two experimental groups received explicit instruction either on suprasegmental or segmental features. The control group received a suprasegmental and segmental features without explicit instruction. Findings indicated that only the experimental group trained on suprasegmentals through explicit phonetic instruction, improved its comprehensibility scores significantly. Similarly, Kane's (2025) investigation of the form-focused instruction (FFI) effects and corrective feedback (CF) indicated that the effect of the explicit pronunciation instruction focusing on suprasegmental features is more significant than the effect of the explicit pronunciation instruction focusing on segmental features. However, more recently, Yagiz, Kaya and Otugen (2024) examined the effects of pronunciation instruction in reviewing 55 interventions. Findings revealed that almost 87% of the experiments showed a significant effect of pronunciation instruction focusing on segmental features.

With regard to the theoretical framework, data are analyzed following Mbaiornom's (2026) Pronunciation Instruction Effects (Henceforth, PIE). Propounded within the scope of his PhD dissertation on *Segmental errors in EFL learners' speech productions*, Mbaiornom (2026) claims that the pronunciation instruction shows various effects on learner's performance depending on the degree of segment's complexity. That is, more difficult the production of the sound to the learner, null or insignificant the pronunciation instruction effect on the learner' performance in pronunciation; but difficult the production of the sound to the learner, moderate the effect of the pronunciation instruction on his performance; and easier the production of the sound to the learner, more significant the effect of the pronunciation instruction on his performance. This is the underlying principle which governs the effects of pronunciation instruction.

3. Methodology

The research design adopted in the context of this study is the quasi-experimental research. The research question that guided the collection of data and the experiment is : What is the effective pronunciation instruction strategy to correct errors in Chadian EFL speakers' speech productions? To this end, audio recorded data were gathered through pre and post-tests, and were phonetically transcribed following the Received Pronunciation standard. Two experimental groups from two high schools were formed. Each group is consisted of 6 students from 1ere level, selected through the convenience sampling technique. Between the pre-test and the post-test, each experimental group received segmental instruction focusing on the back vowel /a:/, the post alveolar /r /, the central /ɜ:/, the diphthongs /əʊ, eɪ/ and the silent vowel letters 'a, e, o'. The pronunciation instruction was based on the analytic-linguistic teaching approach along with audio-lingual teaching techniques, and phonetic transcriptions. Data were analysed from the quantitative perspective.

4. Results/Findings

4.1. correction of the vowel /a:/ substitutions

Sound	Words tested	Experimental groups	Tests' Results		Corrections	
			Substitutions in Pre-test	Substitutions in Post-test	Corrected forms	%
/a:/	Master car	KEG	12/12	3/12	09	75%
		DEG	11/12	6/12	05	41.46%
		Total	23/24	9/24	14	58.23%

Facts from table 1 show corrections of the substitutions of the vowel /a:/. As it could be observed, 9 substitutions from Konkoundja experimental group (Henceforth, KEG) representing 75%, and 5 substitutions from Djarabe experimental group (Henceforth, DEG) representing 41.46% were corrected through the pronunciation instruction. In general, 14 cases of the vowel /a:/ substitutions representing 58.23% were corrected after the pronunciation treatment. This result denotes that the explicit pronunciation instruction has significantly improved learners' performance in correcting 58.23% of the substitutions of the vowel /a:/. In other words, the explicit pronunciation instruction showed a significant effect on the substitutions of the vowel /a:/. This effect is attributed to the effectiveness of approach and teaching methods used for the segmental instruction and the low degree of complexity of the sound /a:/. Thus, it could be concluded that the explicit pronunciation instruction is an effective error correction strategy, as it significantly corrected substitutions of the vowel /a:/. This finding is consistent with Mbaiornom's (2026) Pronunciation Instruction Effects, as it posits that easier the production of the sound to the learner, more significant the effect of the pronunciation instruction on his performance.

4.2 correction of /r / insertions

Sound	Words tested	Experimental groups	Tests' Results		Corrections	
			insertions in Pre-test	insertions in Post-test	Corrected forms	%
/r/	For her car	KEG	18/18	5/18	13	72.23%
		DEG	16/18	5/18	11	61.11%
		Total	34/36	10/36	24	66.66%

Statistics from table 2 indicate corrections of the insertions of the post-alveolar /r/. As it could be seen, from KEG, 13 insertions of the post-alveolar /r/ representing 72.23% of insertions were corrected after the pronunciation treatment. From DEG, 11 insertions of the post-alveolar /r/ representing 61.11% of the insertions were corrected. In general, there were 24 insertions of /r/ sound, representing 66.66% of insertions that were corrected. This result could be interpreted as a significant effect of the explicit pronunciation instruction on participants' performance. The pronunciation instruction has significantly improved learners' performance, in correcting 66.66% of the post-alveolar /r/ insertions. The high effect of the pronunciation instruction could be attributed not only to the ease with which the sound /r/ was rendered after the instruction, but also to the effectiveness of approach and teaching methods used to carry out the pronunciation treatment. Thus, the analysis of data shows that the pronunciation instruction is an effective strategy to correct errors, as it significantly corrected insertions of the post-alveolar /r/. This finding converges with Mbaiornom's (2026) Pronunciation Instruction Effects, as it correlates the significant effect of the pronunciation instruction with the low degree of sound's difficulty.

4.3 correction of substitutions of the vowel /ɜ:/

Sound	Words tested	Experimental groups	Tests' Results		Corrections	
			substitutions in Pre-test	substitutions in Post-test	corrected forms	%
/ɜ:/	thirty world learn	KEG	18/18	18/18	0	0%
		DEG	18/18	11/18	7	38.89 %
		Total	36/36	29/36	7/36	19.44 %

Table 3 above shows corrections of the substitutions of the long vowel /ɜ:/ that occurred after the pronunciation treatment. It could be observed that from KEG any substitution was not corrected after the pronunciation treatment. That is, the pronunciation instruction showed a null effect on the substitutions of the sound /ɜ:/. However, it could be seen from DEG that 7

substitutions representing38.89 % of the substitutions were subsequently corrected. This result indicates that the pronunciation instruction showed a noticeable effect on deviations of the long vowel /ɜ:/. Then, it is observed that in general, 7 cases of substitutions representing 19.44 % of the sound /ɜ:/ substitutions were corrected. This denotes that, in general, the explicit pronunciation instruction has moderately improved learners' performance, in correcting 19.44 % of deviations. Thus, it could be said that the explicit pronunciation instruction is a less effective corrective strategy. The complexity of the sound /ɜ:/ stems from its absence from the French vocalic system. This complexity accounts for the slight effect of the pronunciation instruction. This finding is harmony with Mbaiornom's (2026) Pronunciation Instruction Effects, as it assumes that difficult the articulation of sound, moderate the effect of the pronunciation instruction on the sound.

4.4. correction of substitutions of the diphthong /əʊ/

Sound	Words tested	Experimental groups	Tests' Results		Corrections	
			substitutions in Pre-test	substitutions in Post-test	corrected forms	%
/əʊ/	open home go	KEG	18/18	17/18	1/36	5.56%
		DEG	18/18	12/18	6/36	33.34%
		Total	36/36	29/36	7/36	19.45%

Facts from table 4 show corrections of the substitutions of the diphthong /əʊ/ that resulted from the pronunciation instruction. As for KEG, it could be observed that 1 substitution representing 5.56% of substitutions was corrected. But from DEG, 6 substitutions representing 33.34% of corrections were corrected. This cumulated to 7 substitutions representing 19.45% of substitutions that were corrected. This result could be interpreted as a moderate effect of pronunciation instruction on the substitutions of the diphthong /əʊ/. In other words, it could be said that the explicit pronunciation instruction is somewhat effective, as it has moderately improved learners' performance in pronunciation. As earlier stated, this finding is in line with Mbaiornom's (2026) Pronunciation Instruction Effects, as it posits that the moderate effect of the pronunciation instruction correlates with the relative difficulty of the sound.

4.5. Correction of insertion of the silent vowel letters 'a, e, o'

Sound	Words tested	Experimental groups	Tests' Results		Corrections	
			insertions in Pre-test	insertions in Post-test	corrected forms	%
silent vowel letters 'a, e, o'	capital sustained declared chocolate	KEG	24/24	20/24	4/24	16.67%

Table 5 above indicates corrections of the insertion of the silent vowels 'a, e, o'. As it could be observed 4 insertions (16.67%) from each group were corrected after the pronunciation treatment. In general, 8/48 insertions representing 16.67% of insertions were corrected. These results revealed that the explicit pronunciation instruction has produced a less significant effect on the insertions of the French vowels [a, e, o]. This low effect could be attributed to the fossilized items 'o, a, e', which are difficult to correct. This finding converges with Mbaiornom (2026) Pronunciation Instruction Effects, as it assumes that the insignificant effect of the pronunciation instruction correlates with the high degree of sound's difficulty.

4.6. Correction of the substitutions of the diphthong /eɪ/

Sound	Words tested	Experimental groups	Tests' Results		Corrections	
			insertions in Pre-test	insertions in Post-test	corrected forms	%
/eɪ/	plane table	KEG	10/12	9/12	1	8.33%
		DEG	8/12	6/12	2	16.66%
		Total	18/24	15/24	3/24	12.49%

Evidences from table 6 show the corrections of the substitutions of the diphthong /eɪ/ that resulted from the pronunciation instruction. From KEG, it could be observed that 1 substitution of the diphthong /eɪ/ (8.33%) was corrected subsequently. From DEG, 2 substitutions (16.66%) of the diphthong /eɪ/ were corrected after the pronunciation instruction. In

general, there were 3 substitutions (12.49%) that were corrected. This result revealed that the explicit pronunciation instruction has produced an insignificant effect on the substitutions of the diphthong /eɪ/. This denotes that the explicit pronunciation instruction did not significantly improved learners' performance in the renditions of the diphthong /eɪ/. The insignificant effect could be attributed to the complexity of the diphthong. This finding is in line with Mbaiornom (2026) Pronunciation Instruction Effects, as it posits that the insignificant effect of the pronunciation instruction correlates with the high degree of sound's difficulty.

In all, results have shown that the explicit pronunciation instruction was somewhat effective, as it produced a varied effect on participants' deviations. It significantly corrected /a:/ substitutions (58.23%), and /r/ insertions (66.66%). However, it moderately corrected insertions of the long vowel /ɜ:/ (19.44 %), and substitutions of the diphthong /əʊ/ (19.45%). Its effect was insignificant on the insertions of the silent vowels 'a, e, o' (16.67%), and the substitutions of the diphthong /eɪ/ (12.49%).

5. Discussion

The results of the study indicated that the pronunciation instruction was somewhat effective, as it showed various effects, notably a significant effect, a moderate effect, and an insignificant effect.

The significant effect of the explicit pronunciation instruction

To begin with, the study revealed that the pronunciation instruction showed a powerful effect on errors in significantly improving learners' performance in pronunciation. In this regard, it was found that 75% of the long vowel /a:/substitutions and 72.23% of the post-alveolar /r/ insertions were corrected in the post-test. These percentages denote that the pronunciation instruction has significantly improved Chadian EFL learners' performance in the pronunciation of the aforementioned sounds.

The improvement denotes that the approach and the teaching method used to carry out the pronunciation instruction were effective. In the framework of this study, the segmental instruction was performed through the analytic-linguistic approach, involving the use of explicit instruction (Binasfour, 2018) and teaching techniques such as the phonetic instruction and repetitions. In other words, the integrative method of explicit instruction and audiolingual pronunciation-techniques significantly corrected learners' errors related to the back vowel /a:/and the post-alveolar /r/. Thus, the use of adequate approach to teaching pronunciation correlated with the improvement of learners' performance in pronunciation.

This is in line with Corder (1967), as he held that if language teachers were to achieve a perfect teaching method, then, errors would never be committed in the first place. Therefore, the occurrence of errors is merely a sign of the present inadequacy of our teaching techniques. Corker's assertion denotes that learners' deviations are the reflection of the inadequate pronunciation-teaching techniques used while the improvement of learners' performance results from the effectiveness of the pronunciation-teaching techniques.

With respect to what characterises the effectiveness of a pronunciation instruction, Niyazova (2024) held that an effective pronunciation instruction develops learners' phonetic competence and articulation skills, in integrating techniques, such as pronunciation drill, listening to models and imitating them, repetitious exercise to pronounce long chains of words and/or phrases, tongue twisters; and distinguish between similar sounds through contextual minimal pair drills. As a result, the teaching approach to the pronunciation instruction that was performed in this study, converges with Niyazova' s (2024) characteristics of the effective approach to teaching pronunciation, as the segmental instruction of the study integrated the analytic-linguistic teaching approach, the phonetic instruction and various forms of repetitive drill.

The effectiveness of the analytic-linguistic teaching approach is confirmed by the finding of a previous study (Ghorbani, Neissari & Kargozari, as cited in Binasfour, 2018, p.45), which revealed that the analytic-linguistic teaching approach is more effective than the intuitive-imitative teaching approach, as the experimental group who received pronunciation instruction through the analytic-linguistic teaching approach performed significantly better in perceiving English vowels than the control group, who received the intuitive-imitative teaching approach. That is why findings of the study revealed that the integrative approach to the pronunciation instruction was effective, as learners have significantly improved their performance in the pronunciation of the back vowel /a:/ and the post-alveolar /r/.

This finding converges with findings of considerable research (Ali, 2018; Darcy, 2018; Fucile, 2017; Gilakjani, 2017; Imamesup, 2011; Kang, 2013; Kayaoglu & Caylak, 2013; Keshavarz & Karina, 2011; Lee, Jang & Plonsky, 2014; Muamar, 2022; Nkongho & Tize, 2020), as results revealed that the explicit pronunciation instruction significantly improved learners' performance in pronunciation.

The finding is also in harmony with (Gordon, Darcy, & Ewert, 2013; Silveira, 2013), as results revealed that experimental groups who received the explicit instruction improved their performance in pronunciation. In fact , Gordon, et al.(2013) investigated how explicit instruction influences the acquisition of L2 phonological features. The study involved three groups of ESL learners who received pronunciation instruction during three weeks (25 minutes/day, 3 days/week) using the same teaching sequence within a communicative methodology. Two experimental groups received explicit instruction either on suprasegmental or segmental features. A combination of these features was presented orally to the third group without explicit instruction. Results indicated that only the experimental group trained on suprasegmentals improved its comprehensibility scores significantly from pretest to posttest.

However, the finding diverges from Imamesup (2011), Keshavarz and Karina (2011), Kayaoglu and Caylak (2013) and Nkongho and Tize (2020) in the sense their targeted sounds differ from those under investigation within the scope of this study. Results of Imamesup (2011) and Kayaoglu and Caylak's (2013) studies revealed the significant effect of the explicit-pronunciation instruction on the fricatives /θ, ð/. On the other hand, Nkongho and Tize's (2020) investigation revealed the effectiveness of the explicit instruction on the omission of weak forms. While Keshavarz and Karina's (2011) results indicated the significant effect of the explicit pronunciation instruction on the vowel /ɛ/.

From the teaching approach point of view, the finding also diverges from several previous studies (Ali, 2018; Kane, 2025; Kayaoglu & Caylak, 2013; Keshavarz & Karina, 2011). Compared to the audiolingual drill and phonetic instruction of this study Keshavarz and Karina (2011) revealed a significant influence of explicit pronunciation through the formal L2 English instruction (FEI). Whereas Imamesup (2011), Kayaoglu and Caylak (2013) unveiled that the explicit pronunciation through the Audio Articulation Model (AAM) significantly improved learners' pronunciation of fricatives. Then, Kane (2025) revealed the significant effect of pronunciation instruction through the form-focused instruction (FFI) while Ali (2018) revealed the significant effect of the explicit pronunciation instruction through YouTube video clips.

More so, from the type of pronunciation instruction perspectives, this finding differs from several previous studies (Gordon, et al, 2013; & Kane, 2025), as they revealed that the effect of the suprasegmentals-centered explicit instruction is more significant than the effect of the explicit instruction focused on segmental features. Nevertheless, results of a recent study (Yagiz, Kaya & Ottugen, 2024) clash with Gordon, et al. (2013) and Kane (2025), rather revealing that almost 87% of the experiments showed a significant effect of the explicit segmental instruction.

The discussion has demonstrated that the sole use of the explicit pronunciation instruction is not sufficient to ensure a significant improvement in learners' performance in pronunciation. Instead, the integrative approach including the explicit instruction, selected experimental groups, segmental training, phonetic instruction and repetitive drills is likely to produce a dramatic effect on learners' deviations. This is in line with the findings of previous studies (Beltran-Herrera, Andrade-Chavez & Alvarez-Rojas, 2016; Dandee & Pornwiriyakit, 2022; Nguyen & Tran, 2026), as they revealed that pronunciation instruction with integrative teachings methods produced significant effects.

The moderate effect of the explicit pronunciation instruction

Furthermore, the finding of the study revealed that the explicit pronunciation instruction showed a moderate effect on learners' deviations, as 38.89 % of the long vowel /ɜ:/ substitutions, 33.34% of the diphthong /əʊ/ substitutions were corrected in the post-test. The moderate effect indicates that a less important number of ill-formed renditions were corrected. This finding denotes that the explicit instruction did not attain the goal of the pronunciation instruction, which is the achievement of speech intelligibility. This finding converges with findings of a recent study (Amanda, Yeak & Hiep, 2022) which revealed that L2 pronunciation instruction did not reveal significant changes in the intelligible speech. The moderate effect of the explicit pronunciation instruction could be explained by the complexity of the segments (Trubetzkoy, 1939). The tense vowel /ɜ:/ and the diphthong /əʊ/ are marked sounds for their absence from the French phonemic system. It could be concluded that the explicit pronunciation instruction did not significantly correlate with the correction of the substitutions of the sounds /ɜ:, əʊ /.

The insignificant effect of the pronunciation instruction

Finally, the findings of the study revealed that the explicit pronunciation instruction showed somewhat an insignificant effect on learners' deviations, as only 16.67% of the insertions of the silent vowels 'a, e, o'; 16.66% of substitutions of the diphthong /eɪ/ (DEG), and 8.33% of substitutions of the diphthong /eɪ/ (KEG) were corrected in the post-test.

These results denote that the effect of the explicit pronunciation instruction was somewhat insignificant on learners' deviations. This finding is in line with the results of several previous studies (Amanda, et al., 2022; George, 2013), as they revealed that the explicit pronunciation instruction did not significantly correlate with the improvement of learners' performance in pronunciation. In the same vein, results of Derwing and Munro's (2014) study indicated that the formal pronunciation instruction is largely ineffective.

The insignificant effect or the null effect of the explicit pronunciation instruction on the silent vowel letters 'a, o, e' could be explained by the fossilisation. This explanation converges with Aicha (2014) and Betu (2020), as findings revealed that fossilisation accounted for vowels' mispronunciations. Following Corder (1967), fossilisation accounts for the phenomenon of the regular reappearance in learners' interlanguage ill-formed linguistic items that were thought eradicated. In this regard, the insertions of the silent vowel letters 'a, o, e' that were expected to be corrected by the pronunciation instruction reappeared in participants' interlanguage, regardless the effectiveness of the pronunciation teaching method and techniques (Selinker, 1972, p. 215). Following Betu (2020, p.62), these items have resisted to 'the external influence'. In other words, the insertions of the silent vowel letters 'a, o, e' resisted to teacher' corrective feedbacks.

The fossilisation of the silent vowel letters 'a, o, e' could be attributed to determining factors, notably language transfer, participants' age and interlanguage (Betu, 2020, p.62). With regard to the language transfer, it could be said that the insertions were made in order to conform with the French phonological rules of silent vowels. As for the age factor, considering Krashen's critical period hypothesis according to which it is difficult to learn a second language without foreign accent after puberty, it could be said that the age of participants has played a determinant role in the fossilisation, as all of them are teenagers.

Concerning the interlanguage factor, participants' knowledge of target language (Corder, 1967), as earlier mentioned in several instances, has significantly contributed to the fossilisation of the aforementioned sounds, for the reason that participants' interlanguage is highly characterised by inadequate English knowledge and overgeneralisations. It appears that the findings related to the fossilization of the diphthong /eɪ/ and the silent vowel letters 'a, o, e' were not confirmed by any findings of previous studies.

The discussion has showed that the explicit pronunciation instruction is somewhat effective, as it showed diversified effects on learners' errors. The diversified effects of the explicit pronunciation instruction is in harmony with the underlying principle of PIE (Mbaiornom, 2026) according to which, more difficult the production of the sound to learners, null or insignificant the effect of the pronunciation instruction on learners' performances in pronunciation; but difficult the production of the sound to learners, moderate the effect of the pronunciation instruction on their performances in pronunciation; and easier the production of the sound to learners, more significant the effect of the pronunciation instruction on their performances in pronunciation. The choice of adequate pronunciation approach and teaching methods, and the focus on experimental groups and segmental instruction determines the powerful effect of the pronunciation instruction. Whereas complex segments determine the moderate effect and fossilized items the insignificant effect of the explicit pronunciation instruction.

In all, the discussion showed that the findings of the study are of great significance. Most findings confirmed by the results of previous studies, will contribute to the re-enforcement of the existing knowledge of English spoken by Chadian EFL learners. Furthermore, the discussion highlighted a novel finding, e.g., the fossilisation of the silent letters 'o, a, e'. The novel finding will not only enrich SLA research but will also broaden the knowledge of common phonological processes whereby Chadian learners learn English.

6. Conclusion

The study has showed that the explicit pronunciation instruction is somewhat an effective teaching strategy to correct errors, as it showed diversified effects, which were proved by previous studies. The significant effect of pronunciation instruction was largely corroborated by considerable findings of previous studies (Ali, 2018; Darcy, 2018; Fucile, 2017; Gilakjani, 2017;Gordon, Darcy, & Ewert, 2013; Imamesup, 2011; Kang, 2013; Kayaoglu & Caylak, 2013; Keshavarz & Karina, 2011; Lee, Jang & Plonsky, 2014; Muamar, 2022; Nkongho & Tize, 2020; Silveira, 2013). Whereas the moderate/ insignificant effect as well was confirmed by several previous studies (Amanda, Yeak & Hiep, 2022; Derwing & Munro, 2014; George, 2013). The findings of the study, notably results associated with the significant effect and the moderate effect the pronunciation instruction highlighted the relevance of the pronunciation teaching, as it can improve EFL speakers' spoken English (Hismanoglu, 2019; Sharma, 2011). For this reason, the study recommends the use of the Integrative Pronunciation Instruction Approach (IPIA) in secondary and high schools in Chad. The IPIA involves prescribing pronunciation-learning outcomes in the national syllabus for English language in Chad, the enforcement of pronunciation assessment in continuous evaluations and official examinations, and teaching pronunciation features in every grammar, vocabulary, speaking and reading lesson. Finally, the study suggests further research to investigate the effects of pronunciation instruction on suprasegmental features.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers.

References

[1] Aicha, R. (2014). The fossilized pronunciation of the schwa sound **/** ə/ in the speech of advanced Tunisian English learners: problem and causes. *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies, 1*(1), 1-6.

[2] Ali, R. (2018). *Using technology to improve the pronunciation of the students of English at Al- Baath University*. (Master's thesis). The University of Al-Baath: Al-Baath.

[3] Amanda, H., Yeak, K.H., & Hiep, T.C. (2022). The effects of L2 PI on EFL learners' intelligibility and fluency in spontaneous speech. *TESL.EJ, 25*(4), 21-37.

[4] Amara, N. (2019). Understanding language transfer and errors analysis transfer or not: I am the biggest in my family. *The Online Journal of New Horizons in Education, 9*(1), 70-77.

[5] Beltran-Herrera, M.A., Andrade-Chavez, L.L., & Alvarez-Rojas, D.F. (2016). Pronunciation improvement in EFL young learners through phonics instruction. *Revista Praxis,12* (52), 52-62**.**

[6] Betu, G.M.K (2020). The Fossilized pronunciation of the **/æ/** in the speech of advanced UPKAN English students. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics, 7*(3), 60-68.

[7] Binasfour, H.S.M. (2018). *Investigating the perception and production of the Arabic pharyngealised sounds by L2 Learners of Arabic*. (PhD dissertation). The University of Reading.

[8] Bobda, A. S., & Mbangwana, P. (2004). *An introduction to English speech*. Yaoundé: B&K Language Institute and A.M.A.
[9] Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. (5th ed.). Pearson Longman.
[10] Corder, S.P. (1967). The significance of learner's errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 5*(4), 161-170.
[11] Dandee, W., & Pornwiriyakit, P. (2022). Improving English pronunciation skills by using English phonetic drills in EFLstudents. *Journal of Educational Issues, 8* (1), 611-628.
[12] Darcy, I. (2018). Powerful and effective pronunciation instruction: How can we achieve it? *The CATESOL Journal, 30*(1), 13-45.
[13] Derwing, T., & Munro, M.J. (2014). Once you have been speaking a second language for years, it's too late to change your pronunciation. In L. Grant (Ed.).*Pronunciation Myths: Applying second language research to classroom teaching*(pp.34-55).University of Michigan Press.
[14] Dulay, Heidi C., Burt, Marina K., & Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Language Two*. Oxford: Oxford University Pres.
[15] Ellis, R., & Barkhuizen, G. (2005). *Analysing learner language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
[16] Fucile, C.A. (2017). The effect of Pronunciation Instruction on the perception of /s/ aspiration. *Dimension*, *2*, 44-58.

[17] George, A. (2013). The development of /th/, a variable geographic phonetic feature, during a semester abroad: The role explicit instruction. In J. Levis & K. LeVelle (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 4th Pronunciation in second language learning and teaching conference*. (pp.120-128). Iowa State University: Ames, IA.
[18] Gilakjani, A.P. (2017). English Pronunciation Instruction: Views and recommendations. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 8*(6), 1249-1255.
[19] Gordon, J., Darcy, I., & Ewert, D. (2013). Pronunciation teaching and learning: Effects of explicit phonetic instruction in the L2 classroom. In J. Levis & K. LeVelle (Eds.). *Proceedings of the 4th pronunciation in second language learning and teaching conference*. Aug. 2012. (pp. 194-206). Iowa State University: Ames, IA.
[20] Imamesup, A. (2011). *The study of the effectiveness of audio articulation model in improving Thai learners' pronunciation of fricatives sounds.* (Master's thesis). University of Srinakharinwirot.
[21] Kane, O. (2025). Effects of explicit instruction and corrective feedback on segmental and suprasegmental pronunciation: an ASR-Based Analysis of Japanese FL learner. *LET Kansai Chapter Collected Papers, 23*, 41-62.

[22] Kang, N. (2018). A brief overview of the effectiveness of implicit and explicit feedback in second language acquisition. *Frontiers in Educational Research, 4* (14), 5-12.
[23] Karina, N. (2011). *The influence of formal instruction on segmental speech production by German learners of English*. (Master's thesis). Stockholm University.
[24] Kayaoglu, M.N., & Caylak, N. (2013). What is needed for correct pronunciation: A model or a concern? *Egitim Arastirmalari-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research,53,* 269-290.
[25] Kouega, J.P & Tao, C. (2017). *Francophone English: Some features of the speech of Chadian high school learners.* Abstracts of Simo Bobda, A., International Symposium. Yaoundé, April 5-7.
[26] Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics and Cultures*. The University of Michigan: Michigan.
[27] Lee, J., Jang, J., & Plonsky, L. (2014). The effectiveness of second language pronunciation instruction: A meta-Analysis. *Applied Linguistics, 36*(3),345-366.
[28] Mbaiornom, E. (2026). *Segmental Errors in EFL Learners' speech productions: The case of selected high schools in Moundou, Chad.* (Doctoral dissertation in progress for defence). The University of Maroua.
[29] Muamar (2022). *Improving the students' pronunciation using English language speech assistant (ELSA).*(Doctoral dissertation). Muhammadiyah University of Makassar.
[30] Ngaidandi, N. (2022). The pronunciation of the letter sequence 'g' by the first-year-students of the English Department of the University of Ndjamena. *International Journal of Novel Research and Development, 7*(7),1231-1240.
[31] Ngaidandi, N., & Apuge, M. (2020). Realization of the grapheme 'er' by learners of English as Foreign Language: The case study of level-one students of English department, University of Doba in Chad. *International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development (IJTSRD), 4*(2), 1082-1086.
[32] Ngaidandi, N., & Issa, D. (2022). Analysing the production of 'en' by level II-students of the English Department of the HigherTeachers' Training College of Ndjamena. *Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Science, (10)*10, 341-347.
[33] Nguyen, H.L.L., &Tran, T.T. (2026). Segmental and suprasegmental pronunciation training via AI: An exploration of university students' perception and attitudes. *Technology in Language Teaching & Learning, 8,* 1-26.
[34] Niyazova, F. (2024). Teaching pronunciation by using effective techniques. *The Lingua Spectrum, 1* (1), 103-106. Retrieved from https://lingvospektr,uz/index.php/lngsp/article/view/3

[35] Nkongho, M.B. & Tize, P (2020). The production of weak forms of English function words and the training effects on ESL learners in Cameroon. *British Journal of English Linguistics, 8 (*5),26-43.

[36] Richards, J.C. & Schmidt, R. (2010). *Longman Dictionary of LanguageTeaching and Applied Linguistics*. (4th ed.). Pearson Education Limited.

[37] Rustipa, K. (2011). Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis, Error Analysis and Interlanguage and the implication to language teaching. *Jurnal Pengembangan Humaniora,11*(1),16-22.

[38] Safotso, G.T. (2018). A Study of Chadian learners/ speakers of English's pronunciation. *Language Teaching, 11*(10),1-9.

[29] Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *IRAL: International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 10*(3), 209-231.

[30] Sharma, L.R. (2021). Significance of teaching the pronunciation of segmental and suprasegmental features of English. *Interdisciplinary Research in Education, 6* (2), 65-78.

[31] Silveira, R. (2013). Pronunciation instruction and syllabic-pattern discrimination. In J. Levis & K. LeVelle (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 4th Pronunciation in Second Language learning and Teaching Conference*. Aug. 2012. (pp.147-156). Iowa State University: Ames, IA.

[32] Sompong, M. (2014). Error Analysis. *Thammasat Review, 16* (2), 109-127.

[33] Trubetzkoy, N.S. (1939). Principles of Phonology. (Trans. by Christiane, A.M.B. from *Grundzuge der Phonologie,* 1962, 3rd ed.). Berkey and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

[34] Yagiz, O., Kaya, F., & Otugen, R. (2024). The effectiveness of L2 pronunciation instruction: A critical systematic review of the intervention studies. *The Literacy Trek,10*(1), 21-41.