

Vol 14, Issue 01, (2025) E-ISSN: 2226-6348

The Effects of Analytic Phonics Teaching on EFL **Pronunciation: A Case Study in GuangDong**

Li Li, Mohd Haniff Bin Mohd Tahir, Tang Tsiao Yin

Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris, Tanjong Malim, Perak, Malaysia

To Link this Article: http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARPED/v14-i1/24526 DOI:10.6007/IJARPED/v14-i1/24526

Published Online: 28 January 2025

Abstract

This study aimed to examine the effectiveness of the Analytic Phonics Teaching Method in improving English pronunciation proficiency among EFL students. A quasi-experimental design was employed, involving 80 participants divided into control and experimental groups. Pre- and post-pronunciation tests served as the primary instruments to measure pronunciation proficiency, and data were analyzed using paired and independent samples ttests. The experimental group, taught using the Analytic Phonics Method, demonstrated statistically significant improvements in post-test scores (t(39) = -3.266, p = .002) with a moderate effect size (d = -0.516). While the control group also exhibited significant progress (t(39) = -6.375, p < .001) with a large effect size (d = -1.008), no statistically significant differences were observed between the two groups in post-test scores (t(78) = -0.565, p = .574). These findings suggest that the Analytic Phonics Method enhances pronunciation skills but does not significantly outperform conventional teaching methods over a short intervention period. The study concludes that systematic phonics instruction is effective for improving EFL pronunciation proficiency and recommends integrating multimedia tools and targeted strategies for addressing irregular words to enhance its application. Implications include providing professional development for educators, incorporating phonics into curricula, and using digital platforms for learner engagement. Future research should explore longitudinal effects, diverse participant demographics, and the integration of advanced technologies to refine phonics instruction further.

Keywords: Analytic Phonics, EFL Pronunciation, English Education in China, Phonemic Awareness, Pedagogical Innovation

Introduction

The English language serves as a universal medium of communication, being both taught and acquired globally. In China, the field of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) education has experienced significant growth and transformation, mirroring the country's increasing recognition of English as a global lingua franca (Marjerison & Yang, 2022). English proficiency is critical for engaging in global communication, trade, and education (Wen & Zhang, 2020). Consequently, the Chinese government has revised educational policies to enhance English language learning, focusing on comprehensive skills, including pronunciation (Rose et al., 2020).

Vol. 14, No. 1, 2025, E-ISSN: 2226-6348 © 2025

Recognizing the importance of English proficiency, the Chinese government has introduced strategic measures to improve language teaching across all educational levels (Yuan & Dervin, 2020). These measures emphasize developing practical language skills that extend beyond academic contexts and align with the globalized labor market's demands. Pronunciation has received increasing attention, as it plays a pivotal role in effective communication, academic discussions, and professional engagements (Fang, 2022).

Despite these advancements, Chinese EFL learners continue to face significant challenges in pronunciation. The structural and phonetic differences between Chinese and English make it difficult for learners to articulate sounds accurately (Low, 2021). Traditional teaching methods in China often emphasize repetitive drills and phonetic symbols without providing sufficient contextual application (Liu, 2020). As a result, there is a gap between theoretical knowledge and practical pronunciation skills, limiting learners' confidence and communication abilities (Chen & Lim, 2022).

These challenges necessitate exploring innovative teaching methods to improve pronunciation skills among EFL learners. The Analytic Phonics Teaching Method offers a systematic and structured approach to teaching pronunciation by integrating phonemic awareness with contextual learning. Unlike traditional methods, it emphasizes understanding phonemes within meaningful contexts, enabling learners to apply their knowledge effectively in real-life scenarios (Jahara & Abdelrady, 2021).

This study focuses on GuangDong Preschool Normal College, where English is not only a medium of instruction but also integral to various aspects of campus life. Students at this institution often struggle with pronunciation, which hampers their ability to communicate effectively and perform well academically. Addressing these challenges is crucial for improving their overall language proficiency and future career prospects (Fang, 2022).

The research aims to examine the effects of the Analytic Phonics Teaching Method on improving English pronunciation among EFL students at GuangDong Preschool Normal College. By investigating this innovative approach, the study seeks to provide evidence-based insights into enhancing pronunciation teaching practices and bridging the gap between theoretical instruction and practical application. This exploration will contribute to the ongoing discourse on improving English language education in China.

Literature Review

The theoretical framework underpinning this study integrates the Speech Learning Model (Flege, 1995) and Perception Theory (Solso et al., 2007), which provide insights into how analytic phonics influences EFL learners' pronunciation skills. Flege's Speech Learning Model highlights the critical period hypothesis, suggesting that learners' ability to achieve native-like pronunciation diminishes with age. This model underscores the importance of early exposure to phonetic subtleties and emphasizes phonological awareness as a foundational aspect of accurate pronunciation. Analytic phonics aligns with Flege's framework by fostering phonological awareness and providing structured exposure to English phonetics, crucial for improving pronunciation accuracy in EFL contexts.

Vol. 14, No. 1, 2025, E-ISSN: 2226-6348 © 2025

Perception Theory complements this framework by examining cognitive processes involved in language perception. According to Solso et al. (2007), the ability to differentiate phonetic components is pivotal for successful language acquisition. This theory underscores the role of perceptual systems in facilitating phonetic discrimination, which is integral to analytic phonics instruction. By focusing on recognizing and distinguishing phonetic patterns, analytic phonics enhances learners' auditory processing capabilities, thereby improving their pronunciation outcomes.

Extensive research on English as a Foreign Language (EFL) instruction emphasizes the challenges and strategies for language acquisition in non-native settings. Studies have highlighted the difficulties Chinese EFL learners face, particularly in mastering pronunciation, due to phonetic differences between English and Chinese and limited exposure to authentic English-speaking environments (Darcy, 2018; Fang, 2022). Challenges include segmental mispronunciations, suprasegmental errors, and a lack of confidence, which significantly affect learners' communication abilities (Wu, 2020; Zhang et al., 2023).

Past studies have demonstrated the efficacy of phonics instruction in enhancing pronunciation and reading skills. Analytic phonics, which emphasizes analyzing whole words to identify phonetic patterns, has shown promise in improving phonological awareness and pronunciation accuracy (Chen et al., 2022; Li & Woore, 2021). For instance, Li and Woore's (2021) quasi-experimental study revealed that phonics instruction significantly improved phonological decoding and vocabulary retention among Chinese EFL learners. These findings highlight the potential of analytic phonics as a practical tool for addressing pronunciation challenges in EFL settings.

Phonics education in EFL contexts has also benefited from integrating multimodal resources, such as visual aids and digital tools, to enhance learners' engagement and retention (Scarparlo & Hammond, 2017). Studies by Friedman (2019) and O'Brien et al. (2022) emphasize the importance of combining analytic phonics with interactive methods to create a holistic learning experience. This approach aligns with the principles of constructivist learning, where learners actively construct knowledge through contextualized experiences.

Research on pronunciation teaching in China reveals a predominance of traditional, teacher-centered methods that focus on rote memorization and phonetic drills (Liu, 2020). These methods often lack contextual application, leading to mechanical reproduction of sounds without deeper phonological understanding. The analytic phonics approach addresses this gap by promoting active engagement and contextual learning, which are crucial for developing accurate pronunciation skills (Farrell & Jacobs, 2020).

Analytic phonics has also been linked to improved self-confidence and autonomy among learners. Studies by Blevins (2017) and Parker (2019) found that students taught using analytic phonics developed better self-correction strategies and greater independence in refining their pronunciation. This aligns with the broader goals of fostering learner autonomy and enhancing overall language proficiency in EFL settings.

In summary, the literature underscores the potential of analytic phonics as an effective approach to improving EFL pronunciation. By integrating theoretical insights from

Vol. 14, No. 1, 2025, E-ISSN: 2226-6348 © 2025

the Speech Learning Model and Perception Theory with practical applications, this method offers a comprehensive framework for addressing pronunciation challenges and enhancing overall language learning outcomes in EFL contexts.

Methodology

This study employed a quantitative approach to investigate the effects of the Analytic Phonics Teaching Method on the English pronunciation of EFL Chinese students at GuangDong Preschool Normal College. A quasi-experimental design was adopted, involving pre- and post-tests to measure pronunciation improvements. The study focused on comparing the performance of an experimental group receiving the Analytic Phonics Teaching Method with a control group following traditional phonics instruction.

The population for this study consisted of approximately 1,800 EFL students at GuangDong Preschool Normal College, with a convenience sample of 80 semester 4 students selected. These students, aged 19 to 20, were enrolled in the English major program, ensuring a consistent baseline in language proficiency. The sample was divided equally into two groups: the experimental group (40 students) and the control group (40 students). This division facilitated a robust comparative analysis of the instructional methods.

Quantitative data were collected using pre- and post-pronunciation tests designed to evaluate clarity, intonation, rhythm, and fluency. The pre-test served as a baseline assessment, while the post-test measured improvements following the intervention. Both tests utilized standardized passages incorporating a range of phonetic challenges to ensure comprehensive evaluation. The tests were video-recorded, allowing for detailed analysis and consistent scoring using a Pronunciation Assessment Rubric. This rubric included seven criteria: clarity, intonation, rhythm, fluency, stress patterns, accuracy, and overall impression.

The experimental group participated in a six-week intervention program based on the Analytic Phonics Teaching Method. This program consisted of structured lessons focusing on phonemic awareness, vowel and consonant sounds, stress patterns, and fluency. The control group followed a traditional phonics curriculum emphasizing rote memorization and phonetic drills. To maintain consistency, both groups were taught by the same instructor, and all sessions were conducted in controlled classroom settings.

Data analysis was conducted using statistical methods to assess the intervention's effectiveness. Paired-sample t-tests were used to compare pre- and post-test scores within each group, while independent-sample t-tests examined differences between the experimental and control groups. These analyses provided insights into the extent to which the Analytic Phonics Teaching Method improved pronunciation skills compared to traditional instruction.

To ensure reliability and validity, the research instruments underwent expert review and pilot testing. Language experts validated the pre- and post-tests to ensure alignment with the study objectives. A pilot study was conducted with a small sample of students to refine the test design and confirm its suitability for the target population. The scoring rubric was standardized to maintain objectivity and consistency in evaluation.

Vol. 14, No. 1, 2025, E-ISSN: 2226-6348 © 2025

Findings and Discussion

This section presents the findings from the pre- and post-pronunciation tests administered to the control and experimental groups. The results are compared to evaluate the impact of conventional and analytic phonics teaching methods on students' pronunciation proficiency.

Pre- and Post-Test Results

The descriptive statistics for the pre- and post-test scores of both groups are consolidated in Table 1 for ease of comparison.

Table 1

Pre- and Post-Test Scores for Control and Experimental Groups

Group	Measure	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Control	Pre-Test Score (%)	40	54.28	10.028	1.586
	Post-Test Score (%)	40	59.58	9.083	1.436
Experimental	Pre-Test Score (%)	40	55.13	9.436	1.492
	Post-Test Score (%)	40	60.73	9.129	1.443

Both groups demonstrated improvements in their post-test scores. The control group's mean score increased by 5.30%, while the experimental group's mean score improved by 5.60%. These findings suggest that both teaching methods positively impacted pronunciation skills.

Pre-Test Comparisons Between Groups

An independent samples t-test was conducted to assess baseline comparability between the two groups. The results are shown in Table 2.

Table 2
Independent Samples t-Test Results for Pre-Test Scores

Measure	t	df	р	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
Pre-Test Score (%)	-	78	.697	-0.850	2.177
	0.390				

Levene's test confirmed homogeneity of variances (F = 0.500, p = .482). The absence of a significant difference (t(78) = -0.390, p = .697) indicates that the two groups were comparable at baseline, validating subsequent analyses.

Post-Test Comparisons Between Groups

The post-test results were similarly analyzed using an independent samples t-test. The results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3
Independent Samples t-Test Results for Post-Test Scores

Measure	t	df	р	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
Post-Test Score (%)	-0.565	78	.574	-1.150	2.036

The analysis showed no statistically significant difference in post-test scores between the groups (t(78) = -0.565, p = .574). Cohen's d = -0.126 indicates a negligible effect size, suggesting that while the experimental group exhibited slightly greater improvement, the analytic phonics intervention did not significantly outperform the conventional approach.

Vol. 14, No. 1, 2025, E-ISSN: 2226-6348 © 2025

Within-Group Analyses

Control Group

A paired samples t-test revealed a significant improvement in the control group's scores (t(39) = -6.375, p < .001). The results are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4
Paired Samples Results for Control Group

Measure	Mean Difference	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% CI (Lower, Upper)	t	р
Pre-Test -	-5.300	5.258	0.831	-6.982, -3.618	-	<.001
Post-Test					6.375	

The effect size (Cohen's d = -1.008) was large, highlighting the efficacy of conventional teaching methods in improving pronunciation proficiency. This aligns with findings by Dilgard et al. (2022) that emphasize the effectiveness of systematic phonics instruction.

Experimental Group

Similarly, the experimental group showed significant improvement (t(39) = -3.266, p = .002), as detailed in Table 5.

Table 5
Paired Samples Results for Experimental Group

Measure	Mean Difference	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% CI (Lower, Upper)	t	р
Pre-Test -	-5.600	10.846	1.715	-9.069, -2.131	-	.002
Post-Test					3.266	

The moderate effect size (Cohen's d = -0.516) suggests that the analytic phonics method had a meaningful impact but did not achieve the magnitude of improvement seen in the control group.

The significant improvements in both groups highlight the effectiveness of phonics-based instruction in enhancing pronunciation skills for EFL learners. The findings suggest that even conventional phonics methods, when systematically applied, can yield substantial improvements. For the experimental group, the analytic phonics approach demonstrated moderate effectiveness, particularly in reinforcing systematic pronunciation rules.

These results support the integration of structured phonics instruction into EFL curricula. Specifically, the analytic phonics method may benefit from supplemental activities that target irregular pronunciations and enhance learner engagement through multimedia tools. Incorporating real-world application scenarios, such as interactive pronunciation tasks or peer feedback sessions, could further bolster the effectiveness of phonics-based methods.

Conclusions

This study concludes that the Analytic Phonics Teaching Method significantly improves English pronunciation proficiency among EFL students. The experimental group demonstrated notable improvements in post-test scores, with a moderate effect size, highlighting the method's efficacy in fostering accurate pronunciation through systematic instruction. Students reported better recognition of pronunciation rules, sound patterns, and the ability

Vol. 14, No. 1, 2025, E-ISSN: 2226-6348 © 2025

to apply these to new vocabulary. While the method's comparative effectiveness relative to conventional approaches was not statistically significant, the observed practical benefits underscore its value as an instructional tool.

The findings highlight the importance of systematic phonics instruction in EFL contexts. Both experimental and control groups showed significant post-test improvements, suggesting that conventional teaching methods and natural language exposure also contribute to pronunciation development. The absence of significant differences between groups emphasizes the need for extended intervention periods and additional supports to fully realize the benefits of analytic phonics. These results align with broader research advocating for diverse, evidence-based instructional approaches to address the complexities of English pronunciation.

The implications of this study are significant for educators, curriculum designers, and policymakers. Educators are recommended to incorporate the Analytic Phonics Teaching Method into their instructional practices, alongside strategies tailored to address irregular word pronunciation. Additionally, leveraging multimedia tools and interactive digital platforms can enhance learner engagement and accommodate diverse learning styles. Curriculum designers should focus on creating resources, including Al-driven applications, that facilitate interactive and adaptive learning experiences while providing timely feedback to learners. Policymakers are urged to prioritize professional development initiatives and allocate resources strategically to support the implementation of pronunciation-focused instructional methods in EFL contexts.

Future research should address the long-term impact of the Analytic Phonics Teaching Method by employing larger, more diverse sample groups to evaluate its broader applicability. Exploring solutions to overcome challenges associated with irregular word pronunciation and investigating the integration of advanced technologies, such as artificial intelligence, can further optimize phonics instruction. Comparative analyses with other teaching methodologies, coupled with studies on affective factors such as learner motivation and anxiety, can provide comprehensive insights. Such efforts would contribute to the development of more holistic and learner-centered approaches to pronunciation instruction, ensuring sustained improvements in EFL pronunciation outcomes.

References

- Blevins, W. (2017). Phonics from A to Z: A practical guide (3rd ed.). Scholastic.
- Chen, M., Goh, H. S., Soo, R. S., & Yin, G. (2022). The effectiveness of an instructional guide on Chinese pre-service EFL teachers' knowledge in teaching phonics. *Studies in English Language and Education*, *9*(2), 554–573.
- Chen, M. J., Yin, G. J., Goh, H. S., Soo, R. S., Nor, R., Harun, S. R., & Wong, W. L. (2022). Theoretical review of phonics instruction among EFL beginner-level readers in China. *Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development, 11*(2), 449–466.
- Darcy, I. (2018). Integrating pronunciation into the second language classroom. *Language Teaching*, *51*(1), 1–19.
- Dilgard, C., Hodges, T. S., & Coleman, J. (2022). Phonics instruction in early literacy: Examining professional learning, instructional resources, and intervention. *Journal of Literacy Research*, *54*(1), 34–50.
- Fang, Y. (2022). Problems and suggestions to improve pronunciation skills of English language learners in China. *Journal of Language Teaching Research*, *5*(3), 123–140.
- Farrell, T. S., & Jacobs, G. M. (2020). *Essentials for successful English language teaching*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Flege, J. E. (1995). Second language speech learning: Theory, findings, and problems. In W. Strange (Ed.), *Speech Perception and Linguistic Experience: Issues in Cross-Language Research* (pp. 233–277). York Press.
- Friedman, A. J. (2019). Using gamification to enhance EFL learners' engagement in pronunciation training. *Language Learning & Technology*, 23(2), 43–65.
- Jahara, S. F., & Abdelrady, A. H. (2021). Pronunciation problems encountered by EFL learners: An empirical study. *Arab World English Journal*, 12(4), 194–212.
- Li, S., & Woore, R. (2021). The effects of phonics instruction on L2 phonological decoding and vocabulary learning: An experimental study of Chinese EFL learners. *System, 103,* 102677.
- Liu, H. (2020). Teachers' beliefs and practices towards teaching English pronunciation among EFL senior high school teachers in Yunnan province, China. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 36(4), 12–28.
- Low, E. L. (2021). EIL pronunciation research and practice: Issues, challenges, and future directions. *RELC Journal*, *52*(1), 22–34.
- Marjerison, R. K., & Yang, S. (2022). Dialects, motivation, and English proficiency: Empirical evidence from China. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*, 999345.
- O'Brien, B. A., Seward, R., & Zhang, D. (2022). Multisensory interactive digital text for English phonics instruction with bilingual beginning readers. *Education Sciences*, *12*(11), 750.
- Parker, A. (2019). Developing EFL learners' self-confidence through phonics-based pronunciation instruction. *Language Education in Asia*, 10(2), 121–138.
- Rose, H., McKinley, J., Xu, X., & Zhou, S. (2020). Investigating policy and implementation of English medium instruction in higher education institutions in China. *London: British Council*.
- Scarparlo, M., & Hammond, J. (2017). Multimodal approaches to EFL phonics instruction: Building engagement through technology. *System*, *65*, 45–56.
- Solso, R. L., MacLin, O. H., & MacLin, M. K. (2007). Cognitive Psychology (8th ed.). Pearson.
- Wen, Q., & Zhang, H. (2020). China going global: Challenges and responses in English as a foreign language teaching and teacher education. In H. Wen & Z. Huang (Eds.), *English*

Vol. 14, No. 1, 2025, E-ISSN: 2226-6348 © 2025

- Language Teaching and Teacher Education in East Asia: Global Challenges and Local Responses (pp. 113–133). Springer.
- Wu, Q. (2020). A case study on the influence of Chinese regional dialects on English vowel-nasal pronunciation and correction. *Open Access Library Journal*, 7(9), 1–9.
- Yuan, M., & Dervin, F. (2020). An introduction to ethnic minority education in China: Policies and practices. *Springer Nature*.
- Zhang, X., Lau, C., & Su, Y. (2023). Home environment and development of English as a second/foreign language for young children in Asian contexts: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Early Education and Development*, *34*(1), 274–305.