

Miller, J. S. (2012). Teaching pronunciation with phonetics in a beginner French course: Impact of sound perception. In J. Levis & K. LeVelle (Eds.). *Proceedings of the 3rd Pronunciation in Second Language Learning and Teaching Conference*, Sept. 2011. (pp. 109-123). Ames, IA: Iowa State University.

TEACHING PRONUNCIATION WITH PHONETICS IN A BEGINNER FRENCH COURSE: IMPACT ON SOUND PERCEPTION

Jessica S. Miller, University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire

Recent studies have suggested that L2 learners' pronunciation benefits from explicit instruction. The present exploratory study examines how two different teaching methods impact L2 French learners' sound discrimination skills. One approach employs phonetics and explicit teaching while the other relies on reference words and repeating after the instructor. Results from discrimination tests helped gauge the learners' aural performances. Written surveys addressed the effectiveness of the two teaching methods from the students' perspectives. Qualitative analyses suggested that a majority of students favored explicit instruction. They reported benefitting from using phonetic symbols to compare and contrast French sounds. Quantitative analyses indicated that discrimination improved regardless of the explicit teaching approach but only significantly when the phonetic approach was introduced before the reference approach. Therefore, the phonetic method may have a positive impact in the short term and the reference method in the long term. Combining methods at different stages of the learning process may be the most efficient way to help learners discriminate foreign sounds accurately.

INTRODUCTION

Second languages are taught with the assumed goal of learners eventually using them to communicate. Therefore, communicative situations are typically created within the classroom to prepare students for authentic interactions. In that context, skills like reading/writing and listening/speaking cannot be dissociated; learners read what someone has written, they write what someone will later read, they listen to someone who speaks, and they speak to someone who listens. Consequently, the acquisition of pronunciation seems to be closely tied to that of listening, which is why this study examines them together. Both skills play an important role developing intelligibility, and the ability to listen and to hear different cues in particular contributes to the development of proficiency (Richards, 2008). Darcy, Ewert, Chen, Wang, & Lidster (2011) have found that L2 instructors assign great value to the teaching of pronunciation, even those who report including it sporadically in their classes. Their research underlined obstacles to consistent inclusion of pronunciation instruction linked to lack of training in that area (e.g., not knowing what features to teach and when, not having proper teaching materials, and wondering how to address the link between perception and production).

The tie between perception and production is indeed crucial. The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) provides national standards (2002) to which most language teachers must adhere in the United States to be certified by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). Those standards include a "Phonology" category with recommendations that clearly connect listening and speaking abilities. In order to meet the ACTFL standards teaching candidates must be able to "identify phonemes and allophones of the target language." They further describe them as understanding "the rules of the sound system of the target language. They diagnose their own target language pronunciation difficulties" (p. 11).

This description lends further support to the idea that pronunciation; listening and speaking cooperate as building blocks towards proficiency.

Teaching candidates who exceed the ACTFL standards are able to “describe the differences between the phonological systems of the target and their native languages” (p. 11). But before being able to describe such differences, learners have to notice them and become aware of linguistic distinctions before they become able to correctly utilize those features to communicate. For example, Schmidt (1990, p. 139) explained that intake, i.e., the fragment of input that is noticed by the learner, is what initiates second language development. Therefore, audio input must first be interpreted correctly to become intake, and only then will learners be able to produce it correctly as oral output. The present study focuses on ways to turn input into intake (the first two steps in this process) through pronunciation and listening activities.

Teaching Pronunciation and Discrimination to Beginners

There are several ways to teach listening discrimination through pronunciation at the beginner level of L2 study. One widely used approach is listening and repeating after the instructor. However, students may not actually notice differences with this technique unless the instructor points them out explicitly. A lesser known technique known as “the silent way” involves no modeling of pronunciation outside of regular conversational input between instructor and students so as to allow learners to discover it on their own (Gattegno, 1962, described in Messum, 2011). This potentially forces learners to pay more attention to available input and to notice differences as they reflect on what the correct output should be. Whatever approach teachers select in beginner courses, it is generally their responsibility to add aural and oral pronunciation instruction to their curriculum as little information is included in published teaching material.

An examination of five textbooks of beginning French, *En Avant* (Anderson, Golato & Blatty, 2012), *Points de Départ* (Scullen, Pons & Valdman, 2012), *Mais oui!* (Thompson & Phillips, 2012), *Contacts* (Valette & Valette, 2009), and *Paroles* (Magnan, Martin Berg & Berg, 2006) showed that formal discrimination and pronunciation practice is often relegated to workbook exercises completed by learners individually at home or in a language lab and not systematically included within the textbooks. Every book reviewed included some use of the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) and some listening prompts to test vocabulary. However, the extent of formal phonemic instruction varied greatly from one book to another. For example, the authors of *Contacts* (Valette & Valette, 2009) state that “Pronunciation helps are provided, as needed” (p. xiv), showing that pronunciation instruction is still not considered to be necessary all the time in a beginner language class. That book includes one small phonetics lesson on the last page of each chapter, no larger than a quarter of the page. The texts *Points de Départ* (Scullen, Pons & Valdman, 2012) and *Mais Oui!* (Thompson & Phillips, 2012) provide the most information on pronunciation and perception with a full page of phonetic explanation and practice early in each chapter. However, none of the books reviewed recycled speaking and listening tips throughout lessons other than in margin notes available only in instructors’ editions.

Although including pronunciation instruction has clearly established benefits (Elliott, 2003), it is still too often neglected (Derwing, 2010; Lord, 2010). An email received in March 2012 promoting the latest edition of *Entre Amis* (Oates & Oukada, 2012) demonstrates this oversight: “The seamless articulation of vocabulary, grammar, activities, and cultural content is what makes *Entre Amis* so effective. The new Sixth Edition features greater integration of language and

culture, more listening practice, new active learning exercises on the reading and writing processes, and more.” Again, we see a strong focus on grammar and vocabulary with no mention of pronunciation. We are told that the number of listening activities/exercises increased, but it is unclear how or in what way they are linked to the other components and whether or not they were designed to improve perception of sounds at all.

There are usually listening opportunities such as dialogues reviewing grammar or vocabulary in beginner textbooks, but they are rarely linked to specific intelligibility problems that affect L2 perception and pronunciation. For example, French distinguishes plural from singular and masculine from feminine in the pronunciation of articles, not nouns. Thus, the word [mɛʁ] can refer to “la mer” [lamɛʁ] (*the sea*), which is different from “le maire” [ləmɛʁ] (*the mayor*) which is different from “les maires” [lemɛʁ] (*the mayors*), although the pronunciation of the noun itself never changes and only the vowel in the article as well as context would give cues on meaning. During dictation exercises in beginner French courses, I have observed many students unable to correctly spell articles, even when I isolated them and explicitly identified the distinctions to help them notice them. Learners often experience difficulty in mapping pronunciation with the different forms of the articles. How can they subsequently make the distinction in pronunciation themselves if they cannot successfully discriminate them? A connection between perception and pronunciation needs to happen.

Pedagogical Goals

This empirical exploration is driven by pedagogical concerns and motivated by the desire to efficiently integrate discrimination and pronunciation instruction in the L2 beginner curriculum so as to facilitate basic functionality. Teaching pronunciation has perhaps been left aside because of the conviction that perfecting a foreign accent is nearly impossible in adulthood (Saalfeld, 2011) and also because teaching methods are now more focused on communicative practices. Those exercises emphasize general function and task-based practice to the detriment of drills that used to be widely used to teach pronunciation and listening (Richards, 2008). Bringing pronunciation instruction into the communicative language teaching classroom would give beginner learners opportunities to listen and speak right away as well as understand the significance of intelligibility and its connection to functionality when pronunciation is paired with discrimination activities. However obvious the importance of perception and pronunciation may be for a teacher, informal discussions with students suggest that they do not automatically appreciate their significance until their instructor makes them work on them through practice and assessment.

This pilot study looks at two specific ways to establish a relationship between listening and speaking while emphasizing intelligibility. Both approaches let learners discover letter-to-sound correspondences by listening to the instructor pronounce meaningful minimal pairs associated with a grammatical function. Then learners compare them and formulate the rules before addressing them explicitly. The difference is that one technique (henceforth called the reference approach) relies on reference words already familiar to learners and containing target sounds. The other technique (henceforth the phonetic approach) instead draws support from phonetics, “the study of the sounds of speech, their production, combination, description, and representation by written symbols” (Dansereau, 1995, p. 639), by using symbols and articulatory descriptions to contrast minimal pairs.

Research Questions

The reference approach was selected because it seems to be common and is intuitive. Dansereau (1995) recommends focusing on spelling-to-sound correspondences “by the use of orthographic examples” (p. 639) to teach French pronunciation. She proposes the use of phonetic symbols only at advanced levels so that beginners do not feel overwhelmed by additional unfamiliar codes such as the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA). However, despite Dansereau’s reservations, the use of phonetic symbols at beginning levels may actually benefit students who later pursue advanced language studies. This study proposes to gather data to explore the question. In addition, the study of phonetics at more advanced levels has been shown to have a positive impact on the pronunciation of L2 learners in Spanish (Castino, 1996; Lord, 2005), English (Aliaga-García, 2007; Lu, 2002), Arabic (Huthaily, 2008), and has an appeal to beginner students of French who reported finding it helpful (Miller, 2012). It is conceivable that the use of phonetic symbols at beginning levels has a positive effect on perception skills.

Finally, Dansereau herself noted: “Students who are constantly aware of phonetics tend not to develop bad pronunciation habits [...] and [...] learn not only to pronounce better, but also to listen better. Such students develop better auditory discrimination habits” (1995, p. 640). Therefore, a learner who is made aware of those differences may be more likely to both hear and produce target sounds with accuracy. My research questions are as follows.

1. What kind of impact does the phonetic approach really have on learners’ discrimination skills at the beginner level?
2. How does that technique compare with the reference technique?

Research on advanced college-aged learners of Spanish (Rasmussen & Zampini, 2010) suggests that training in phonetics can improve the intelligibility of native speakers for English-speaking learners. What is the situation for French? This study will bring empirical evidence to the table in an attempt to answer such questions at the introductory level.

METHODS

Quantitative and qualitative data were collected in 2010 from college students enrolled in two sections of a French 101 course at a mid-sized liberal arts university in the Midwest.

Participants

While up to 54 students can enroll in French 101 every semester, only a total of 23 who agreed to voluntarily participate in the study were present for all of the experimental treatments: 11 in section one, and 12 in section two. This low study sample is a limitation of this study. The following results therefore reflect trends and cannot be generalized until more data are gathered from a larger population.

Procedure

All learners received pronunciation instruction with the two techniques described above for a total of four formal pronunciation lessons (see Table 1 for details, and Appendices A and B for examples of student worksheets), each lasting approximately 15 minutes. After the lessons, the target sounds were reviewed briefly and informally as they appeared with new vocabulary in subsequent chapters. As researcher and teacher, I controlled the time allotted for the experimental treatment so that all participants would be equally exposed to it. As a teacher, I

made sure to recycle the material when the opportunity arose, making sure to do so in both sections.

Table 1.

Experimental Methods and Data Used in this Study

Participants	23 student volunteers in all
Teaching techniques	phonetic approach (n=12) reference approach (n=11)
Lessons using those techniques	Four 15-minute lessons every two weeks
Written surveys	Two in all: one before and one after all treatments
Discrimination assessment	Five in all: one before, and one after each lesson

During the first half of the semester, section one was introduced to pronunciation lessons 1 and 2 with the phonetic approach and section two with the reference approach. During the last half of the semester, section one was introduced to lessons 3 and 4 with the reference approach, and section two with the phonetic approach (see Table 2 below for details). This design was previously used in Miller's production study (2012) and was created around the perception and production of common minimal pairs following Kelly (2000) and Arteaga (2000) who suggested teaching pronunciation by relying on familiar example words that tend to generate confusion. I also agree with the intelligibility principle described by Hendrickson (1979), Levis (2005), and Derwing (2010): pronunciation errors affecting intelligibility should be prioritized. Thus, high-frequency minimal pairs seemed like a good resource to work on discrimination and pronunciation in an introductory L2 course.

Instruments

To evaluate progress and the impact of each treatment approach, a discrimination assessment was administered as a pre-test (see Appendix C) at the beginning of the semester, and then again after each lesson (for a total of one pre-test and four post-tests). For those tests, students heard words containing target sounds and were asked to circle the matching written form among a choice of three possible answers, most often all minimal pairs. Pre- and post-treatment written surveys contributed to understanding the effectiveness of the two teaching methods from the students' perspectives. Additionally, although not discussed here, one pronunciation question on each of the five in-class exams, three recordings, and a final oral exam weighed heavily on the students' course grades. Those course components not only helped gauge the learners' oral performances but also provided external incentives to pay attention, take good notes, and do well on discrimination tests.

Table 2.
Topics of Each Lesson Plan and Timing of Treatment

	PHONEMES	GRAPHEMES	MINIMAL PAIRS	FUNCTION
LESSON 1	[$\tilde{\epsilon}$] vs. [\tilde{a}] vs. [\tilde{o}]	in, ein, ain, un im, eim, aim, um an, en, am, em on, om	vent, vingt vent, vont vingt, vont [<i>wind, twenty, go</i>]	To distinguish pronouns and articles such as “un” [<i>a</i>], “on” [<i>we</i>], and “en” [<i>some</i>]
LESSON 2	[s] vs. [z]	ss s (between two vowels and in liaison)	poisson, poison [<i>fish, poison</i>]	To work on liaison and distinguish between “ils ont” [<i>they have</i>] and “ils sont” [<i>they are</i>]
LESSON 3	[y] vs. [u]	u, ou	tu, tout [<i>you, all</i>]	To clarify meaning in descriptions, as in “russe” [<i>Russian</i>] and “rousse” [<i>red-haired</i>]
LESSON 4	[ə] vs. [e]	e	le, les [<i>the, singular and plural</i>]	To distinguish singular and plural in articles and prepositions, as in “de” [<i>of the sing.</i>] and “des” [<i>of the plur.</i>]

RESULTS

Quantitative Findings

Despite a decreased number of errors in both sections from the pre-test to the last discrimination test after lesson 4 (a 46% decrease for section one, and a 40% decrease for section two, shown in Tables 3, 4, and 5), paired samples *t*-tests revealed that the reduction is significant for section one only, i.e. the section that started the semester with phonetic instruction and finished it with the reference approach ($t(10) = 4.82, p < .001$). Furthermore, while both sections made improvements after the first two lessons, comparing the data within each group between the first two lessons shows that this early progress was not statistically significant. Thus, there was only one significant difference in the data comparing within-group progress: section one made significantly fewer errors on the discrimination test from the beginning to the end of the semester. Section two made fewer errors as well, but not statistically significantly so. In other words, while both sections made improvements, only section one’s improvement was significant.

Independent samples *t*-tests showed that there were no significant differences between groups at any stage of the semester. Comparing groups immediately after the pre-test, after the first two treatments, or even at the end of the semester when each section had been instructed with both approaches yielded no significant results. That means that the pronunciation teaching techniques

under investigation had an equal effect on the learners' discrimination skills throughout the semester: one group did not perform significantly worse or better than the other.

This quantitative analysis consequently suggested that the sequence in which the pedagogical techniques are introduced to learners is what matters for within-group improvement. The group that received instruction with the phonetic approach first and the reference approach second made significant improvement (as explained above), while the group that was taught with the reference approach first and the phonetic approach second improved, but not significantly. In other words, introducing phonetics and then utilizing reference words to reinforce pronunciation rules made a statistically significant positive impact on students' discriminatory performances, but not the other way around.

Table 3.
Pre-Test and Post-Test Results for Section One.

	MEAN# OF ERRORS	STD. DEVIATION	% CHANGE FROM PREVIOUS	% CHANGE FROM PRE-TEST
Pre-test	6.18	2.52	N/A	N/A
Post-test 1 [ɛ̃] [ɑ̃] [ɔ̃]	5.82	3.16	- 6.25%	- 6.25%
Post-test 2 [s] [z]	4.55	2.66	- 28%	- 26.47%
Post-test 3 [y] [u]	4.64	3.80	+ 1.96%	- 25.00%
Post-test 4 [ə] [e]	3.36	2.06	- 37.84%	- 45.59%

Table 4.
Pre-Test and Post-Test Results for Section Two.

	MEAN# OF ERRORS	STD. DEVIATION	% CHANGE FROM PREVIOUS	% CHANGE FROM PRE-TEST
Pre-test	5.58	2.54	N/A	N/A
Post-test 1 [ɛ̃] [ɑ̃] [ɔ̃]	5.58	2.71	0.00%	0.00%
Post-test 2 [s] [z]	3.25	2.18	- 41.79%	- 41.79%
Post-test 3 [y] [u]	3.08	2.15	- 5.13%	- 44.78
Post-test 4 [ə] [e]	3.33	2.19	+ 8.11%	- 40.30%

Table 5.
Pre-Test and Post-Test Results for Both Sections: A Comparative View.

	SECTION	MEAN # OF ERRORS	STD. DEVIATION	% CHANGE FROM PREVIOUS	% CHANGE FROM PRE- TEST
Pre-test	1	6.18	2.52	N/A	N/A
	2	5.58	2.54	N/A	N/A
Lesson 1 [ɛ̃] [ɑ̃] [õ]	1 (phon.)	5.82	3.16	- 6.25%	- 6.25%
	2 (ref.)	5.58	2.71	0.00%	0.00%
Lesson 2 [s] [z]	1 (phon.)	4.55	2.66	- 28%	- 26.47%
	2 (ref.)	3.25	2.18	- 41.79%	- 41.79%
Lesson 3 [y] [u]	1 (ref.)	4.64	3.80	+ 1.96%	- 25.00%
	2 (phon.)	3.08	2.15	- 5.13%	- 44.78
Lesson 4 [ə] [e]	1 (ref.)	3.36	2.06	- 37.84%	- 45.59%
	2 (phon.)	3.33	2.19	+ 8.11%	- 40.30%

Qualitative Findings

Qualitative analyses suggested that a majority of students favored explicit instruction. They reported benefitting from using phonetic symbols to compare and contrast French sounds. Quantitative analyses indicated that discrimination improved regardless of the explicit teaching approach but only significantly when the phonetic approach was introduced before the reference approach.

The qualitative data presented in Table 6 helps interpret the quantitative results. A key question on the final survey was: “Among the teaching techniques used by your instructor this semester, describe one or more that you feel helped improve your listening comprehension of French and explain how it helped.” This question purposefully did not identify any teaching method so as to avoid leading the participants. The responses were sorted into categories that emerged upon reading the survey. Respondents often provided answers that fell into multiple categories, which is why there are more answers than participants in Table 6.

The formal pronunciation lessons, regardless of the approach, were mentioned the most as being helpful; 57% of participants identified them as beneficial without specifying reference or phonetic approach. When respondents did identify an approach as beneficial, the phonetic technique was noted the most (by 26% of participants). Minimal pairs, cited by 17% of the students, were used with both approaches but were more prevalent with the reference approach as they were reinforced in applications after the lesson. Therefore they can be tied to the reference approach. It seems that offering learners a structured time for the acquisition of perception and pronunciation skills makes an impact on how well they remember that type of instruction by the end of the semester, perhaps along with its content as well.

Next, another structured learning opportunity was singled out: the discrimination tests given after each formal lesson (22%). Learners felt that they benefited from that sort of assessment, perhaps as an opportunity to test and check their abilities. Aural input was favored as well as 30% of respondents mentioned benefitting from audio and video activities. Teaching pronunciation explicitly was found in 17% of the responses as having a positive impact but respondent did not provide further explanations. Only two students mentioned that listening and repeating after the instructor helped.

Table 6.

Categories, Number of Mentions in Survey Responses, and Percent Out of 23 Respondents

HELPFUL TECHNIQUES FOR LISTENING SKILLS (SELF-REPORTS)	N	%
Formal lessons (teaching approach left unspecified)	13	57%
Phonetics	6	26%
Discrimination tests	5	22%
Minimal pairs	4	17%
Listening (audio)	4	17%
Explicit (unspecified)	4	17%
Listening (video)	3	13%
Repeating after teacher	2	9%

DISCUSSION

This exploratory study suggests that both approaches to teaching pronunciation – phonetics and reference – have merit as they both seem to contribute to improving scores on listening comprehension tests and that learners report finding both helpful. But the sequence in which those techniques are presented to learners may be important. Progress was significant from lesson 1 to lesson 4 in the group that received the phonetic instruction first and learned from the reference method second.

Sequence Matters

There was one significant difference in the data examined above when within-group differences were considered: section one made significantly fewer errors on the discrimination test from the beginning to the end of the semester. Section two made fewer errors as well, but not statistically significantly. Tables 3, 4, and 5 above explore the progress in each group and show that each time the phonetic technique is introduced students make fewer discrimination errors (between -5% and -7% in each section). However, the second time it is employed, learners may make either fewer or more mistakes (-28% in section one – the ‘phonetic first group’, but +8% in section two, the ‘reference first’ group). Table 5 also shows, on the other hand, that each time the reference technique is introduced, students’ number of errors either stagnate or increase (+2% in section one, 0% in section two). But the second time that learners are exposed to it they drastically reduce their number of mistakes (-38% in section one, -42% in section two). A possible interpretation would be that the phonetic approach is successful in introducing phonemic differences for short-term retention, while the reference approach manages to reinforce

and anchor those differences into long-term memory. The reference approach uses common familiar words that are easily recycled throughout the semester, which may aid long-term retention.

One might also postulate that the target sounds in the study have varying difficulties for learners. For example, distinguishing [s] and [z] (lesson 2) for a native speaker of English whose language also makes that distinction would logically be easier than differentiating [y] and [u] (lesson 3). That would explain why the number of mistakes dropped after lesson 2. However, the ability to discern the phonemes does not guarantee correct answers; learners still need to associate them to spelling. For instance, participants had to recognize that *dessert* in French is pronounced with a [s], not a [z] as in English. Success on the discrimination test therefore demonstrates correct phoneme discrimination as well as correct sound-to-spelling matching. As a consequence, the difficulty level of some target sounds depending on learners' native phonology cannot solely be tied to the test scores. What is becoming apparent is that the sequence in which phonemes are introduced and the sequence in which the teaching methods used are likely makes a difference in the learners' ability to correctly identify certain sounds in minimal pairs.

Different Learning Styles

Generally speaking, the formal pronunciation lessons were seen as beneficial by practically every respondent. This may mean that what matters is simply providing explicit instruction of any kind. However, among those who explained their answers, a majority preferred the phonetic technique over the reference technique (26% vs. 17%), suggesting that drawing support from symbols and articulatory information has an appeal to adult beginner learners of French. A participant explains: "I think the phonetics alphabet helped me. Sometimes you look at a word and trying to pronounce it seems overwhelming, but having it written in only phonetics tells you exactly what sounds to make." This comment indicates that the IPA functions as a tool from which learners can benefit. Students are given instruments such as rules, diagrams, and pictures to acquire grammar and vocabulary. Outfitting them with tools such as explanations on what to listen for as well as showing them symbols and correct speech organ placement should contribute to their success with pronunciation and discrimination as well.

Another respondent wrote: "Showing similar sounding words so we can look for patterns was beneficial." The ability to identify recurring patterns and derive rules from them constitutes a crucial step towards noticing, an act directly linked to the intake needed to develop second language skills as mentioned in the introduction. Those patterns can be reinforced visually with phonetics, thus multiplying opportunities for intake. Such visual stimuli are key assets of the phonetic approach. Based on students' comments regarding personal preferences, typical listening and pronunciation exercises mostly appeal to aural learners. Adding a phonetic component with symbols and articulatory demonstrations can create appeal for visual learners as well. This would explain why some respondents noted enjoying video exercises in addition to audio ones: visual cues seem to be helpful to improve listening skills as ways to materialize an aspect of language learning traditionally left unseen, and thus confined to the learners' auditory memory. With phonetic symbols, learners no longer need to depend on their memory alone to retrieve valuable information.

CONCLUSION

The quantitative and qualitative data analyzed in this exploratory study suggested that discrimination skills tended to improve with explicit teaching approaches but improvement was

significant only when the phonetic approach was introduced before the reference approach. Drawing attention to specific phonemic and articulatory differences gives learners the opportunity to notice them, reinforcing those distinctions with recycled familiar words appeared to have a positive significant impact on listening skills. As a consequence, the combination of different techniques was found to likely be the most efficient teaching technique for discrimination skills as was the case for pronunciation development (Lord, 2010; Miller, 2012). Introducing phonetic concepts at an early stage of proficiency may be effective and may enhance the effectiveness of other teaching techniques like the reference approach.

Acknowledgments

The author wishes to acknowledge the support from student differential tuition funds through the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire Summer Research Experiences for Undergraduates Program, as well as the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, the University of Wisconsin System Leadership Site for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, and the University of Wisconsin System Office of Professional and Instructional Development.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Jessica Sertling Miller (Ph.D., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign), a native of Strasbourg, France, is an Assistant Professor of French at the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire. She teaches beginner courses of French as well as French Phonetics and Pronunciation, French for Professional Communication, in addition to courses in conversation and courses in linguistics. She also supervises students in the French Education program. She has published work on French phonology and foreign language pedagogy.

REFERENCES

- ACTFL/NCATE program standards for the preparation of foreign language teachers.* (2002).
Yonkers, NY: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.
- Aliaga-García, C. (2007). The role of phonetic training in L2 speech learning. *Phonetics Teaching & Learning Conference (PTLC)*. Retrieved from http://www.phon.ucl.ac.uk/ptlc/proceedings/ptlcpaper_32e.pdf
- Anderson, B., Golato, P., & Blatty, S. (2012). *En avant!: Beginning French*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Arteaga, D. L. (2000). Articulatory phonetics in the first-year Spanish classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 84(3), 339-354.
- Castino, J. (1996). Impact of a phonetics course on FL learners' acquisition of Spanish phonology. *Selecta: Journal of the Pacific Northwest Council on Foreign Languages*, 17: 55-58.
- Dansereau, D. (1995). Phonetics in the beginning and intermediate oral proficiency-oriented French classroom. *The French Review*, 68(4): 638-651.
- Darcy, I., Ewert, D., Chen, X., Wang, L., & Lidster, R. (2011). Bringing pronunciation instruction back into the classroom: An ESL Teachers' pronunciation "toolbox".

Pronunciation in Second Language Learning and Teaching Conference, Iowa State University. Ames, Iowa.

- Derwing, T. M. (2010). Utopian goals for pronunciation teaching. In J. Levis and K. LeVelle (Eds.). *Proceedings of the 1st Pronunciation in Second Language Learning and Teaching Conference* (24-37). Ames, IA, Iowa State University.
- Elliott, A. R. (2003). Staking out the territory at the turn of the century: Integrating phonological theory, research, and the effect of formal instruction on pronunciation in the acquisition of Spanish as a second language. In B. A. Lafford & R. Salaberry (Eds.), *Spanish Second Language Acquisition: State of the Science* (19-46). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Gattegno, C. (1962). *Teaching foreign languages in schools: The silent way*. Reading: Educational Explorers.
- Hendrickson, J. M. (1979). Evaluating spontaneous communication through systematic error analysis. *Foreign Language Annals*, 12(5), 357-364.
- Huthaily, K. Y. (2008). *Second language instruction with phonological knowledge: Teaching Arabic to speakers of English*. University of Montana, Missoula.
- Kelly, G. (2000). *How to teach pronunciation*. Upper Saddle River: Pearson Education Limited.
- Levis, J. (2005). Changing contexts and shifting paradigms in pronunciation teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39: 369-377.
- Lord, G. (2005). (How) can we teach foreign language pronunciation? The effects of a phonetics class on second language pronunciation. *Hispania*, 88(3): 557-567.
- Lord, G. (2010). The combined effects of immersion and instruction on second language pronunciation. *Foreign Language Annals*, 43(3): 388-503.
- Lu, D. (2002). Phonetic symbols: a necessary stepping stone for ESL learners. *Forum*, 40(4), 36-39.
- Magnan, S., Martin Berg, L., & Berg W. J. (2006). *Paroles, 3rd edition*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Messum, P. (2011). Teaching pronunciation without using imitation. *Pronunciation in Second Language Learning and Teaching Conference, Iowa State University*. Ames, Iowa.
- Miller, J. S. (2012). Teaching French pronunciation with phonetics in a college-level beginner French course". *The NECTFL Review*, 69, 47-68.
- Oates, M. D. & Oukada L. (2012). *Entre amis, 6th edition*. Stamford, CT: Heinle.
- Rasmussen, J., & Zampini, M. (2010). The effects of phonetics training on the intelligibility and comprehensibility of native Spanish speech by second language learners. In J. Levis and K. LeVelle (Eds.). *Proceedings of the 1st Pronunciation in Second Language Learning and Teaching Conference* (38-52).
- Richards, J. C. (2008). *Teaching Listening and Speaking: From Theory to Practice*. Singapore: Regional Language Centre.

Saalfeld, A.K. (2011). Acquisition of L2 phonology in advanced learners: Does instruction make a difference? *Proceedings of the Second Annual Conference on Pronunciation in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 144-152.

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics* 11(2): 129-159.

Scullen, M. E., Pons C., & Valdman A. (2012). *Points de départ, 2nd edition*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Thompson, C., & Phillips, E. (2012). *Mais oui!, 5th edition*. Stamford, CT: Heinle.

Valette, R., & Valette, J.-P. (2009) *Contacts: Langue et culture françaises, 8th edition*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

APPENDIX A: reference method worksheet

The pronunciation of ‘u’ and ‘ou’

1. Theory

In the spelling of the words “tu” and “tout”, what indicates that they are pronounced differently?

2. Exercises

a. Sort the words below according to their pronunciation, to say if they are pronounced like the “tu” ou “tout”.

lu pour dur douter mule moule

Tu	Tout

b. Pronounce the following sentence.

Nous venons du cours de littérature russe. Mon ami Luc étudie toujours beaucoup.

APPENDIX B: phonetic method worksheet

[y] vs. [u]

1. Theory

a. In the spelling of the words “tout” and “tu”, what indicates that they are pronounced differently?

b. How is tongue and lip placement different for [y] and [u]?

2. Exercises

a. Write the phonetic symbol ([y] or [u]) that you use to pronounce the following words.

lu

pour

dur

douter

mule

moule

b. Write the phonetic symbol ([y] or [u]) to indicate how the underlined letters are pronounced. Then pronounce the sentence.

Nous venons du cours de littérature russe. Mon ami Luc étudie toujours beaucoup.

APPENDIX C: discrimination test used five times in the semesterDiscrimination auditive

Écoutez et encerclez le mot que vous entendez. Si vous n'êtes pas sûrs, cochez la case appropriée.

	A	B	C	?
1	Poisson	Poison	Poivron	
2	Ils sont	Ils ont	Ils vont	
3	Pull	Poule	Paul	
4	Ton	Temps	Teint	
5	Vos	Vous	Vu	
6	Tu	Tôt	Tout	
7	Lisez	Lissez	L'idée	
8	La	Le	Les	
9	M'en	Mon	Main	
10	Je	J'ai	J'y	
11	Ce	Ça	C'est	
12	Vingt	Vent	Vont	
13	Long	Lin	Lent	
14	Du	De	Des	
15	Désert	Dessert	Des verts	
16	Bain	Banc	Bon	
17	Pur	Pour	Port	
18	Son	Saint	Sans	