

Levis, J., & LeVelle, K. (2013). Pronunciation and assessment. In J. Levis & K. LeVelle (Eds.). *Proceedings of the 4<sup>th</sup> Pronunciation in Second Language Learning and Teaching Conference*. Aug. 2012. (pp. i-xii). Ames, IA: Iowa State University.

## PRONUNCIATION AND ASSESSMENT

[John Levis](#), Iowa State University

[Kimberly LeVelle](#), Iowa State University

The 4<sup>th</sup> Pronunciation in Second Language Learning and Teaching conference went on the road for the first time, moving not only to another city, but to another country. The conference was held in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. Murray Munro of Simon Fraser University (SFU) was the host of the conference, which was held at SFU's [Morris J. Wosk Centre for Dialogue](#) in downtown Vancouver. All sessions were held in the beautiful building with a large conference room in the round, giving the feel of our own United Nations. The conference attracted over 100 participants from 18 countries, a significant increase in international participation over the three previous conferences.

The theme of the conference was Pronunciation in Language Assessment. Pronunciation is involved in the assessment of oral language proficiency and performance, but in scoring such tests, pronunciation is sometimes explicitly included by test creators and sometimes ignored. In addition, pronunciation ability must also be assessed in order to create an accurate picture of student needs. These varied uses of assessment are rarely addressed openly, but it was our hope that the conference would provide a venue for such discussion. The 4<sup>th</sup> annual conference included 34 concurrent sessions, 26 poster sessions (13 each day), a plenary address by Pavel Trofimovich of Concordia University in Montreal, and a [Language Learning](#) sponsored roundtable on Pronunciation Assessment. The conference schedule is below.

### FRIDAY, August 24, 2012

08:15-08:50	Registration check-in (Atrium) and poster setup (Atrium/APH)	
08:50-09:00	Welcome (APH): Tom Perry, Chair, Department of Linguistics, Simon Fraser University	
09:00-10:10	<b>Plenary: Teaching second language pronunciation: From the psycholinguistic lab to the language classroom</b> <i>Pavel Trofimovich, Concordia University</i> (APH); Chair: Tracey Derwing	
10:10-10:35	<i>Break</i>	
<b>Fri. AM</b>	<b>FR1. Pedagogical Research (APH)</b> , R. Thomson, Chair	<b>FR2. Curriculum &amp; Teaching (Rm 420)</b> G. Muller Levis, Chair
10:35-11:00	<i>Foote &amp; McDonough</i> Using auditory priming tasks to target AWL word stress patterns	<i>Sardegna &amp; McGregor</i> Scaffolding students' self-regulated efforts for effective pronunciation practice
11:05-11:30	<i>Saito</i> Recasts in instructed second language speech learning	<i>Reed</i> Operationalizing curriculum objectives: Integrating and assessing listening and speaking in an IEP
11:35-12:00	<i>Derwing, Foote &amp; Munro</i> Teaching old dogs new tricks: L2 pronunciation instruction after 19 years of English experience	<i>Edelstein</i> L1 and L2 learners in the college public speaking course
<b>Friday PM 12:15 - 2:00</b>	<b>Working Lunch + Poster Session A: Student &amp; Post-doc Posters (Atrium/APH)</b>	

Alsadoon	A01. Perception and production of English vowels	
Aly Bailey & Brandl	A02. Pronunciation instruction in the beginning Spanish classroom: A perceptual study	
Chang & Weng	A03. Late ESL learners' difficulties of producing lax and tense vowels in English	
Chen	A04. Perception of English lexical stress by Chinese native speakers: A critical review	
Gordon, Darcy & Ewert	A05. Pronunciation teaching and learning: Effects of explicit phonetic instruction in the L2 classroom	
Lege & Tanner	A06. The effect of pause duration on comprehensibility	
Ullakonoja, Van Moere, Huhta, Alderson, Haapakangas, & Nieminen	A07. L2 learners' oral reading fluency development during extensive reading intervention	
Wang	A08. Prosodic acquisition: tone, stress and intonation	
Zhuang	A09. You will speak like an American: ESL learner's pronunciation improvement	
<b>Friday PM 12:15 - 2:00</b>	<b>Working Lunch + Poster Session A: Non-student Posters (Atrium/APH)</b>	
De Meo, Pettorino, Vitale, Cutugno & Origlia	A10. Imitation/self-imitation in a computer-assisted prosody training for Chinese learners of L2 Italian	
Sturm	A11. Liaison in L2 French: The effects of instruction	
Ou	A12. Intelligibility and comprehensibility of English lexical stress and EIL phonological cores	
Zetterholm	A13. Teaching Swedish as a foreign language	
<b>Fri PM</b>	<b>FR3. Technological Innovations (APH), Y. Wang, Chair</b>	<b>FR4. Teaching &amp; Teacher Training (Rm 420), B. Zielinski, Chair</b>
2:00-2:25	<b>Chun &amp; Yu</b> Visualization of tone and intonation for teaching and learning Mandarin Chinese	<b>Thomson</b> Teachers' beliefs and practices in pronunciation teaching: Confidently right or confidently wrong?
2:30-2:55	<b>Richards</b> Optimizing the acquisition of AWL word stress patterns via a principled web-based flashcard pedagogy	<b>LeVelle &amp; Levis</b> Learning to teach pronunciation: Attitudes, images, and identity
3:00-3:25	<b>Okamura</b> The comparison of L2 speakers' evaluation of and machine evaluation of Japanese learners' English	<b>Kirkova-Naskova, Tergujeff, Frost, Henderson, Kautzsch, Levey, Murphy &amp; Waniek-Klimczak</b> The English pronunciation teaching in Europe survey: Teacher training and assessment
3:30-3:50	<b>Break</b>	
<b>Fri PM</b>	<b>FR5. Studies of Learners (APH), K. Saito, Chair</b>	<b>FR6. Teaching Practices and Teacher Training (Cont.)</b>
3:50 - 4:15	<b>Wilson &amp; Horiguchi</b> How accurately people follow articulation instructions	<b>Tergujeff</b> English pronunciation teaching practices in Finland
4:20 - 4:45	<b>McCrocklin &amp; Link</b> Accent and identity: Fear of sounding native?	<b>Costa Kurtz dos Santos</b> Pronunciation in the perspective of trainee teachers: an analysis of curricular training reports
4:50 - 5:15	<b>O'Brien</b> Successful L2 pronunciation?	<b>Poisson</b> Can a pronunciation approach based on research findings have an impact on learners' performance?

5:30 -	<i>Reception: Segal Centre (Rm 420-430) in the Harbour Centre across the street.</i>
--------	--

**SATURDAY, August 25, 2012**

08:00-08:30	Registration check-in (Main Atrium) and poster setup (Atrium/APH)	
08:30-10:45	<b>PSLLT Roundtable on Pronunciation Assessment (APH), sponsored by <i>Language Learning</i></b> <i>Panelists: April Ginther, Luke Harding, Sara Kennedy, Rebecca Hincks, Murray Munro</i> <i>Discussants: Sarah Fleming, Beth Zielinski</i> , Moderator/Chair: John Levis.	
10:45-11:15	<i>Break</i>	
<b>Sat. AM</b>	<b>SA1. Assessment (APH), O. Kang, Chair</b>	<b>SA2. Teaching Pronunciation (Rm 420), T. Harada, Chair</b>
11:15-11:40	<i>Zielinski, Yates &amp; Pryor</i> Assessing pronunciation: How judgements of intelligibility relate to IELTS pronunciation scale scores	<i>Acton, Burri, Teaman &amp; Baker</i> Preliminaries to haptic-integrated pronunciation instruction
11:45-12:10	<i>Danforth &amp; St. John</i> The glossary project	<i>Rogan</i> Pronunciation and task-based instruction
12:15-12:40	<i>Kang</i> Pronunciation features distinguishing examinees	<i>Baker</i> Integrating pronunciation into content-based ESL instruction
<b>Saturday PM 1:45 to 3:00</b>	<b>Poster Session B: Non-student Posters (Atrium/APH)</b>	
Eustice	B01. Fledgling phonologists	
Fotovatnia & Shahini	B02. Using <i>Pronunciation Power 2</i> to improve Iranian EFL learners' consonant production	
Gonzalez Lopez & Counselman	B03. The acquisition of L2 pronunciation of Spanish by novice learners	
Harada & Sato	B04. Effects of minimal exposure to English in early childhood on phonemic perception	
Kondo	B05. Phonological memory on L2 pronunciation skills	
Miller & Szymanski	B06. Improving oral proficiency with technology: A give and take	
Muller Levis	B07. Lexical and grammatical features associated with contrastive focus	
Munro, Derwing & Saito	B08. English L2 vowel acquisition over seven years	
Ou, Yeh & Chuang	B09. Units of analysis, intelligibility evaluation and phonological cores of EIL	
Rauber, Kluge, Rato, & Santos	B10. Designing audio, visual and audiovisual perceptual training tasks with TP application software	
Rojczyk	B11. Spontaneous phonetic imitation of L2 vowels in a rapid shadowing task	
Wallen	B12. Accent modification group: Using a mixed group format to address pronunciation concerns	
Watts & Huensch	B13. Integrated speaking, listening, and pronunciation: Are textbooks leading the way?	
<b>Sat. PM</b>	<b>SA3. Phonetic Issues (APH), X. Wu, Chair</b>	<b>SA4. L2 Speech Rating and Related Issues (Rm 420), M. Reed, Chair</b>

2:00-2:25		<b>Tanner, Landon &amp; Porter</b> How does prosodic error frequency influence NNES' and NES' comprehensibility ratings?
2:30-2:55		<b>Fullana</b> Exploring listeners' response times in the assessment of L2 speech
3:00-3:25	<b>de Moras</b> The role of frequency in the acquisition of L2 pronunciation: the example of the French liaison	<b>Kawase, Hannah &amp; Wang</b> Effects of visual speech information on native listener judgments of L2 speech intelligibility
3:30-3:50	<b>Break</b>	
<b>Sat PM</b>	<b>SA5. Phonetic Issues (Cont.), X. Wu, Chair</b>	<b>SA6. L2 Speech Rating and Related Issues (Cont.), K. Saito, Chair</b>
3:50-4:15	<b>George</b> The development of /θ/, a variable geographic phonetic feature, during a semester abroad: The role of explicit instruction	<b>Koffi</b> Confusion research as a complement to intelligibility research
4:20-4:45	<b>Sato</b> Effect of English-medium instruction on the production of VOT by Japanese learners of English	<b>Lima</b> Fundamental considerations in developing an intelligibility test for nonnative teaching assistants
4:50-5:15	<b>Silveira</b> Pronunciation instruction and syllabic-pattern discrimination	<b>Gomes</b> Understanding Brazilian way of speaking English, in theory and practice
5:15-	<b>CLOSING</b>	

## Sessions

### Language Learning Roundtable

The Roundtable on Pronunciation Assessment brought together five scholars presenting different perspectives of the assessment of pronunciation skills. Panelists were [April Ginther](#) (Purdue), [Murray Munro](#) (Simon Fraser), Sarita Kennedy (Concordia), [Rebecca Hincks](#) (KTH Royal Institute of Technology), and [Luke Harding](#) (University of Lancaster). Discussants were Sarah Fleming (IELTS) and Beth Zielinski (Macquarie). The moderator for the discussion was [John Levis](#) (Iowa State). The papers provided a historical overview of how pronunciation has been assessed (Munro), how intelligibility is assessed in relation to high-stakes spoken language tests and how intelligibility and nativeness are often conflated in such tests (Harding), ways to measure how pronunciation's components differentially contribute to holistic judgments of spoken language (Ginther), how pronunciation contributes to the assessment of interactive spoken language tests (Kennedy), and a discussion and overview of how computers are being used to automatically assess pronunciation and spoken proficiency, along with a critique of such attempts (Hincks). Because the papers given in the Roundtable are being used for an article being submitted to a journal, they do not appear in the proceedings. Instead, each presenter's abstract is reproduced below to give a fuller flavor of the talks given during the roundtable.

April Ginther (Purdue University)  
Measuring Characteristics of Spoken L2 English

The use of computers for the administration of speaking tests has considerably eased the burden associated with the capture and analysis of speech, and reliable assessment of spoken language can be established with

the use of human ratings in association with the use of holistic scales. However, fully validating holistic speaking scales requires explication and understanding of the differential contributions of the components of oral performance (e.g., pronunciation, fluency, accuracy, vocabulary) and the interaction among these components at different levels of holistic scales. Praat, a computer program with which you can analyze, synthesize, and manipulate speech, is a tool that allows close analysis of temporal and acoustic components of oral production. While temporal variables associated with fluency (e.g., speech rate, mean syllables per run) are relatively easy to capture, the selection and quantification of variables associated with pronunciation and prosody pose difficult but incredibly interesting challenges. This presentation will discuss findings from completed and ongoing studies that have used Praat to examine the temporal and acoustic properties of L1 Chinese speakers' performance at different levels of the Oral English Proficiency Test, a semi-direct test used to screen prospective international teaching assistants at Purdue University. These studies have examined speech rate, mean length of run, filled and silent pauses, pause placement, vowel quality, vowel length, consonant voicing, stress assignment, and pitch contour. Ongoing efforts are investigating ways to quantify the intelligibility of responses to read-aloud and free response items. Although the use of acoustic analysis software programs requires training and commitment, their use holds great promise not only for validating holistic speaking scales but also, and more importantly, explicating and understanding the characteristics and development of L2 speaking ability.

Luke Harding (Lancaster University)

Nativeness or Intelligibility: locating the construct in pronunciation scales

A significant challenge in assessing pronunciation – particularly in English language testing contexts – is the existence of what Levis (2005) calls ‘two contradictory principles’: the nativeness principle (that learners should achieve a native-like accent in the L2) and the intelligibility principle (that learners’ pronunciation should be understandable to a broad range of listeners). The language of many current pronunciation assessment scales demonstrates a shift away from the nativeness principle, with statements in criteria focusing either on intelligibility (e.g., “easily understood”), or on more abstract pronunciation goals (e.g. “correct”, “accurate”). However this shift presents several challenges for test developers in gauging the validity and reliability of their pronunciation criteria. First, it raises the question of whether raters still draw on perceptions of nativeness in their judgements of pronunciation, even when native norms are not invoked in scales. Secondly, it raises the question of whether raters from different language backgrounds interpret intelligibility, or abstract terms like “correct”, in the same way. This paper will discuss these challenges, drawing on examples from pronunciation rating scales to illustrate key points.

Rebecca Hincks (Royal Institute of Technology (KTH))

Pronunciation Assessment Using Speech Technology

After decades of research, language technologies finally entered the mass market in the fall of 2011 with the release of the iPhone 4, whose main innovation was the introduction of Siri, the virtual, speech-directed personal assistant. As we become more comfortable with speech interfaces, we can expect growing trust in their use for pedagogical purposes. Language technologies are, relatively speaking, better at assessing pronunciation than at teaching it. Speech recognition (ASR) can identify deviant phonemes, without being able to easily provide a learner with information about what needs to be adjusted in terms of articulation. My contribution to the round table will report on the research challenges faced by engineers designing pronunciation assessment systems. Current issues include the development of technological alternatives to

ASR for assessment, and the relation between computer pronunciation error detection and human ratings of pronunciation. I will also reflect on how individual practitioners in the field could beneficially take advantage of existing language technologies, using as an example my own work giving feedback on pitch variation to Chinese speakers of English.

Sarita Kennedy (Concordia University)

All Together Now: assessing pronunciation and communication in interaction

A significant shift is slowly taking place in the assessment of second language pronunciation. Test rubrics and assessors are no longer solely targeting speakers' use of native-like pronunciation; there is greater emphasis on assessing speakers' ability to communicate their message effectively; in addition, there is a growing trend for speaking assessments to include pair or group speaking tasks (Taylor, 2006). This means that assessing pronunciation and effective communication is no longer straightforward, raising several important questions: Should a rater's understanding of interactive speech always be the default measure of assessment if the rater is not also an interlocutor? Can we identify a common core of second language pronunciation (Jenkins, 2000) which is generally intelligible to any listener? Should pronunciation assessment also target speakers' use of effective strategies for managing problems in understanding, whomever the listener? These questions have implications for key aspects of second language pronunciation assessment, such as how raters and interlocutors are selected and how the target of evaluation is determined. In this presentation, these issues will be discussed with the aim of suggesting a research agenda for the future.

Murray Munro (Simon Fraser University)

Pronunciation Testing and Classroom Research: What should we test and why?

Language testing is carried out for many purposes, including diagnosis of learner difficulties, measurement of classroom learning, and assessment of L2 proficiency. In pronunciation research, 'testing' is also used as a means of evaluating the effectiveness of laboratory training procedures, classroom techniques, and CALL approaches. Implicit in all classroom-based research on pronunciation is the assumption that the dependent variable under study has some sort of relevance to teachers, students, and the students' interlocutors. In particular, when we wish to argue that a particular technique or piece of software 'works,' we assume that it has brought about changes in learners' skills and that we have evaluated those changes in a meaningful way. However, it is not always clear that these assumptions are valid. An examination of the limited set of classroom-based studies of pronunciation indicates that a diverse range of outcome measures have been employed, including perception scores, accent ratings from trained and untrained listeners, segmental and prosodic accuracy scores as assigned by the researchers themselves, and various types of intelligibility and comprehensibility measures. We have yet to see a clear convergence of opinion among researchers about which of these are genuinely useful in terms of their relevance to L2 communicative ability. Resolving this problem requires that classroom researchers work in concert with testing specialists to establish valid procedures for both research and testing purposes.

### **Plenary Address**

The plenary was given by Pavel Trofimovich of Concordia University in Montreal. Entitled "From the psycholinguistic lab to the language classroom: What are some of the most efficient ways of helping non-

native speakers improve their ability to speak a second language?”, the talk examined how an understanding of alignment in speech can be used to provide more effective teaching and more accurate assessment of pronunciation. The talk first described research in which L1 interlocutors repeat language used by another in order to build on what the other said. This repetition is part of the process of alignment, involving words, grammar, phonetic realization, accent and speech rate.

The main question addressed by Trofimovich was whether L2 speakers show the same kind of alignment shown by L1 speakers. Results of several studies provided evidence that successful L2-L2 interactions almost always used a lot of repetition, which was one way that L2 speakers used to promote mutual intelligibility. L2 learners were said to heavily rely on repetition in all types of learning including pronunciation learning. The talk then asked whether teachers could promote alignment in pronunciation through language tasks. A study using academic word stress patterns suggests that the kinds of tasks used in class can promote the natural process of alignment. This process was related to the psychological process of priming. Finally, the speaker suggested ways to promote alignment in teaching pronunciation, suggesting the types of activities promoting alignment and repetition have not been sufficiently exploited.

The proceedings version of the plenary is a shortened version of his talk. For a more complete discussion of the issues involved, see his forthcoming article in the journal [\*Language Teaching\*](#) (published by Cambridge University Press).

## Proceedings Papers

The proceedings papers are a representative sample of the types of papers given at the conference. This year’s proceedings include 25 papers (a new record) from six different general categories: Assessment, Phonetic Research, Technology, Acquisition Studies, Results of Instructional Interventions, and Teacher Development Practices.

### Assessment

Three papers are included in the Assessment category. Okim Kang, in “Relative Impact of Pronunciation Features on Ratings of Non-Native Speakers’ Oral Proficiency,” examines how various errors in pronunciation predict ratings of oral proficiency on the Cambridge ESL General English Examination. Kang argues that there was a clear hierarchy of errors in relation to oral proficiency ratings. This short report does not give a more complete set of results, which will be included in a longer article to be published soon.

In “*Versant* and Advanced L2 Speakers’ Ratings of Japanese Learners’ Oral English,” Akiko Okamura compares the automatic proficiency assessments of Japanese students provided by the *Versant* test with evaluations of the proficiency made by advanced proficiency L2 speakers in Sweden. Pronunciation seemed to play an important role in the judgments made by the Swedish L1 judges, but so did vocabulary.

The final paper in this category, “Teachers’ Views on their Professional Training and Assessment Practices: Selected Results from the English Pronunciation Teaching in Europe Survey” is a contribution from a diverse group of pronunciation scholars and teachers from Europe (Anastazija Kirkova-Naskova, Elina Tergujeff, Dan Frost, Alice Henderson, Alexander Kautzsch, David Levey, Deirdre Murphy, and Ewa Waniek-Klimczak). The group looks at the assessment and teacher training findings from a larger survey. Teachers on the whole reported that they were not satisfied with the kind of training they received in

teaching pronunciation, and the ways that teachers assess pronunciation was not based on established scales. Indeed, it seemed somewhat ad hoc in how it was done.

## Phonetics Research

Several papers took a phonetics-oriented approach to L2 pronunciation issues. In “Acoustic Cues for English Lexical Stress Perception by Mandarin Native Speakers: A Critical Review,” Sibó Chen discusses Mandarin learners’ perception of English lexical stress. The paper looks at previous studies of the cues used by Mandarin learners of English, identifies factors underlying disagreements in previous research, and suggests directions for pedagogy.

Ettien Koffi draws connections between L2 intelligibility research and another decades-old approach to listener understanding in “Confusion as a Complement to Intelligibility Research.” Koffi describes the mechanics of confusion research before illustrating the ways confusion research operates by looking at three English vowels. He argues that confusion research, a model for making speech intelligibility prediction, is a valuable complement to current research into intelligibility.

Finally, Arkadiusz Rojczyk looks at how a rapid shadowing task affects the production of /æ/, non-categorical vowel in Polish that is prone to being confused with two other vowels, in “Phonetic Imitation of L2 Vowels in a Rapid Shadowing Task.” The results showed that Polish learners of English modified their productions of the vowel due to exposure in the shadowing task, showing that L2 learners can successfully modify their production of unfamiliar vowels.

## Technology

A regular feature of L2 pronunciation research is the use of technology to promote learning. Dorothy M. Chun, Yan Jiang, and Natalia Ávila examine the effectiveness of visual feedback in “Visualization of Tone for Learning Mandarin Chinese.” Learners of Mandarin learned tones by comparing their production with the production of native speakers of Mandarin, both hearing the production and seeing the pitch tracks of the tone production. For the tones that were mispronounced in the pretest, nearly half improved in the posttest.

In “Imitation/Self-Imitation in a Computer-Assisted Prosody Training for Chinese Learners of L2 Italian,” five Italian researchers (*Anna De Meo, Marilisa Vitale, Massimo Pettorino, Francesco Cutugno, and Antonio Origlia*) look at the use of “prosodic transplantation” to encourage more effective CALL training for pronunciation learning in Italian. Prosodic transplantation involves the use of native speaker prosodic patterns with the learners’ own voices, and the researchers found that it yielded superior results to traditional imitation techniques.

In “Improving Oral Proficiency by Raising Metacognitive Awareness with Recordings,” Jessica Miller looks at the use of voice recording technology to enhance metacognitive skills in German and French classes. The encouragement to help learners think more about their communication through self-evaluation had a positive impact on their Willingness-To-Communicate.

## Acquisition Studies

A number of papers looked at L2 acquisition of different pronunciation features for different languages. In “English L2 Vowel Acquisition over Seven Years,” Murray J. Munro, Tracey M. Derwing, and Kazuya Saito examined the rate of vowel learning for Mandarin and Slavic L1 learners of English over a seven-year period in Canada. They found that learning does not stop in naturalistic learning contexts, but that the rate of learning is greatest in the first year after arrival, after which development slows greatly.

Angela George examines social constraints on learning pronunciation features during study abroad in “The Development of /θ/, a Variable Geographic Phonetic Feature, During a Semester Abroad: The Role of Explicit Instruction.” Although the feature being examined is one that exists in the learners’ L1, George finds that their use of /θ/ actually decreased over time, which she attributes to attitudes toward the dialect being learned, dialect exposure and proficiency level.

In “Late ESL Learners’ Difficulties of Distinction between Lax and Tense Vowels,” Daniel Chang and Calvin Weng look at the accuracy of tense/lax vowel production by early- and late-bilingual Chinese learners of English. Mirroring other results in previous studies, they found that late-bilingual learners were more likely to mispronounce tense and lax vowels than were early-bilingual learners.

Discussion of prosodic difficulties in Swedish are discussed in “Prosodic Pitfalls when Learning Swedish as a Second Language” (Elisabeth Zetterholm). The paper uses recordings of learners of Swedish and discusses how long-time residents continue to have particular difficulties with vowel quantity and word stress.

In “Pronunciation Instruction and Syllabic-Pattern Discrimination,” Rosane Silveira examines the vowel insertion of Brazilian learners of English, a syllabification strategy that adds extra syllables and potentially changes the word stress patterns of the users’ speech. The study looked at the effect of instruction on learners’ awareness of this strategy and their ability to distinguish between CVC and CV.CV words, and found that instruction regarding this common error was effective in improving perception.

## Results of Instructional Treatments

A common theme at PSLLT is the way that instruction affects learning/acquisition. In “Liaison in L2 French: The Effects of Instruction,” Jessica L. Sturm presents a study of whether phonetics training is effective in promoting greater use of liaison in French. Particularly interesting was the fact that instructed learners used fewer forbidden liaisons, a particular problem in acquiring liaisons.

In another study of liaisons, Nadine de Moras looks at the “The Role of Pronunciation Instruction on the Acquisition of *Liaisons* by Anglophone Speakers.” Working from reports of near-native acquisition of liaisons by learners, de Moras compared the production of liaisons and enchainements by French native speakers and three groups of Anglophone speakers of French. All three Anglophone groups showed improvement by the posttest, but none reached a level that could be described as native-like.

“Scaffolding Students’ Self-Regulated Efforts for Effective Pronunciation Practice” (Veronica G. Sardegna and Alison McGregor) examined how the use of practice and strategy use, along with teacher scaffolding, affected the accuracy scores of international teaching assistants in a 15-week course. Accuracy was measured for vowel reduction, linking, primary stress and intonation. The paper concludes that the role of teachers is critical for the success of self-regulated pronunciation practice.

“Pronunciation Teaching and Learning: Effects of Explicit Phonetic Instruction in the L2 Classroom,” by Joshua Gordon, Isabelle Darcy and Doreen Ewert, tested how instruction in phonological features affected improvement in comprehensibility ratings. Results were interpreted in light of calls for attention to noticing and communicative approaches to teaching pronunciation.

Ann Aly Bailey and Anel Brandl look at the effect of instruction on early L2 learning in “Incorporating Pronunciation in the First-Year Spanish Classroom: An Early Intervention.” Using a beginning L2 context, the authors look at the effects of technical and non-technical instruction as well as a control group receiving no instruction on pronunciation. The perceptual abilities of the non-technical instruction group showed significant differences at the posttest, but this difference faded at a delayed posttest.

### **Teacher Development Practices**

The last category, Teacher development practices, is another consistent interest at PSLLT. Teachers are perennially reported to be under-trained to teach pronunciation, leading to interest in the causes and effects of this problem as well as how to more effectively train teachers. In “ESL Teachers’ Beliefs and Practices in Pronunciation Teaching: Confidently Right or Confidently Wrong?” Ron Thomson examined the accuracy with which English language teachers evaluated online statements about pronunciation and how to teach and describe it. He found that teachers generally agreed with a core of uncontroversial statements, but that they were frequently uncertain about questionable or blatantly false claims.

William Acton, Amanda Baker, Michael Burri, and Brian Teaman discuss an unusual approach to pronunciation instruction and teacher training in “Preliminaries to Haptic-Integrated Pronunciation Instruction.” Haptic techniques (movement plus touch) is presented as appropriate for use even by untrained instructors. It is also suggested that the techniques may be effective in promoting recall and integration of teaching targets when transferred to spontaneous speech.

In “Integrating Fluent Pronunciation Use into Content-Based ESL Instruction: Two Case Studies,” Amanda Baker looks in detail at how two teachers integrated pronunciation instruction into oral communication courses. Baker looks at five categories of pronunciation instruction: Language awareness, controlled practice, guided practice, fluency development and free practice. While all areas needed greater attention, fluency development was almost absent in teacher practice.

What do teachers actually think about pronunciation in the midst of teaching? Larissa Buss examines this question in “Pronunciation from the Perspective of Pre-Service EFL Teachers: An Analysis of Internship Reports.” Her study of internship reports written by Brazilian EFL teachers suggested four broad themes: how teachers identify problems, how they explain them, how they address them, and finally, their beliefs about pronunciation and teaching. The results from these Brazilian teachers contrast with other results based on research looking at teachers in ESL contexts.

Patricia Watts and Amanda Huensch look at an understudied area of pronunciation teaching and teacher training in “Integrated Speaking, Listening and Pronunciation: Are Textbooks Leading the Way?” They looked at 11 integrated skills textbooks to see how pronunciation was integrated into oral

communication teaching. They suggest that, despite weaknesses, integrated textbooks do a relatively good job of reflecting the need for intelligibility-based goals in teaching pronunciation.

Finally, in “Understanding the Brazilian Way of Speaking English” Maria Lúcia de Castro Gomes describes the grass-roots formation of a professional study group among Brazilian teachers. The group studies phonetics, phonology and pronunciation teaching and explores the use of speech analysis technology to explore the acquisition of English pronunciation by Brazilian learners. The group offers a potential model for teachers who have no other access to consistent professional training in pronunciation.

**Future Conference**

When these proceedings come out, the 5th Pronunciation in Second Language Learning and Teaching Conference (again held at Iowa State University) will be history. Please consider joining us next year at the University of California Santa Barbara, where the conference theme will be “Looking at L2 Pronunciation Research from Varying Perspectives.” The call for submissions is at

<http://linguistlist.org/easyabs/PSLLT2014>. **The final date for submissions is April 12, 2014.**

Sixth Annual Conference  
Pronunciation in Second Language Learning and Teaching  
University of California, Santa Barbara  
Santa Barbara, California USA

Looking at L2 Pronunciation Research from Varying Perspectives  
September 5-6, 2014  
Plenary Speaker  
Alene Moyer, University of Maryland

Pronunciation instruction is increasingly popular in language classrooms around the world, in second language and foreign language contexts. Issues of intelligibility (Munro & Derwing, 1995) vs. nativeness (Levis, 2005), functional load (Brown, 1991; Munro & Derwing, 2006), effective instructional techniques for overcoming learning plateaus (Acton, 1986; Hardison, 2004; Goodwin, 2006), fluency (Derwing et al., 2008) and the relative roles of suprasegmentals and segmentals in instruction (Hahn, 2004) have all been examined in multiple studies. However, a large majority of important research into pronunciation has been carried out with English as the target language, despite the importance L2 pronunciation in other languages, such as Japanese (e.g., Hirata, 2004), Spanish (e.g., Lord, 2008), French (Ruellot, 2006), German (Moyer, 1999), Chinese (Liu et al, 2000), and Dutch (Bongaerts, Mennen & Slik, 2000), among others. Research from a variety of L2 learning contexts is essential to filling out the current English-centric research agenda.

The 6th Pronunciation in Second Language Learning and Teaching Conference invites proposals for papers and posters on all topics related to naturalistic and classroom pronunciation acquisition and learning. We especially welcome proposals for papers on pronunciation in a wide variety of L2s other than English. Possible paper topics include descriptive and experimental studies, re-examinations of key research findings (e.g., intelligibility, comprehensibility and accentedness) in new languages, technology in the teaching of pronunciation, and innovative approaches to teacher education.

In addition to papers related to the place of pronunciation in L2s other than English, the conference invites proposals for papers or posters on any aspect of pronunciation research, teaching and learning. Papers will be given in English.

For further information about the conference, contact Dorothy Chun, Conference Organizer at [pslltconference@gmail.com](mailto:pslltconference@gmail.com).

COMING IN 2015

**THE JOURNAL OF SECOND LANGUAGE PRONUNCIATION**

Published by John Benjamins Publishing Company

Editor in Chief: John Levis, Iowa State University (jlevis@iastate.edu)

*The Journal of Second Language Pronunciation* is a quarterly journal devoted to research into the acquisition, perception, production, teaching, assessment, and description of prosodic and segmental pronunciation related to second languages in all contexts of learning. *The Journal* publishes papers in four main areas:

- experimental, instructed, and naturalistic research about second language pronunciation;
- reviews and syntheses covering research perspectives on key pronunciation issues from different disciplines;
- teaching-oriented perspectives on successful practices and research-based instruction;
- reviews of technology and books focused on second language pronunciation.

*The Journal* encourages research that connects theory and practice, enhances our understanding of L2 phonological learning processes, and provides connections between L2 pronunciation and other areas of applied linguistics research such as pragmatics, CALL, and speech perception. Contributions focusing on empirical research will represent all portions of the methodological spectrum including quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods studies.

*The Journal of Second Language Pronunciation* was born out of the professional goals and interactions of the PSLLT Conference and will be unique in providing a dedicated scholarly and interdisciplinary forum for research and practice into second language pronunciation. Research into second language pronunciation intersects with many other aspects of applied linguistics and with other fields, and such research is published in a wide variety of professional journals, professional proceedings, and other venues, yet no journal is yet dedicated to research on L2 pronunciation. The articles we envision as being appropriate for the journal include papers dealing with intelligibility and comprehensibility, accent, phonological acquisition, learning and teaching, the use of technology (such as automatic speech recognition, text-to-speech, and computer assisted pronunciation teaching), spoken language assessment, the social impact of L2 pronunciation, the ethics of pronunciation teaching, pronunciation acquisition in less commonly taught languages, language attitudes, speech perception and its relationship to speech production, and many other topics.