



Investigating English Pronunciation

Trends and Directions

Edited by

Jose A. Mompean

& Jonás Fouz-González



12

The English Pronunciation Teaching in Europe Survey: Factors inside and outside the Classroom

Alice Henderson

University of Savoie

Lesley Curnick

University of Lausanne

Dan Frost

University of Savoie

Alexander Kautzsch

University of Regensburg

Anastazija Kirkova-Naskova

University of Skopje

David Levey

University of Cadiz

Elina Tergujeff

University of Jyväskylä

Ewa Waniek-Klimczak

University of Lodz

12.1 Introduction

In the past two decades, a number of studies have looked at how English pronunciation is taught, focusing on teaching practices, materials, training and attitudes to native speaker models from both the teachers' and the learners' perspective. Most of these studies have been conducted in English-speaking countries such as the USA (Murphy, 1997), Great Britain (Bradford and Kenworthy, 1991; Burgess and Spencer, 2000), Canada (Breitkreutz, Derwing and Rossiter, 2001; Foote, Holtby and Derwing, 2011), Ireland (Murphy, 2011) and Australia (Couper, 2011; Macdonald, 2002). In Europe,

pronunciation teaching has been studied in Spain (Walker, 1999) and, more recently, in Finland (Tergujeff, 2012, 2013a, b). Work has also looked at attitudes towards native speaker models and the degree of success in reaching the model, for example, in Poland (Nowacka, 2010; Waniek-Klimczak, 2002; Waniek-Klimczak and Klimczak, 2005), Serbia (Paunović, 2009) and Bulgaria (Dimitrova and Chernogorova, 2012). In Finland, Lintunen (2004) and Tergujeff, Ullakonoja and Dufva (2011) focused on learners, not teachers, but both studies included a survey section exploring methods in English pronunciation teaching.

These studies examined important aspects of the issue but, to the best of our knowledge, no study has extensively investigated and compared how English pronunciation is taught in different European countries. The English Pronunciation Teaching in Europe Survey (EPTiES) seeks to fill this gap. EPTiES is a collaborative project¹ in which teachers and researchers in ten European countries compiled data in order to facilitate comparisons of European practices (Henderson et al., 2012). This chapter looks at what teachers from seven countries said about three interrelated aspects: (a) the training they received to teach English pronunciation; (b) what happens inside the classroom (teaching methods and materials, evaluation of pronunciation); and (c) what happens outside the classroom (type and frequency of learners' exposure to English in society at large). Analysis of the results includes reference to other research and national language policy actions.

12.2 The survey and participants

The online survey's 57 questions (multiple-choice, Likert-scale and open-ended questions) were devised by the authors and other participants over a one-year period, via e-mail, meetings at conferences and phone conversations. The full list of questions appears in the Appendix. The items were chosen in relation to each individual's interests or specific lines of inquiry based on our experience as teachers and researchers, not within the framework of a specific theory or from a desire to use an existing questionnaire with new populations. Questions were grouped into nine categories in the survey, which was designed and administered using the open-source application *LimeSurvey* (Schmitz, 2012). Data were collected online from February 2010 until September 2011. Responses were obtained from 843 EFL/ESL teachers from 31 European countries. Attempts were made to contact teachers at all levels of the private and public sectors. To do this, we used several means, including personal contacts and mailing lists of professional bodies such as teachers' associations (e.g. SUKOL in Finland, TESOL-France, ELTAM in Macedonia, ETAS in Switzerland). We also contacted educational institutions and administrative structures in Finland, France and Germany. Invitations were distributed internationally via *The*

Table 12.1 Participants per country and total number of respondents per country (including incomplete replies)

Country	No. of respondents
Finland (FI)	103
France (FR)	65
Germany (DE)	362
Macedonia (MK)	36
Poland (PL)	20
Spain (ES)	31
Switzerland (CH)	23
Total	640

LINGUIST List and promotional bookmarks were handed out at various conferences over a two-year period.

The present chapter is based on the 640 respondents from the 7 countries for which at least 12 teachers completed the survey in its entirety: Finland, France, Germany, Macedonia, Poland, Spain and Switzerland (Table 12.1).

As the survey was long, some participants did not complete every section. For example, many people did not answer open-ended questions or questions about age or professional qualifications. Therefore, in the tables of this chapter the number of respondents for a given question is always indicated and may differ from the initial figures in Table 12.1. In the analysis, all responses were considered for the parts of the questionnaire that were filled in. Averages were calculated for the quantitative data (multiple-choice and Likert-scale questions). The open-ended questions were analysed qualitatively by coding the answers for recurrent themes (Dörnyei and Taguchi, 2010). Follow-up interviews were also conducted with ten of the respondents in France.

Most of the respondents were female but there were some major differences between countries: 95 per cent in Finland, 92 per cent in Macedonia, 83 per cent in Switzerland, 75 per cent in France and Poland, and 72 per cent in Germany but only 52 per cent in Spain. Most respondents were non-native speakers (90 per cent), rising to 96 per cent in Germany, 99 per cent in Finland and 100 per cent in Macedonia and Poland. In France and Spain three-quarters of respondents were non-native speakers, whereas in Switzerland they were predominantly native English speakers (83 per cent).

Both younger and older teachers participated, the average age being 43 years and mean teaching experience 16 years. The lowest average age and years of experience was for the Polish respondents: 17 of the 20 participants were aged between 22 and 26 and had 2–3 years' teaching experience. This is significantly lower than the overall survey average of 16 years' teaching

experience. The range of age and experience was slightly higher for respondents in Macedonia: average age 29 (from 28 to 50 years) and 8 years' teaching experience (from 3 to 34 years). On average the Finnish respondents were aged 45 years and had 16 years' teaching experience. The German figures are almost exactly the same as those in Finland, as were the figures for Spain, where almost half (45 per cent) of respondents were over the age of 45 with more than 15 years' experience. Even though France and Switzerland have the same average age (46), the former averaged 21 years' teaching experience as against 15 years in Switzerland. In France and in Spain – where it can be difficult to qualify as a public-sector teacher or to come into the profession after another career – respondents tend to be career teachers from the outset, whereas in Switzerland, English teaching is perhaps not the participants' first career.

Two descriptive questions were asked about learners: 'What is the average age range of your learners? Please choose only one of the following:' and 'Please indicate at which level you teach.' Options for the first question were overlapping age brackets (under 3 years old, 3–7 years old, 6–10 years, 9–12 years, 11–15 years, 14–18 years, 17–22 years, etc.). The choices available in the second question were specific to each country, because European countries do not split learners neatly into the same age brackets. For example, in Germany 10–18-year-olds can be taught in three different types of school, thus 41 per cent of the participants taught at *Gymnasium* (learners aged 10–18), 21 per cent taught at *Realschule* (age 10–16), and 14 per cent taught at *Hauptschule* (age 10–15). Each response was only counted once but conflicts did arise. In such cases, priority was given to the 'named level', so that if a participant ticked *Realschule* for the 'level' question but chose the age bracket 9–12 years old for the 'age' question, in Table 12.2 their choice was categorized in the combined '11–18 years old' category. The results are presented in three combined, overlapping groups (Table 12.2), beginning with the youngest age at which children start public schooling (age 6), taking into account the following differences: in Finland, children are allowed to start a year later; in Switzerland mandatory elementary school starts at age seven, although many children attend kindergarten at age five or six; in Poland and Macedonia they start school at age seven.

Total percentages for Macedonia (92 per cent) and Germany (97 per cent) are less than 100 per cent because some learners were younger than the categories presented in Table 12.2. The total percentage for Switzerland (105 per cent) is over 100 per cent because the categories in the first question were not distinct from one another. This might also have influenced the age groups reported by the Polish teachers, as several taught in public schools in the daytime and gave additional classes in private language schools in the evenings or at weekends. The respondents in Switzerland (87 per cent) and in France (79 per cent) taught primarily in higher education. Respondents in

Table 12.2 Age of survey participants' learners (%)

	6–12 years old	11–18 years old	≥ 17 years old
Finland (<i>n</i> = 77)	31	53	16
France (<i>n</i> = 52)	0	21	79
Germany (<i>n</i> = 267)	17	76	4
Macedonia (<i>n</i> = 13)	31	46	15
Poland (<i>n</i> = 14)	36	7	57
Spain (<i>n</i> = 20)	5	25	70
Switzerland (<i>n</i> = 23)	18	0	87

Finland tended to be involved in secondary schools (84 per cent), with only a few respondents teaching in vocational schools or at university. In four of the seven countries a large majority of respondents worked in the public sector: France (97 per cent), Germany (94 per cent), Finland (92 per cent) and Spain (81 per cent). However, in Macedonia, Poland and Switzerland the opposite was true; 77, 75 and 61 per cent of respondents, respectively, taught in the private sector.

To summarize, the majority of participants were female non-native speakers of English. They worked predominantly in the public sector, except in Macedonia, Poland and Switzerland. Participants in Switzerland primarily taught adults; participants in France and Spain primarily taught adults and a smaller percentage of young adults; respondents from Finland, Germany and Macedonia mostly taught young adults and, to a lesser degree, children. In Poland participants' learners came from the two ends of the age spectrum.

12.3 Results and analyses

The survey results are presented in three parts, referring to what teachers from seven countries said about: (a) the training they received to teach English pronunciation; (b) what happens inside the classroom (teaching materials and methods, evaluation of pronunciation); (c) and what happens outside the classroom (type and frequency of learners' exposure to English in society at large).

12.3.1 Training received to teach English pronunciation

In terms of their general level of education, respondents in only two countries held specific EFL qualifications. In Switzerland, 13 described themselves as TEFL-trained (i.e. as having a DipTEFL, CELTA, MEd in TESOL) and two had PhDs. The majority (94 per cent) of Finnish respondents had at least an MA degree, as EFL subject teachers are expected to hold an MA degree in English with pedagogy as a minor subject in the degree. The Polish respondents were either recent graduates or were still doing MA courses.

All the Macedonian respondents held BA degrees, one had an MA degree, and one had a CPE certificate. In the case of Spain, with the exception of one teacher working in the private sector who had not graduated, all respondents had university degrees and a further 25 per cent also had an MA or PhD. In France, over half of the respondents had passed the *CAPES* or the *Agrégation* (France's national competitive exams for recruiting teachers), and many other different levels and types of qualifications were listed. Since 2011, these exams are not the only requirement; teachers in France are not allowed to teach unless they have also completed a 2-year Master's programme.

Of the remaining six countries, Spain and Germany have competitive exams for recruiting schoolteachers. In Spain they are called *oposiciones* and are organized by the autonomous regional communities. In Germany, each federal state has independent responsibility for teacher training, but all states share a system in which prospective teachers for all school types are not allowed to teach until they pass both *Erstes Staatsexamen* (first state exam, a degree at university) and *Zweites Staatsexamen* (second state exam, teacher training in schools).

This section of the survey began with explicit instructions to answer in relation to training they had received specific to teaching English pronunciation. Nonetheless, many of the respondents clearly saw their undergraduate courses in phonetics as part of their training, and described how they themselves had practised their own pronunciation. The three questions concerning pronunciation training were:

- In relation to pronunciation, please rate the teacher training you received from 1 to 5, with 1 as 'extremely poor' and 5 as 'excellent'.
- Please tell us how much training you received specific to teaching pronunciation. Feel free to mention any period of time (hours, months, years, etc.).
- Please explain the content and/or style of the training you received. Feel free to mention types of courses, approaches, etc.

An encouraging picture emerged when teachers rated the teacher training they had received on a 5-point Likert-scale, where 1 meant 'extremely poor' and 5 was 'excellent' (Table 12.3).

In Finland, Macedonia and Poland the average score was above 3. Although none of the averages are particularly high, the modes reveal that overall respondents rated their teacher training positively. The exception is France which had by far the lowest mode (1) of all the countries, even though its average score was not very different from Germany's or Switzerland's. In general, the modes show a relatively rosy picture.

In the two open-ended questions, respondents often commented simultaneously about training quantity and style. The analysis here will do

Table 12.3 Teachers' ratings of the teacher training they received: average values and mode

	Average	Mode values
Finland ($n=81$)	3.16	4
France ($n=54$)	2.63	1
Germany ($n=278$)	2.86	3
Macedonia ($n=17$)	3.24	4
Poland ($n=14$)	3.21	4
Spain ($n=25$)	3.00	4
Switzerland ($n=16$)	2.81	4

the same; after briefly presenting information about quantity, the quality of training will be presented in more detail via representative comments.

In all countries, respondents indicated having received amounts of training which varied greatly. Overall, content analysis of their answers revealed three common themes in all seven countries: (a) no or hardly any training, (b) a pronunciation component in a more general TEFL course or MA programme, and (c) phonetics/pronunciation courses/modules. For example, in Switzerland the replies about quantity varied from 3 comments citing no training at all, 10 references to training during CELTA courses, and a very specific description of a 16-week course during a Bachelor's programme (which did not address the teaching of pronunciation but only 'learning the symbols'). In Macedonia undergraduate courses were often mentioned, but pronunciation was part of 'not more than 5 per cent of the total number of classes during our undergraduate methodology course'. German respondents could not always remember their training, but others provided detail about university courses, which ranged from 60 hours, to two or three lessons per week, to 'one course each semester' or 'one hour a month during the 2-year teacher training'. Amongst the younger and less experienced teachers in Poland, less than a quarter of respondents (19 per cent) said they had received formal training in teaching pronunciation. In the Spanish data 28 per cent of the respondents indicated having received no, or practically no, formal training; only three respondents had received further training or taken subsequent courses after university.

Asked to describe the content and/or style of their training, numerous non-native English-speaking teachers (native speakers being less than 10 per cent of total respondents) explained how their undergraduate courses were aimed at improving their own pronunciation through phonetics and transcription, repetition and drills, discussion exercises, reading aloud, and listening tasks: 'working in a language lab, listen and repeat exercises (individual or in groups) with teacher or CD, ways of introducing new words and their pronunciation, ways of controlling the correct pronunciation'.

Training in a language lab was mentioned frequently by respondents in all countries except Switzerland, as were theoretical lectures and various types of exercises for practising phonetic symbols and phonemic transcription, English sound formation and categorization, basic phonetic and phonological rules, and different types of intonation patterns: 'We had a few classes about the pronunciation of English, intonation etc. but just the theory and no actual demonstration of how to teach them.' Many respondents did not distinguish between their undergraduate education and their actual teacher training. This may be for the simple reason that the only experience on which they *could* draw was their undergraduate phonetics and phonology lectures. Although most non-native teachers mentioned receiving pronunciation/phonetics training at undergraduate level, some respondents described practical techniques they acquired during postgraduate teacher training, such as how to teach pronunciation to young learners. The mostly native-speaker respondents in Switzerland mentioned that they 'watched teachers on DVDs' or that 'A speaker comes and then in groups we practise their teaching methods.' Some of them also referred to specific universities, books, biographies and authors, or explicitly claimed to be self-taught. For example, 17 per cent of French respondents mentioned training they had received at conferences, workshops, etc., which they had attended since becoming teachers. This type of autonomous profile also appears in the Spanish data, where 22 per cent described themselves as self-taught. One teacher in Macedonia concurred: 'I picked up the training during the seminars, summer schools or different workshops I took part in, and investigating on my own.'

Concomitantly, it was widely felt that having good pronunciation is *sufficient* for teaching pronunciation, however it is acquired. Some feel that being in an English-speaking country is essential to such acquisition: 'I went to study abroad, one year in Australia. Best pronunciation training ever.' Another confessed that 'I had spent three months as an au pair in the USA, and had the feeling at first, that I wouldn't need any pronunciation courses.' While they admitted to having received no formal training at all, one simply wrote that she was a native speaker and several remarked that they had nevertheless spent a year or more in Britain. Another referred to the distinction between ability to pronounce and ability to teach: 'Professors at the university and teacher trainers presumed that if one is able to pronounce correctly, they will somehow be able to make the children pronounce correctly, too.' Furthermore, as yet another aptly remarked, 'knowing about something is certainly not the same as knowing how to teach it'. Another common theme was equating phonetics with pronunciation, such as expressed in a comment from Germany: 'there was only a general phonetics course at the beginning of my studies, during one semester' and in another from Macedonia 'We studied Phonetics at university; it was a two-semester course.'

These comments confirm the tenacity of three commonly held misconceptions about pronunciation: first, that being a native speaker is enough; second, that simply living in an English-speaking country necessarily results in better pronunciation (Grant, 2014; Moyer, 2014); and third, that studying phonetics translates into being able to teach pronunciation. The first and second evoke the myth of the native speaker as superior, which persists despite evidence supporting the advantages of non-native speakers as teachers (Davies, 2003). For example, a respondent in Germany insisted on the importance of 'teachers who know difficulties of German learners' and a Finnish respondent lauded the pedagogical skills of her instructor, not their nativeness: 'I had a native teacher whose teaching skills were excellent.' Another Finn continued: 'My experience is generally (also at other institutions) that universities are often keen to recruit native speakers for this role, regardless of their training in pronunciation.'

All three misconceptions have arguably contributed to frightening many teachers away from pronunciation work in the classroom (Macdonald, 2002; Murphy, 2014). Insight into teachers' reticence to deal with pronunciation was provided by follow-up interviews with French participants from EPTiES, whose comments were echoed in numerous answers to the two open-ended questions. One participant 'avoided doing pronunciation' for her entire career and another spoke of 'a vicious circle': she didn't feel she truly understands the phonetics and phonology of English but, as she didn't feel obliged to teach pronunciation, she wasn't bothered about learning more. Another described herself as 'wandering around in the dark'.

To conclude, participants' comments reveal that most of the non-native English-speaking respondents had received training in improving their own pronunciation. They emphasized that although they had been taught about pronunciation or had worked on improving theirs, they had been taught little or nothing about how to teach pronunciation. Nonetheless, whatever training they had received was often judged positively.

12.3.2 Inside the classroom: materials, teaching methods and assessment

Materials

Teachers were asked about published and online materials, as well as about their use of language laboratories and/or portable sound players. The results indicate that, unsurprisingly, use of cassettes and VHS-format videos is declining, whereas CDs and DVDs are widely used. On average, 84 per cent of participants said they used DVDs but this percentage was lower in France and Poland (60 per cent). Use of textbooks and dictionaries was quite varied, with participants in France indicating significantly less use (49 and 69 per cent), compared with the other six countries (means of 97 and 90 per cent).

A separate question asked about the use of various types of online resources. The most popular choice was specific language-learning websites

(76 per cent), such as Voice of America or BBC Learning English, followed by sites not specifically intended for this purpose, such as YouTube (64 per cent). Pre-existing modules or courses and podcasts were chosen by 45 and 37 per cent of respondents, respectively. All of these figures will undoubtedly evolve as the use of a wide variety of online resources (e.g. blogs, forums, MOOCs, games) becomes more prevalent.

It is a positive sign that over half (58 per cent) of respondents indicated that they had sufficient access to technical help, with Spain having the lowest score (30 per cent) and Finland the highest (78 per cent). Access to a language lab varied from 7 per cent in Germany to 100 per cent in Switzerland. Labs tend to be multimedia and/or digital, although cassette-based labs are still in use everywhere except in Switzerland. Portable sound players are also widely available, including tape, mp3, CD and 'other' types. Use of labs or portable players is quite varied, with infrequent use of a separate language lab often being offset by use of a portable sound player.

Teaching methods

In terms of teaching methods, questions focused on English language use in the classroom, the amount of time spent on pronunciation work, use of ear training and phonetic symbols. In addition to being broached in short quantitative questions, these topics arose in open-ended questions not necessarily included in this section of the survey. As the comments shed light on the statistics, the two are blended in the following analysis.

One important methodological difference between countries concerns the language used in the classroom, as this reflects differences in individual opinions, in national language policy and in societal priorities. In the 2012 *First European Survey on Language Competences* (ESLC) report (European Commission, 2012), on average respondents indicated that they *usually* use the target/foreign language (although students' estimations of teachers' use are slightly lower). The question on the EPTiES survey asked approximately how much of the time was a language other than English spoken in the classroom. The results obtained confirm those of the ESLC, as 60 per cent of EPTiES participants said they used another language only 0–20 per cent of the time. In Switzerland, an officially plurilingual society, 35 per cent of the respondents stated that they *never* used another language, compared to only 17 per cent in neighbouring France and an average of 8 per cent for all the countries surveyed. Half of the participants in Spain and 52 per cent in Switzerland claimed to use another language only 0–10 per cent of the time (compared to one third overall), whereas just over one third in France claimed such a low level of use. Switzerland's low use of a language other than English might be partly attributed to a supposed sensitivity to plurilingual issues.

The majority of respondents (79 per cent) indicated that they devoted up to a quarter of their weekly teaching time to teaching pronunciation,

although one teacher stated that '...apart from some random pronunciation exercises (demonstrating pronunciation of the new words mainly), I don't think that more than 5 per cent of the teaching time needs to be devoted to pronunciation'. Overall, 54 per cent of respondents from the seven countries said that devoting a quarter of weekly class time is sufficient, and 31 per cent indicated that they would like to devote up to half. Half the Polish participants felt that the minimal amount of pronunciation practice (from 1 to 25 per cent) was sufficient and two of them commented: 'I believe Polish students don't have problems with pronunciation, they are easily understood.' and 'My students are more interested in communication than pronunciation.' In Macedonia, the participants' comments showed that communication clearly takes priority over correct pronunciation. According to a widely spread comment, English '...needs to be learnt' because it is '...the language of global trade' and '...all information is in English'. These teachers were voicing the idea that communication is the goal of learning English for their learners; thus pronunciation as a skill is perceived as a lower priority (Henderson et al., 2012).

Comments made it clear that even when pronunciation seems teachable it may not be perceived as learnable, as one teacher commented in response to the question about the amount of time spent teaching pronunciation: 'I enjoy teaching pronunciation, the difficult part is that the students find it difficult to grasp. It's a difficult subject.' Another participant argued that '...the phoneme is too abstract and the syllable is more intuitive. So I teach only the schwa and work on lexical stress and weak vowels at the syllable level.'

A large majority of the respondents indicated that they used ear training (73 per cent). Individual percentages for each country are given in Table 12.4, in decreasing order.

Table 12.4 Rates of claimed use of ear training (yes + some replies combined) (%)

MK (n = 24)	DE (n = 326)	FR (n = 52)	ES (n = 27)	CH (n = 24)	FI (n = 92)	PL (n = 16)
83	82	75	74	67	67	63

Thus, ear training seems to be an uncontroversial and popular choice across the board. On the other hand, use of phonetic symbols is a more contentious issue as the open-ended replies frequently revealed. For example, one teacher argued that '...unless they become English language teachers, they will not really need to know how to write them. They will only need to be able to recognise them.' Another participant was quite certain that ear training '...helps the learners to get a feeling for the differences in writing

Table 12.5 Rates of claimed use of phonetic symbols in teaching among respondents: reading and writing (yes + some replies combined) (%)

	FI	MK	PL	ES	DE	FR	CH
Recognize	(n = 92)	(n = 24)	(n = 16)	(n = 27)	(n = 329)	(n = 52)	(n = 26)
	96	92	88	85	84	81	50
Write	(n = 92)	(n = 24)	(n = 16)	(n = 27)	(n = 328)	(n = 52)	(n = 26)
	23	63	56	41	28	54	8

and speaking' whereas another said that '...parents are paying for English communication – not the learning of symbols'.

As far as the use of phonetic symbols is concerned, two questions asked participants if they taught their student to write (W) or to recognize (R) phonetic symbols (Table 12.5).

In all seven countries, respondents were less likely to teach their learners to write symbols (average 40 per cent) rather than to recognize them (average 82 per cent). Learners' ages might explain some of the variation in the results, as teachers are perhaps more likely to teach symbols to older learners. However, in Switzerland only 50 per cent of the participants claimed they taught their learners to recognize symbols and only 8 per cent indicated that they taught learners to write them, even though most of them worked with learners aged 17 and older. On the other hand, 79 per cent of respondents in France indicated having learners mainly in this age category and the majority indicated teaching students to recognize (81 per cent) as well as write (54 per cent) symbols. The greatest difference in responses between teaching students to recognize and to write symbols was in Finland (73 per cent). This could be due in part to the fact that one third of participants in Finland indicated that their learners were aged just 6–12 years.

The quantitative data are thought-provoking but the qualitative comments revealed a more complex set of influences on decision-making. In written comments, four common themes appeared: (a) language-specific features; (b) the age of learners; (c) a lack of self-confidence with symbols and with technology; and (d) the need to prioritize during limited contact hours. The latter two are areas where teachers and teacher training can effect change.

Language-specific features influence teachers' decisions and this seems logical if they attribute importance to contrastive comparisons between English and the students' first language. In this respect, participants referred to teaching symbols only for those sounds which do not exist in the learners' native language or considered to be difficult for whatever reasons – never made explicit by the respondents. Whether the symbols were taught or not was often conditioned by the age of the learners. Of university-level learners one participant wrote: 'I teach the symbols which are most pertinent for

their pronunciation difficulties (vowels, diphthongs) so that they can check pronunciation, connect sounds/spelling etc.' In contrast, a few participants saw it as a futile investment with older students, the implication being that learners' pronunciation was already fossilized: 'it's too late in their studies'. Teachers working with younger learners often linked teaching symbols to work on the spelling-pronunciation mismatch of English.

In terms of confidence in one's professional skills, many respondents felt that a teacher has to master IPA symbols in order to teach pronunciation; as they themselves are not experts, they doubted their ability to teach it. One teacher described how she was 'not at home with them'. Survey participants often mentioned symbols in the same breath as technology when justifying why they do or do not teach pronunciation. For example, several respondents attributed their reticence to teach pronunciation to a lack of technological skills, being convinced that pronunciation cannot be taught without technology, be it in the form of a language lab, software or Internet-based resources. Although technology can be extremely useful, many would argue that it is not essential for teaching pronunciation, so a lack of technology skills should not deter teachers. Technology in the learners' hands also influences prioritizing. According to one participant, 'It's very – too – time-consuming. Now they use on-line dictionaries and listen to the pronunciation of words.' Several participants referred to Internet dictionaries' clickable sound files. A desire to promote autonomy was also given as a reason for teaching at least symbol recognition. For example, one participant argued that learners 'are independent and with a good dictionary should be able to pronounce any word, known or unknown'. One went so far as to claim that learning the symbols promotes 'rigorous reasoning', whereas another asserted 'This is not an efficient way of teaching pronunciation. I have better.'

Assessment

Pronunciation assessment was explored in a series of questions. First, teachers were asked whether they base assessments on an established national or international scale. In every country, a minority of the respondents replied affirmatively to this Yes–No question (Table 12.6).

The highest percentages of established scale use were found in Switzerland (36 per cent) and in France (31 per cent), with Spain (27 per cent) and

Finland (23 per cent) not far behind. That none of the participants in Poland and so few in Germany and Macedonia refer to an established scale is surprising and cannot be explained simply by looking at the age of learners. Participants in Germany and Macedonia taught similar age ranges (mostly young adults and a few teach children) but participants in Poland taught both ends of the age spectrum. Economic factors may play a role (e.g. lack of pre- or in-service training in how to use a scale), but this probably does not explain the low German figure.

Of those participants who did use an established scale, a few mentioned international certifications (BULATS,² ILR or TOEFL). The vast majority (86 per cent) referred to the CEFR, i.e. the Common European Framework of Reference (Council of Europe, 2001) in a related open-ended question: 'If yes, please state which scale is used as a reference scale for your evaluations, e.g. ACTEFL, CEF, etc.' This is interesting, as use of the Framework is relatively rare throughout Europe (European Commission, 2012, p. 65). An ongoing poll confirms this.³ It asks 'How well do you understand the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages?' As of 2 June 2014, out of 3291 votes, 14 per cent chose 'I have no idea what the CEFR is' and 31 per cent chose 'I know what it is, but I'm not very confident with it.' Almost half (43 per cent) chose 'I'm fairly confident, but would like more help with it', and a mere 12 per cent chose 'I'm an expert.' In the EPTiES survey, amongst the minority who indicated that they did refer to an established scale, 100 per cent of respondents in France and in Spain mention the CEFR. For France, this is reassuring because more than 60 per cent of teachers in French primary and secondary schools have received specific training in using it (European Commission, 2012, p. 65). Percentages were also quite high for Switzerland (89 per cent), Germany (88 per cent) and Finland (79 per cent), whereas in Macedonia only 11 per cent of respondents mentioned the CEF and none in Poland. Failure to use the CEFR in relation to pronunciation might also be linked to the fact that the descriptors do not directly refer to pronunciation, only to fluency and ease. For example, the descriptor for Spoken Interaction at Level B2 is: 'I can interact with a degree of fluency and spontaneity that makes regular interaction with native speakers quite possible' (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 12).

Questions about the practical aspects of assessment explored when it is carried out and via which types of activities. Of the two questions about assessment timing, one Yes–No question explored whether teachers make use of diagnostic assessments at the beginning of the course, and another multiple-choice question asked whether they do assessment only at the end of a course (evaluative), during the course to help the learning process (formative or continuous assessment), or whether they combine the two (during and at the end). The results for these two questions are given in Table 12.7.

In answer to the question about the use of diagnostic assessments before a course, 31 per cent of respondents indicated doing such assessments, with figures ranging from 67 per cent in Switzerland and 64 per cent in Spain

Table 12.6 Rate of claimed links between assessment and (inter)national scales: yes replies (%)

CH (n = 25)	ES (n = 26)	FR (n = 52)	FI (n = 84)	MK (n = 18)	DE (n = 291)	PL (n = 14)
36	27	31	23	11	9	0

Table 12.7 Assessment timing options: rates for diagnostic, evaluative, formative (%)

Diagnostic (<i>n</i> = 513)		Non-diagnostic (<i>n</i> = 511)			
Yes	No	Evaluative	Formative	Both	Other
31	69	6	49	33	13

to 26 per cent in Germany and 23 per cent in Finland. Respondents may have indicated less use of diagnostic assessments simply because it is not an evaluation requirement.

In general, evaluating learners only at the end of a course seems to be quite rare (6 per cent on average, with no respondents in Macedonia, Spain or Switzerland). However, 21 per cent of surveyed teachers in Poland said they evaluated learners only at the end of a course and 57 per cent of them indicated that they use a combination of final and continuous assessment. Assessment during the course seems to be the most common choice, with an overall average of 49 per cent with the highest percentages for participants in Finland (45 per cent), Germany (55 per cent) and Macedonia (58 per cent). Overall, a combination of continuous and end-of-course assessment is apparently also used (average 33 per cent), especially in Spain where the figure rises to 63 per cent. In France and Switzerland, all three assessment types were almost equally chosen, implying that these teachers diagnose problems, monitor their students' progress during the course and evaluate it at the end.

The respondents were also asked to choose from a list the activities they use for diagnostic, formative and evaluative assessments (Table 12.8).

Amongst the types of assessment activities selected, the most popular were oral performances (presentations, sketches, dialogues), closely followed by

Table 12.8 Tasks used in the assessment of pronunciation skills (%)

Type of activity	Type of assessment		
	Diagnostic (<i>n</i> = 525)	Formative (<i>n</i> = 535)	Evaluative (<i>n</i> = 535)
Oral performances	28	78	70
Reading aloud	28	73	56
Listening comprehension	23	65	58
Oral exams in pairs	15	46	53
Individual oral exams	15	37	42
Written work	9	18	18
Other	5	11	7

reading aloud and listening comprehension. In both formative and evaluative assessments there was a distinct tendency to test students in pairs (46 and 53 per cent, respectively). This may be due in part to the influence of training to become a Cambridge examiner or training received during a CELTA or DELTA⁴ course. The data highlight the fact that written tasks (e.g. transcription) are used less frequently compared to the more popular tasks (9, 18 and 18 per cent respectively). This brings to light an intriguing mismatch, in that the majority of the teachers were trained in transcription but do not make use of it in evaluating learners' performance. This may be related to the stated communicative objectives of many European curricula. Although the European Union makes no attempt to impose a teaching method for foreign languages, it does seek to promote 'a broad holistic approach to teaching in which emphasis is placed upon communicative ability and multilingual comprehension. The great majority of educational systems issue recommendations to attach equal emphasis to all four communication skills' (European Commission, 2012, p. 82). Therefore, it seems logical that teachers would prefer to assess learners' pronunciation in situations resembling real-life communication rather than via transcriptions, for example.

Finally, it should be noted that the Council of Europe's European Language Portfolio (ELP) was not included in the list of activities to choose from, even though it was explicitly developed and promoted as a self-assessment tool that could also help improve meta-linguistic reflection (Council of Europe, 1997). We expected it to be mentioned in the open-ended questions, as Swiss universities and vocational schools, for example, often use it (CDIP, 2014), but no one referred to it. This lends credence to the ESLC report, according to which fewer than 25 per cent of European teachers use the ELP (European Commission, 2012, p. 65).

12.3.3 Outside the classroom: TV and cinema, face-to-face and online interactions, private tuition

It is also important to gauge levels of exposure to English outside the classroom, where learners can practise (or at least read or listen to) a foreign language. To this end, two questions focused on availability and use:

- Are students exposed to English outside the classroom via ___? (four options to choose from): Yes, Some, No, I don't know.
- Estimate how often your learners are exposed to English outside the classroom via the following sources: ___ (five options to choose from): Never, Rarely, Sometimes, Frequently, I don't know.

It must be stressed that the results reflect teachers' appraisals or opinions of their students' habits; the information does not come directly from the learners and must, therefore, be treated with caution. Participants chose

from a list of possibilities: subtitled television programmes, subtitled films in the cinema, private tuition, face-to-face contact and online resources such as e-mail, forums, chatrooms.

Television and cinema

The media are an obvious field of action for national language policy. Legislation affects everyday language use and, as a consequence, language learning. In 2008, in a paper to the European Parliament, the European Commission (2008) recommended the use of subtitles. The European Union has passed several laws in order to promote the languages of member states, including the 'Télévision sans frontières' (TSF) directive. First issued in 1989 and renewed in 2007, this directive obliges member states to ensure that at least 51 per cent of all television programmes, including those broadcast via satellite, Internet, etc., are made in the country. Films shown in the cinema face a similar battle, the European average for domestic film market share being only 13 per cent (Suomen elokuva Säätiö, 2013, p. 5). According to a 2012 report from the Finnish Film Foundation, 58 per cent of Finland's film market is taken by American films, compared with 27 per cent for Finnish films (*ibid.*). Domestic films fare even worse in Switzerland, occupying only 3 per cent of the market in 2008, compared with a 63 per cent market share for American films. Although the amount of domestic films varies in the different countries of the EPTIES survey, the latter focused on teachers' perceptions of how English-speaking films, widely available in the countries studied, were presented.

Table 12.9 summarizes the results of the survey questions concerning the availability of subtitled TV programmes.

According to the vast majority of participants in Finland and Macedonia (98 and 97 per cent), learners have access to subtitled TV programmes. The lowest percentages of positive answers for subtitled TV-programme access came from participants in Germany (24 per cent) and Spain (31 per cent). In France, Switzerland and Poland approximately 50 per cent of participants responded positively to this question. For Germany, Berentzen (2009) noted that it is rare for films and television programmes to be subtitled. Where subtitles are provided, they are 'primarily intended for the hearing-impaired. But in Scandinavian countries, the option of viewing productions with subtitles

Table 12.9 Rates of claimed exposure outside the classroom via subtitled TV programmes (yes + some replies combined) (%)

FI (n = 96)	MK (n = 29)	PL (n = 16)	CH (n = 26)	FR (n = 60)	ES (n = 29)	DE (n = 344)
98	97	57	51	49	31	24

in one's respective native tongue is available. In this way, immigrants are supported in their efforts to learn their new country's language' (*ibid.*). Subtitling probably plays a role in helping Scandinavians to learn each other's languages, thus promoting a degree of regional multilingual awareness. The idea of using television to improve language learning recently motivated the French national channel France2 to show an English-language television series every Monday night in English with French subtitles. According to *hdnumerique.com*, a media industry website, 'watching films in their original language encourages the learning of English.... This is part of the national channel's desire to favour this learning.'⁵

Conversely, Switzerland's multilingual reality and language policy may explain why only 51 per cent of the EPTIES participants in Switzerland indicated that subtitled television programmes provided exposure to English. Quite simply, the Federal Radio and Television Act of 24 March 2006 (Confédération Suisse, 2006) clearly requires the Swiss Broadcasting Corporation (SSR, Société Suisse de radiodiffusion et télévision) to provide programming to the entire populace in the three official languages and at least one radio programme in Romansch. In regions of language contact, broadcasting is in the two languages. Public channels broadcast in the national languages but people may also choose from a wide variety of international channels. The advent of cable and digital TV has been a key development throughout Europe, offering previously unavailable options. Often viewers can choose either a dubbed or subtitled version. For example, according to a survey of first-year Spanish university students studying English, 21 per cent prefer dubbed versions of English language films when available (Levey and Eizaga, unpublished).

In the cinema, foreign language films may be presented as dubbed, subtitled (in English or other languages) or neither. Table 12.10 presents the results for the question regarding the availability of English-subtitled foreign films in the cinema.

Table 12.10 Rates of claimed exposure outside the classroom via subtitled films in the cinema (yes + some replies combined) (%)

FI (n = 96)	MK (n = 29)	FR (n = 60)	PL (n = 16)	CH (n = 26)	DE (n = 344)	ES (n = 29)
99	97	89	88	85	42	27

In all the countries, foreign films are subtitled in the local language(s) and perhaps in English. An American film shown in Finland as a 'foreign language film' would have Finnish or Swedish subtitles but learners would hear English. In Macedonia, where there is only one national language, foreign

films in cinemas are subtitled in Macedonian. In Germany foreign films may be presented in three different ways in cinemas: in their original language (*Original Fassung*), in their original language with German subtitles (*Original mit Untertiteln*) or in the original language with English subtitles (*Original mit engl. Untertiteln*). This variety might explain why only 42 per cent of the participants in Germany answered affirmatively. However, the key factor in the results to this survey question is not how films are subtitled, but whether they are subtitled or dubbed. In other words, do they provide opportunities to read English or to hear it? In Spain, dubbing is deeply entrenched, going back to Franco's dictatorship when it served as a means of controlling and censoring content. Dubbing is more expensive than subtitling but it is culturally and historically established; this would explain why only 27 per cent of participants in Spain reported that their learners had access to English via subtitled cinema films. Switzerland juggles with different languages in both subtitles and dubbing; outside of urban centres, films are dubbed in the regional language, but in cities they are shown in their original language with subtitles in two of the official languages. In 2011, 27 per cent of the 1565 films shown were American films (Statistique Suisse, 2014), which means there are opportunities for learners to hear English in Swiss cinemas.

The next question explored to what extent learners make use of these resources, according to their teachers. The results confirm the tendencies noted above (Table 12.11). However, as in Finland no TV programmes and no films in the cinema are subtitled in English, Finnish participants must have understood the survey questions to be referring to aural exposure (through dubbing).

The results for availability of media and frequency of exposure to media are correlated to some extent. Frequency of exposure to English via subtitled TV programmes was estimated to be highest in Finland (98 per cent) and in Macedonia (86 per cent), whereas it was estimated to be lowest in Germany (11 per cent) and Spain (28 per cent). In Poland, only 38 per cent of participants responded affirmatively, perhaps because the 'voice-over' technique is the most popular means of treating foreign programmes on television; one speaker voices all characters' parts. However, this technique is not used in Polish cinemas, which may explain why participants in Poland had the

Table 12.11 Teachers' estimations of frequency of exposure via subtitled TV programmes/subtitled films at the cinema (%)

Subtitled TV	Frequently or sometimes	FI (n = 96)	MK (n = 28)	CH (n = 25)	FR (n = 60)	PL (n = 16)	ES (n = 29)	DE (n = 341)
		98	86	44	39	38	28	11
Subtitled cinema	Frequently or sometimes	FI (n = 92)	MK (n = 28)	CH (n = 25)	FR (n = 60)	PL (n = 16)	ES (n = 29)	DE (n = 340)
		91	61	68	52	94	17	7

highest levels of affirmative responses (94 per cent) for frequency of exposure to English via subtitled films in the cinema, ahead of Finland (91 per cent). The lowest figures for frequency of exposure via subtitled films in the cinema come from participants in Germany (7 per cent) and Spain (17 per cent).

To summarize, according to the teachers who participated in the survey, learners in Finland and Macedonia make the greatest use of a potential for exposure to English via TV programmes, and learners in Finland and Poland make the greatest use of potential exposure via films in the cinema. On the other hand, learners in Germany and Spain will have to rely on other sources to hear English, or already do.

Face-to-face and online interactions

Another key source of English outside the classroom is interactions with other people. In the same series of questions about film and television, participants were asked to estimate how frequently their learners were exposed to English outside the classroom via live interaction(s) with native and/or non-native speakers or online resources such as e-mail, forums, chatrooms, etc. Other sources such as Skype or MSN were not explicitly mentioned. A subcategory of these data is presented in Table 12.12, focusing on face-to-face or online encounters. It is noticeable that significantly fewer participants in Finland replied to these two questions (only 80, instead of 96 and 92 for television and cinema films), perhaps because most of them taught younger learners. Table 12.12 presents the results for both questions.

Overall, online opportunities for communicating in English exceed face to face, except in Switzerland, which has four national languages (three official ones) but where English is often used as a lingua franca by Swiss people from one language area when they want to communicate with people from another language area. There are also a considerable number of international companies in Switzerland whose in-house language is English. One might have thought the same to be somewhat true in Germany's powerful economy where a large number of international companies are involved, which might expect their employees to be able to communicate in English. Even though the percentage of pupils in vocational schools learning English

Table 12.12 Teachers' estimations of frequency of exposure outside the classroom via face-to-face/online interaction with native or non-native speakers (%)

		CH (n = 25)	FI (n = 80)	ES (n = 29)	PL (n = 16)	FR (n = 60)	MK (n = 28)	DE (n = 340)
Face to face	Frequently or sometimes	84	61	55	38	35	29	17
Online	Frequently or sometimes	68	88	59	69	69	82	48

has increased from 42 to 52 per cent (Statistisches Bundesamt, 2003, 2011) it appears that opportunities for practising English face to face outside language classes are limited.

Similarly, according to 41 per cent of Spanish respondents, their learners have few or no opportunities to speak face to face with native or non-native speakers and only 10 per cent said learners have frequent opportunities. Other comments made by participants in Spain confirm the commonly expressed belief that students have few opportunities to practise their English outside the classroom.

It is interesting to note that in terms of frequency of exposure via online opportunities, once again Finland and Macedonia seem to be 'paired up' (88 and 82 per cent reporting that exposure occurs 'frequently' or 'sometimes'). Other data from the EPTiES survey (Henderson et al., 2012) highlighted similarities between the two countries in the perceived status of English, with the importance of English in relation to other languages receiving an average rating of 4.7 (on a Likert scale of 1 to 5) in Finland and Macedonia. In their comments, respondents in Finland frequently mentioned the status of English as a global language, and in Macedonia they mentioned the economic and communicative relevance of English as a world language. However, one Finnish respondent pointed out that '*English is not the only foreign language people should learn*'. Finland is a country where foreign language skills are highly valued and vast resources are invested in language education. Foreign language skills may be equally valued in Macedonia but the country has fewer public sector resources to devote to language teaching. Despite vast historical, cultural and economic differences between the two countries, online opportunities may be fulfilling a role that official outlets for language learning are failing to satisfy.

Private tuition

Private tuition, in the form of extra lessons outside the school/university day, provides another way in which learners may be exposed to English. Table 12.13 presents the combined Yes + Some results for exposure to English via private tuition.

Table 12.13 Teachers' estimations of frequency of exposure outside the classroom via private tuition (yes + some replies combined) (%)

	MK (n = 29)	PL (n = 16)	ES (n = 29)	DE (n = 344)	FR (n = 60)	CH (n = 26)	FI (n = 96)
Private tuition	79	69	59	49	25	19	10

There are clear differences between the countries but the causes are not always easy to identify. The lowest figures are from Finland (10 per cent), Switzerland (19 per cent) and France (25 per cent). Although this could be attributed to the measurably high standard of public education in these countries or to a perception of its quality as high, this is not necessarily the case. As Oller and Glasman point out in their study of private tutoring in France: '(private tutoring) is mainly the result of new academic stakes, due to rising competition between schools and between students within school' (2013, p. 78).⁶ The countries where survey participants indicated the highest recourse to private tuition are Macedonia (80 per cent), Poland (69 per cent) and Spain (59 per cent). The participants from Macedonia and Poland, however, did not provide their insights as to why such tendencies occur in their countries. The Spanish data, on the other hand, imply that students or parents may be aware of the low priority given to spoken English in Spanish schools, where exams still tend to be only written, as noted in this respondent's comment: 'Unfortunately, the truth is that students must pass a written exam at the end of the year – there is no oral test. So I'm sorry to say oral skills are not the priority.'

To conclude, these three aspects of life beyond school (subtitled television and films, opportunities to practise speaking, and private tuition) reflect a range of characteristics and realities in the countries we surveyed. In terms of television programmes, Finland and Macedonia had the largest percentages of respondents who said their students had access to subtitled programmes on television and to subtitled films in cinemas. It was also in these two countries that the highest percentages of respondents felt their learners made use of these opportunities to expose themselves to English. In terms of films shown in the cinema, Finland and Poland had the highest percentages of respondents who indicated that their students make the greatest use of this source of exposure to English. In contrast, relatively few respondents in Germany and Spain felt their students had access to and made use of television and cinema resources. Switzerland had the highest percentage of respondents who said that learners take advantage of opportunities for face-to-face interaction in English, whereas recourse to online interactions was reported most frequently by respondents in Finland and Macedonia. Relatively few teachers in Finland, France and Switzerland stated that their learners received additional private tuition, in contrast to Macedonia, Poland and Spain, where more than half of our respondents felt that their learners probably call upon this often expensive resource. A fuller picture of influences from outside the classroom is beyond the scope of this chapter and can only be obtained by further research into official and de facto influences, including national language policy, issues of language status, and regional and national imperatives.

12.4 Conclusion

The goal of this chapter was to examine quantitative and qualitative data from seven European countries in which teachers replied to an online teacher survey of English pronunciation teaching practices (EPTiES). The survey asked teachers to evaluate and comment on the training they had received to teach English pronunciation, what they do inside the classroom and what happens outside the classroom in terms of students' exposure to English.

Our questions about teacher training led several old myths to resurface, notably about how spending time in an English-speaking country equates with pronouncing English well and that having a sound knowledge of phonetics and phonology is sufficient to be able to teach pronunciation. The results suggest that the respondents were generally satisfied with the training they had received, even though it did not involve much practice in teaching pronunciation. This was revealed in the comments to open-ended questions, where respondents often described their undergraduate training in phonetics and phonology, and/or the instruction they received to improve their pronunciation. Other comments made it clear that for some respondents, pronunciation is not seen as being a necessary part of communication skills. Overall, the teachers surveyed could be referred to as amateurs in terms of teaching pronunciation, as many of them are self-taught or have sought further training after starting teaching.

The survey also addressed practices inside the classroom via a number of questions about materials, methods and assessment. One surprising finding was the limited use of established assessment scales, despite promotion of the CEFR throughout Europe. This could mean that the CEFR is not seen as relevant to the teaching or assessment of pronunciation. To a certain extent, this may also be true for phonetic symbols, as the respondents tended to teach learners to recognize symbols, rather than to write them. Generally, the respondents appeared satisfied with the amount of time they devoted to pronunciation teaching, as well as with the availability of technical help. Use of labs or portable sound players varied greatly between the seven countries, as did the use of dictionaries and textbooks. As might be expected, use of CDs and DVDs has overtaken older technologies.

In terms of assessing pronunciation, the respondents tended to prefer continuous assessment methods. Further research should probe why this approach is preferred and whether it is holistic or centred on different aspects of pronunciation such as segments, intonation, etc. Respondents indicated how and when they carry out pronunciation assessment by stating which tasks on a list they use and for which type of assessment. In all three categories (diagnostic, formative, evaluative), oral performance (e.g.

presentations), reading aloud, listening followed by questions, and oral exams in pairs were much more popular than written tasks (e.g. transcription) and individual oral exams. This is not surprising because communication is the main purpose for which European secondary-school pupils learn English; therefore, the most frequently used assessment tasks are the kinds that focus on communication skills. Further research could explore which aspects of oral performance are assessed, and which features are rewarded and/or penalized.

Three aspects of life beyond school (subtitled television programmes and films, opportunities to speak English, private tuition) were evaluated via teachers' appraisals of their students' habits (rather than the learners' own assessments of their habits). The choices in the survey did not include Internet streaming of films and television series, or online and video games, but future studies should take these media into account, as high-speed Internet access, web 2.0 technology and 4G smartphone services are becoming widespread. Sockett's (2011) study of French students' downloading habits revealed that 60 per cent of those surveyed downloaded films or television series at least once a month. In addition, a recent survey in Finland shows that young Finns regularly consume English language media (Leppänen et al., 2011).

The EPTiES survey was designed to reveal possible differences between the countries surveyed. Not surprisingly, therefore, it generates more questions than answers. Although the quantitative and qualitative data it provides do not allow direct causal relationships to be established between factors, this chapter suggests tentative explanations for some of these differences. Further research, including both classroom observation and learner surveys in order to verify some of the claims made by teachers, is now needed to assess these possible explanations.

Our results confirm that the CEFR remains an underused tool. Nevertheless, studies and reports reflecting the efforts of teachers and researchers to adapt the existing descriptors to take pronunciation into account more explicitly should soon start to appear. Teacher training, both pre- and in-service, is another sector that needs improving, for example by clearly distinguishing between instruction in phonetics and phonology (knowing about English pronunciation) and training in pronunciation pedagogy (knowing how to teach pronunciation).

Acknowledgements

EPTiES is a product of the authors' collaboration with Una Cunningham, Deirdre Murphy and Rias van den Doel. We would also like to thank all the teachers who responded to the survey. Special mention must be made of the extensive work using questionnaires done by Polish colleagues, for example Marta Nowacka, Włodzimierz Sobkowiak and Katarzyna Janicka, Małgorzata

Kul and Jarosław Weckwerth. We were inspired by their work, although we did not use their exact questions.

Appendix: EPTiES questions

Participant information

Please select your gender:

How old are you?

How many years have you been teaching English?

Is English your native language?

Where do you teach? (Select a country.)

Do you teach in the private sector?

(Finland) Please list your qualifications, for example LH, HK, ...

(France) Please list your qualifications, for example CAPES, Agrégation, BA, DipTEFL, MA TESOL, PhD, IPA Certificate, etc.

(Macedonia, Poland, Spain, Switzerland) Please list your qualifications, for example BA, DipTEFL, MA TESOL, PhD, IPA Certificate, etc.

(Germany) Please list your qualifications, for example GrundschullehrerIn, HauptschullehrerIn, RealschullehrerIn, GymnasiallehrerIn, Universitätsdozent, BA, DipTEFL, MA TESOL, PhD, IPA

(France) Please indicate the *département* in which you teach:

(Germany) Please select the *Bundesland* in which you teach:

(Finland, France, Germany, Poland, Switzerland) Please select one of the following, about the type of area where you teach:

(Macedonia) Please indicate the town or postal code of the area where you teach:

(Switzerland) Please indicate the canton in which you teach:

(Spain) Please select one of the following, about the place where you teach:

(Poland) Please select one of the following, about the place where you teach:

(Finland, France, Germany) Please indicate at which level you teach:
Please state the native language(s) of your students.

Outside the classroom

Are students exposed to English outside the classroom?

- Are TV programmes subtitled?
- Are foreign language films in the cinema subtitled?
- Are there opportunities for students to practise English outside the classroom?

- Do your learners receive private English language tuition outside the classroom?
- Do they watch news channels such as BBC World, CNN, etc.?

Estimate how often your learners are exposed to English outside the classroom via the following sources:

- Via subtitled TV programmes
- Via subtitled films at the cinema
- Via radio programmes
- Via phone interaction(s) with native and/or non-native speakers
- Via live interaction(s) with native and/or non-native speakers
- Via online resources such as e-mail, forums, chatrooms, etc.
- Via other sources

Pronunciation teaching methods

Do you teach your learners how to RECOGNIZE phonetic symbols?

Why DO you or do you NOT teach your learners to recognize phonetic symbols?

Do you teach your learners to WRITE phonetic symbols?

Why DO you or do you NOT teach your learners to WRITE phonetic symbols?

Do you use ear training?

What percentage of your teaching time do you devote to teaching pronunciation PER WEEK?

What percentage of your teaching time would you LIKE to devote to teaching pronunciation PER WEEK?

Do you feel this is a sufficient amount of time? Why or why not?

Teaching materials

Do you use any of these published materials? You may select more than one (textbooks, dictionaries, CDs, cassettes, videos, DVDs).

Do you use any of these online materials? You may select more than one.

- Podcasts
- Pre-existing modules or courses
- Mailing lists
- Blogs
- Forums
- Social networking sites, e.g. Facebook, ...
- Websites intended for language learning, e.g. VOA, BBC Learning English, ...

- Websites not specifically intended for language learning
- 'Virtual World' environment, e.g. Second Life

Do you have access to a separate language lab?

If yes, please indicate what type of language lab. You may select more than one. (cassette, digital, multimedia)

Do you have access to portable sound players?

If yes, please indicate what type of portable sound player. You may select more than one (tape player; digital, e.g. mp3 player, ...; CD player; other).

How frequently do you use these resources: Separate language lab, Portable sound player.

Do you feel that you have sufficient access to technical help?

Evaluation of pronunciation

Do you do an initial diagnostic for any of your learners?

Do you evaluate your learners' pronunciation at the end of a course and/or during the course?

Are any of your evaluations linked to an established scale, for example a national or international scale?

If yes, please state which scale is used as a reference scale for your evaluations, e.g. ACTEFL, CEF, etc.

Which types of tasks do you use for DIAGNOSTIC assessment of pronunciation skills? Please tick

Which types of tasks do you use for FORMATIVE assessment of pronunciation skills? Please tick the ones you use.

Which types of tasks do you use for EVALUATIVE assessment of pronunciation skills? Please tick the ones you use.

- Written work, e.g. transcription into symbols or letters, etc.
- Oral performances, e.g. short sketches, dialogues, presentations, etc.
- Individual oral exams
- Oral exams in pairs
- Listening and questions, e.g. multiple-choice, short answer, note-taking, etc.
- Reading aloud (with or without preparation time)
- Other
- I don't know
- None of the above

*(Finland)

Do you do an initial diagnostic (*lähtötaso*) for any of your learners?

Which types of tasks do you use for DIAGNOSTIC (*lähtötaso*) assessment of pronunciation skills? Please tick the ones you use.

Which types of tasks do you use for FORMATIVE (*väliarviointi*) assessment of pronunciation skills? Please tick the ones you use.

Which types of tasks do you use for EVALUATIVE (*päättöarviointi*) assessment of pronunciation skills? Please tick the ones you use.

Teacher training

In relation to pronunciation, please rate the teacher training you received from 1 to 5, with 1 as 'extremely poor' and 5 as 'excellent'.

Please tell us how much training you received specific to teaching pronunciation. Feel free to mention any period of time (hours, months, years, etc.).

Please explain the content and/or style of the training you received. Feel free to mention types of courses, approaches, etc.

Views/attitudes

For you personally, how important is English in relation to other languages? Please rate from 1 to 5, with 1 as 'not important at all' and 5 'extremely important'.

For you personally, how important is pronunciation in relation to other language skills? Please rate from 1 to 5, with 1 as 'the least important' and 5 as 'the most important'.

For you personally, how easy is it to teach English pronunciation? Please rate from 1 to 5, with 1 as 'extremely difficult' and 5 as 'extremely easy'.

How would you rate your own pronunciation skills? Please rate from 1 to 5, with 1 as 'extremely poor' and 5 as 'excellent'.

Rate your awareness of your learners' goals. Please rate from 1 to 5, with 1 as 'no awareness' and 5 as 'excellent awareness'.

Please rate your awareness of your learners' skills. Please rate from 1 to 5, with 1 as 'no awareness' and 5 as 'excellent awareness'.

Please rate from 1 to 5 how motivated you feel your learners are to speak English, with 1 as 'totally unmotivated' and 5 as 'extremely motivated'.

To what extent do you feel your students aspire to have native or near native pronunciation of English? Please rate from 1 to 5, with 1 as 'do not aspire to this at all' and 5 as 'aspire to this 100 per cent'.

Teaching context

What is the average age of your learners?

On average, how many years of English instruction have your learners already received in the educational system?

On average, how many hours of English instruction do your learners receive per week?

Are groups streamed by language competence level?

If learners are streamed into groups by levels, how is their level assessed?

If you refer to the CEFR levels, what is the average level of your learners' spoken English?

Approximately how much of the time is a language other than English spoken in the classroom?

Model/norm

For RECEPTIVE work (listening, reading), which variety (ies) or model(s) of English do you use in your classes? You may choose more than one answer.

For PRODUCTIVE work (speaking, writing), which ...

For RECEPTIVE work (listening, reading), which ...

For PRODUCTIVE work (speaking, writing), which ...

- British 'RP'
- General American English
- Canadian English
- Irish English
- Scottish English
- Welsh English
- Australian English
- New Zealand English
- South African English
- A type of international English
- Another variety
- No preference
- Other

Notes

1. Alice Henderson assumes the main responsibility for the present chapter and the other authors are listed alphabetically. They all contributed to the EPTiES project and to this chapter (survey design, data collection, data analysis, writing and editing).
2. BULATS, or Business Language Testing Service, is a series of computerized language tests. The ILR (Interagency Language Roundtable) refers both to the test and the scale used by the American government to evaluate the language skills of its employees.
3. Figures from the online survey available at the Cambridge University Press-sponsored website Cambridge English Teacher (<http://www.cambridgeenglishteacher.org/>).
4. The DELTA (Diploma in English Language Teaching to Adults) is one of several diplomas available via Cambridge University and certifies people as apt to teach English as a foreign language. It can only be taken by teachers with two years' teaching experience.

5. <http://www.hdnumerique.com/actualite/articles/11709-une-option-vost-le-lundi-soir-sur-france-2.html>: 'visionner des films en VOST a le mérite également de favoriser l'apprentissage de l'anglais. [...] L'opération s'inscrit dans la volonté de la chaîne publique de favoriser l'apprentissage de l'anglais.'
6. See also Bray (2011) for a discussion of private tutoring elsewhere in Europe.

References

- Berentzen, K. (2009, September). *Learning through soap operas: Does ordinary TV assist foreign-language competence?* Goethe Institut. Online-Redaktion. Retrieved from: <http://www.goethe.de/ges/spa/prj/sog/mud/en5023826.htm>
- Bradford, B. and Kenworthy, J. (1991). Phonology on Teacher Training Courses. *Speak Out!* 9: 12–15.
- Bray, M. (2011). *The challenge of shadow education: Private tutoring and its implications for policy makers in the European Union*. Brussels: European Commission. Retrieved from: <http://www.nesse.fr/nesse/activities/reports/the-challenge-of-shadow-education-1>
- Breitkreutz, J. A., Derwing, T. M. and Rossiter, M. J. (2001). Pronunciation teaching practices in Canada. *TESL Canada journal*, 19 (1): 51–61.
- Burgess, J. and Spencer, S. (2000). Phonology and pronunciation in integrated language teaching and teacher education. *System*, 28 (2): 191–215.
- CDIP (Conférence suisse des directeurs cantonaux de l'instruction publique) (2014). *Langues étrangères: Portfolio*. Retrieved from: <http://www.ides.ch/dyn/15540.php>
- Confédération Suisse (2006). *Loi fédérale sur la radio et la télévision*. Retrieved from: <http://www.admin.ch/opc/fr/classified-compilation/20001794/index.html>
- Council of Europe (1997). *European Language Portfolio. Propositions for elaboration*. Strasbourg, France: Council for Cultural Co-operation, Language Learning for European Citizenship CC-LANG.
- Council of Europe (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Couper, G. (2011). What makes pronunciation teaching work? Testing for the effect of two variables: Socially constructed metalanguage and critical listening. *Language Awareness*, 20 (3): 159–82.
- Davies, A. (2003). *The native speaker: Myth and reality* (2nd edn). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Dimitrova, S. and Chernogorova, T. (2012). English pronunciation models and tertiary-level students: A Bulgarian perspective. In T. Paunović and B. Čubrović (eds), *Exploring English phonetics* (pp. 208–24). Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Dörnyei, Z. and Taguchi, T. (2010). *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing* (2nd edn). New York: Routledge.
- European Commission (2008). Multilingualism – an asset and a commitment. Retrieved from: http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/education_training_youth/lifelong_learning/ef0003_en.htm
- European Commission (2012). *First European survey on language competences*. Retrieved from: http://ec.europa.eu/languages/policy/strategic-framework/documents/language-survey-final-report_en.pdf
- Foote, J. A., Holtby, A. K. and Derwing, T. M. (2011). Survey of the teaching of pronunciation in adult ESL programs in Canada. *TESL Canada Journal*, 29 (1): 1–22.
- Grant, L. (2014). Students would make better progress in pronunciation if they just practiced more. In L. Grant (ed.), *Pronunciation myths: Applying second language*

- research to classroom teaching (pp. 137–59). Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press.
- Henderson, A., Frost, D., Tergujeff, E., Kautzsch, A., Murphy, D., Kirkova-Naskova, A., Waniek-Klimczak, E., Levey, D., Cunningham, U. and Curnick, L. (2012). The English pronunciation teaching in Europe survey: Selected results. *Research in Language*, 10 (1): 5–27.
- Leppänen, S., Pitkänen-Huhta, A., Nikula, T., Kytölä, S., Törmäkangas, T., Nissinen, K., Kääntä, L., Räisänen, T., Laitinen, M., Pahta, P., Koskela, H., Lähdesmäki, S. and Jousmäki, H. (2011). *National survey on the English language in Finland: Uses, meanings and attitudes*. Studies in Variation, Contacts and Change in English, Vol. 5. Retrieved from: <http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/journal/volumes/05>
- Levey, D. and Eizaga, B. Survey of Spanish university students' English language habits. Unpublished report. Cadiz, Spain: Universidad de Cadiz.
- Lintunen, P. (2004). *Pronunciation and phonemic transcription: A study of advanced Finnish learners of English*. Turku, Finland: University of Turku.
- Macdonald, S. (2002). Pronunciation: Views and practices of reluctant teachers. *Prospect: An Australian Journal of TESOL*, 17 (3): 3–18.
- Moyer, A. (2014). Exceptional outcomes in L2 phonology: The critical factors of learner engagement and self-regulation. *Applied Linguistics*, 35 (4): 418–40.
- Murphy, D. (2011). An investigation of English pronunciation teaching in Ireland. *English Today*, 27 (4): 10–18.
- Murphy, J. M. (1997). Phonology courses offered by MATESOL programs in the U.S. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31 (4): 741–64.
- Murphy, J. M. (2014). Teacher training programmes provide adequate preparation in how to teach pronunciation. In L. Grant (ed.), *Pronunciation myths: Applying second language research to classroom teaching* (pp. 188–224). Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press.
- Nowacka, M. (2010). The ultimate attainment of English pronunciation by Polish college students: A longitudinal study. In E. Waniek-Klimczak (ed.), *Issues in accents of English 2* (pp. 233–60). Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Oller, A.-C. and Glasman, D. (2013). Forms and stakes of private tutoring in France. In M. Bray, A. E. Mazawi and R. G. Sultana (eds), *Private tutoring across the Mediterranean: Power dynamics and implications for learning and equity* (pp. 77–92). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Paunović, T. (2009). Plus ça change... Serbian EFL students' attitudes towards varieties of English. *Poznań Studies in Contemporary Linguistics*, 45 (4): 511–33. Retrieved from: <http://versita.metapress.com/content/6563h54842u858nm/fulltext.pdf>
- Schmitz, C. (2012). *LimeSurvey: An open source survey tool*. Hamburg, Germany: LimeSurvey Project. Available from: <http://www.limesurvey.org>
- Socket, G. (2011). From the cultural hegemony of English to online informal learning: Cluster frequency as an indicator of relevance in authentic documents. *ASp*, 60: 5–20.
- Statistique Suisse (2014). *Les films exploités dans les salles de cinéma en Suisse*. Retrieved from: <http://www.bfs.admin.ch/bfs/portal/fr/index/themen/16/02/01/dos/02/02.html>
- Statistisches Bundesamt (2003). *Bildung und Kultur. Berufliche Schulen* [Education and culture. Vocational schools]. Fachserie 11, Reihe 2. Wiesbaden. Retrieved from: https://www.destatis.de/GPStatistik/receive/DESerie_serie_00000111
- Statistisches Bundesamt (2011). *Bildung und Kultur. Berufliche Schulen*. [Education and culture. Vocational schools]. Fachserie 11, Reihe 2. Wiesbaden. Retrieved from: https://www.destatis.de/GPStatistik/receive/DESerie_serie_00000111
- Suomen elokuva Säätio/SES [Finnish Film Foundation] (2013). *Elokuvavuosi 2012* [Facts and Figures]. Helsinki, Finland: SES.
- Tergujeff, E. (2012). English pronunciation teaching: Four case studies from Finland. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 3 (4): 599–607.
- Tergujeff, E. (2013a). *English pronunciation teaching in Finland*. Jyväskylä, Finland: University of Jyväskylä. Available from: <http://tinyurl.com/nd624kz>
- Tergujeff, E. (2013b). Learner perspective on English pronunciation teaching in an EFL context. *Research in Language*, 11 (1): 81–95.
- Tergujeff, E., Ullakonoja, R. and Dufva, H. (2011). Phonetics and foreign language teaching in Finland. In S. Werner and T. Kinnunen (eds), *XXVI Fonetiikan päivät 2010* (pp. 63–8). Joensuu, Finland: University of Eastern Finland.
- Walker, R. (1999). Proclaimed and perceived wants and needs among Spanish teachers of English. *Speak Out!* 24: 25–32.
- Waniek-Klimczak, E. (2002). Context for teaching English phonetics and phonology. In E. Waniek-Klimczak and P. J. Meia (eds), *Accents and speech in teaching English phonetics and phonology* (pp. 139–52). Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Peter Lang.
- Waniek-Klimczak, E. and Klimczak, K. M. (2005). Target in speech development: Learners' views. In K. Dziubalska-Kolaczyk and J. Przedlacka (eds), *English pronunciation models: A changing scene* (pp. 229–50). Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang.



UNIVERSIDAD DE
MURCIA

12 December 2019

To Whom It May Concern:

I hereby certify that the paper titled :

Henderson, A., Curnick, L., Frost, D., Kautzsch, A., **Kirkova-Naskova, A.**, Levey, D.
Tergujeff, E., & Waniek-Klimczak, E. (2015). **The English Pronunciation Teaching in
Europe Survey: Factors Inside and Outside the Classroom**. In J. Mompean, & J. Fouz-
González (Eds.), *Investigating English Pronunciation: Trends and Directions* (pp. 260-291).
Palgrave Macmillan.

published by Palgrave Macmillan in 2015 (ISBN 978-1-137-50943-7) under the supervision
of my colleague Jonás Fouz-González and myself, was blind peer-reviewed by to external
researchers:

David Detterding (University of Brunei Darussalam, Brunei);
Imelda Brady (Universidad Católica de Murcia, Spain)

Both reviewers agreed that the paper should be included in the volume – all contributions to
the volume were also peer-reviewed. The manuscript was also thoroughly edited by us (Dr.
Fouz-González and Dr. Mompean) and we were also assisted in this process by staff from
Palgrave Macmillan. The peer review work carried out for all the contributions in the volume
is acknowledged on page xii (Preface and Acknowledgments) of that work.

Should you require more information about the contribution (see also
<https://www.palgrave.com/gp/book/9781137509420>) or the paper by Henderson et al., (2005)
please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Jose A.Mompean

José A. Mompeán-González
Associate Professor
Department of English
University of Murcia (Spain)
mompean@um.es
<https://webs.um.es/mompean/miwiki/doku.php>

Facultad de Letras
Departamento de Filología Inglesa
Universidad de Murcia
Campus Universitario de La Merced. 30.071 Murcia
Tel. (+34) 868 88 4383 – Fax: (+34) 868 88 3185

Preface and Acknowledgements

It is a great pleasure for us to present the current volume, which focuses on cutting-edge research in English pronunciation, a field that continues to attract a great deal of attention and is still in need of maturation and further evolution.

The contributions in the present volume are an example of this. They are extended, peer-reviewed accounts of selected presentations in Murcia at EPIP3, the third in the conference series English Pronunciation: Issues and Practices (EPIP). The contributions exemplify some of the current trends and directions in the field. They offer interesting empirical results that advance knowledge on a range of issues, following modern research standards and using a wide range of data-gathering methods, techniques and tools.

We heartily thank all the authors for their collaboration during the work carried out for the present volume. Our thanks also go to a number of researchers who have offered their time and insightful feedback on the work presented here. These include Helen Fraser (University of New England, Australia), Alice Henderson (University of Savoie, France), David Deterding (University of Brunei Darussalam, Brunei), Dan Frost (University of Savoie, France), David Levey (University of Cadiz, Spain), Masaki Taniguchi (Kochi University, Japan), Patricia Infante and Eugenia San Segundo (CSIC PhonLab, Spain), Pilar Mompeán and Imelda Brady (Universidad Católica de Murcia, Spain), Javier Valenzuela (University of Murcia, Spain) and Inmaculada Arboleda (Universidad Politécnica de Cartagena, Spain).

We would also like to thank Libby Forrest, Rebecca Brennan and Esme Chapman at Palgrave Macmillan and copy-editor Philip Tye for their constant support and help.

We hope our readers will embark on an inspiring and motivating experience as they explore the following pages.

Jose A. Mompean and Jonás Fouz-González

Notes

Lesley Curni is a teacher trainer and researcher in France and Spain. She is at the University of Murcia for her research on pronunciation and academic writing.

Jonás Fouz-González completed his PhD in English for Second Language Acquisition at the University of Murcia. He is currently teaching English as a Second Language and has participated in several conferences on language acquisition, (L2)

Dan Frost is a teacher and at Strasbourg. He completed his doctorate in English at the University of Murcia and Sweden. He is currently a secondary school teacher and is now a senior lecturer at the University of Murcia, Spain. He is also a teacher of oral English at the University of Murcia.

Mark Gray is a teacher at the Université de Paris. He is a linguist, speaking English, French and Spanish. He is in the area of English as a Second Language, speaking English, French and Spanish. He is the author of an English as a Second Language (ESL) textbook.

Alice Henderson is a teacher in France, where she is currently a teacher of English as a Second Language. She is also a researcher in phonology and coordinates the English as a Second Language research group at the University of Savoie.