

# Engaging the senses

## A sensory-based approach to L2 pronunciation instruction for actors

Suzanne Cerreta and Pavel Trofimovich

Concordia University

This case study examined the benefits of a sensory-based approach for teaching second language pronunciation to actors, addressing the unique learning goal of nativelike speech for nonnative professional actors. Two French Canadian actors (Marianne and Sebastian) were followed over 10 weeks of pronunciation instruction based on Knight's (2012) theatrical voice methods and Gibson's (1969) principles of sensory learning. Audio samples from scripted performances before and after instruction were rated for global and linguistic measures by 10 linguistically trained listeners and for performance measures by 10 advanced acting students. Listener ratings showed a significant improvement in accentedness for Marianne and greater comprehensibility for both actors, while qualitative data revealed actors' preferences for different types of instruction. Results suggest that sensory learning appears beneficial for some learners and that pronunciation instruction could be supplemented with sensory-based activities.

**Keywords:** pronunciation instruction, theatre, sensory-based learning, classroom-based teaching, case study

### 1. Introduction

While most current second language (L2) pronunciation research follows the intelligibility principle, focusing on methodologies that promote L2 speech that is both intelligible and comprehensible to interlocutors (see Derwing & Munro, 2015), many L2 teachers and learners around the globe hold nativeness, often equated with lack of foreign accent, as the desired learning and teaching goal. For example, among the 50 Japanese students studied by Tokumoto and Shibata (2011), 34 chose sounding native rather than comprehensible as their priority. Although it is worth emphasizing to both teachers and learners in various contexts that “[they] need to accept that having an accent is a normal aspect of L2 learning”

(Munro, 2003, p. 48), it would also be important to address the needs of learners who require nativelike pronunciation, especially those in specific occupational contexts. To date, researchers have investigated the learning of L2 pronunciation in the occupational context of air traffic controllers (e.g., Aiguo, 2007) and international teaching assistants (e.g., Wennerstrom, 1992). However, little research has focused on pronunciation needs and outcomes for professional actors, whose pronunciation accuracy may determine employability. The only study known to us is Leigh's (2016) action research project to teach, in five sessions, Italian lyric diction to opera singers.

In the context of television and film in North America, many actors for whom English is not a native language feel the pressure to sound native in English (Schiffman, 2004). For example, French-speaking Quebec actors who had traveled to New York City to work with a pronunciation therapist in the hopes of acquiring native pronunciation in English reported losing jobs to less experienced actors, being told that "they don't sound right for the part" (Fine, 1999, p.1). A focus on native speech, at least among US filmmakers, likely reflects the practice that "accents in a movie have traditionally been used as part of a character's identification and thus are only around if they are part of the plot" (Gasher, cited in Fine, 1999, p. 2). Although Hollywood is reaching out to include diverse locations and stories in film and television, it fails to reflect the "multi-accented reality alive on the streets of major cities" (Fine, 1999, p.2). Thus, as communities in North America become increasingly multilingual and diverse (Banks, 2006), actors are still being asked to conform to a standard way of speaking, exemplified by native speech varieties represented in North American film and television (Knight, 1997).

The focus on nativeness in film and television will likely persist until the industry standard changes to reflect the wide cultural spectrum of the society it represents, meanwhile leaving L2 actors dependent on pronunciation instruction to further their career goals. Most theatre voice and speech programs use audiolingual practices in teaching pronunciation (Knight, 1997), promoting Edith Skinner's book *Speak with Distinction* (1942/2000) since the 1950s. Used in many acting conservatories and theatre speech classes, this textbook encourages "Good American Speech" through rote-drill instruction (Barnes, 2011). Rote learning may be beneficial for some students; however, there is a lack of instructional methods for actors that help transfer form-focused skills, such as pronunciation, into a performative discipline, such as acting (Knight, 1997). Therefore, the goal of this longitudinal case study was to evaluate an alternative way of teaching pronunciation to L2 actors, focusing on a technique based on the sensory approach to learning, compatible with actors' professional skillset and their unique pronunciation needs.

## 2. Theatre and drama techniques in L2 pronunciation teaching

Much like a language learner, an actor must convey a message in a believable and comprehensible way. However, actors have not benefitted from acting-centered speech instruction in their conservatory and theatre training, which has generally followed the audiolingual approach based on rote repetition (Knight, 1997). In fact, it is classroom L2 learners who have often enjoyed the benefits of theatre and drama techniques. Beginning with Stern (1980), language researchers and teachers, drawing from theatrical training, began incorporating drama activities into the L2 classroom. Drama activities allow learners to suspend their ego and take on unfamiliar characteristics, all in a context that is nonthreatening, highly collaborative, and communicative.

For these reasons, drama exercises have been readily adapted for the teaching of L2 pronunciation (Galante & Thomson, 2016; Stevens, 1989; Thirsk & Solak, 2012). For example, Copeman (2012) described a curriculum which included a system of vocal warmups and a focus on articulatory settings or “articulatory kinesthetics,” based on the assumption that actors have the advanced ability to “use external, kinesthetic cues” (p. 22). Although this project represented an extensive three-year study and involved innovative ways of implementing drama in a classroom, the report included no empirical data or qualitative findings from the learners’ perspective, thus making it difficult to determine the efficacy of instruction. Hardison and Sonchaeng (2005) proposed a contextualized framework for pronunciation teaching using theatrical voice techniques, which included preparatory activities (e.g., relaxation, breathing), language-focused activities (e.g., targeting prosodic features), and implementation, where students incorporate what they have learned into performance (e.g., in dialogues and monologues). This framework is thorough and clearly articulated for the dramatically untrained teacher, yet it has not been empirically tested with L2 learners.

In fact, the only study to date that has implemented drama exercises in an L2 teaching context with reported statistical findings comparing speech samples from before and after instruction comes from Galante and Thomson (2016). The researchers created a semester-long curriculum consisting of drama-based activities, culminating in a final rehearsed performance. The drama condition was implemented in two L2 English classes, and speech samples from pre- and post-instruction were compared to two control group classes. Focusing on fluency outcomes, the researchers found that students in the drama-based group made significant improvement in their overall fluency, compared to the control group. However, Galante and Thomson’s adaptations of drama exercises for language learners, taken from practitioner handbooks (e.g., Spolin, 1986), might not be directly relevant to the needs and interests of professional actors, for whom acquiring L2 pro-

nunciation – notably, nativelike, non-accented L2 speech – has direct implications for job performance.

### 3. Sensory training for teaching L2 pronunciation to actors

To repeat a successful performance, actors must rely on the full capacity of their physical and emotional skills. For example, Stanislavski (1936), who was the creator of Method Acting (also known as sense memory acting), believed that experience is funneled through the senses and that associating senses with a physical and/or dramatic action helps enforce the episode in which the action is taking place, increasing the chances of it occurring again. This type of learning, which relies on sensory memory and which is compatible with the actor's skillset (Hagen, 1991), is defined as engaging different body sensations through cues to link new concepts to previous experiences (Gibson, 1969).

As a response to Skinner's (1942/2000) audiolingual approach, Knight (1997, 2012) assembled a new way of teaching theatrical voice and speech skills, in line with sensory learning, by capitalizing on the sensations created at the moment of articulation. Following Gibson's (1969) definition, sensory and multisensory learning may benefit learners by helping them associate previous sensory experiences with new concepts. In the theatre context, Knight operationalized sensory learning through a nonsense language called Omnish, consisting only of the sounds and prosody of the target language (as perceived by the student), with no lexical or grammar content. For instance, Omnish would sound like gibberish but with English-like rhythmic cadence and intonation, interdental fricatives, retroflex /r/, and open vowels produced with a relaxed jaw. As students try to produce Omnish, they would begin to internalize specific speech patterns by attending to the physical sensations of subtle differences in the shape of their vocal tract, compared to the way they normally sound (and feel) while speaking. Omnish would thus be relevant to learning speech skills, including L2 pronunciation, because it would seem to heighten learners' awareness of the muscle sensations instantiated during speech production.<sup>1</sup> It was Knight's belief that by "allowing ourselves to rediscover the physical basis of individual speech actions... we gain the skills of shaping sound" (Knight, 2012, p. 35).

---

1. At first glance, Omnish might be equated with audiolingual learning. However, its use is driven by a student's *sensory perception* of how the target language speech should sound like. Omnish is thus not a listen-and-repeat but rather an awareness raising activity, whereby students construct and implement *their own* conception of speech (e.g., based on their own prior experience or a previously heard model).

Outside of a theatre context, sensory learning has been applied only to the teaching of children with hearing loss or mutism (e.g., Polatajko, Kaplan, & Wilson, 1992), and has not been adapted to or evaluated for the teaching of L2 pronunciation. In fact, most prior studies using drama-based techniques in L2 instruction have focused on specific activities, or what to teach, rather than learning methods, or how to teach. Although Copeman (2012) targeted kinesthetic responses in his drama-based teaching, citing the need for learners to exact the skill of conceptualizing the sound within the body (Fraser, 2001), he defined “conceptualization” of sounds by relating them to similar sounds. For instance, to acquire English /ɛ/ (as in *bed*) for learners producing /æ/ (as in *bad*), they must replace all /æ/ segments with /ɪ/ (as in *lip*), finally bringing in /ɛ/ when they are ready. However, such use of kinesthetic responses has more to do with aural-oral sound substitutions than with the use of sensory memory. Moreover, sound substitution might sidetrack learners from the target vowel or consonant and its sensory memory, adding to the cognitive load and distracting them in performance. Notwithstanding these explanations, which must be targeted in future research, kinesthetic responses, so defined, appear nonessential to drama activities, as learners can make aural-oral substitutions outside drama tasks. Thus, it remains to be seen how effectively learners – and especially actors who are already familiar with the concept of sensory learning – can use sensory-based instruction as part of L2 pronunciation training.

#### 4. The current study

The uptake of Knight’s work in theatre voice curricula has been slow (Barnes, 2011), and researchers have yet to examine the use and benefits of sensory-based techniques in the teaching of pronunciation, especially for L2 actors. Indeed, using active associations, such as senses, to relate to sound, word stress, or intonation in pronunciation training may be beneficial in helping actors transfer pronunciation patterns into performance. Put differently, sensory-based pronunciation training might encourage L2 actors to use the tools they are already accustomed to using on a daily basis in dramatic interaction (i.e., their senses) and link them to articulation. To evaluate this possibility, this study examined the pronunciation learning of two L2 actors (speakers of Quebec French) as they experienced instruction through a 10-week sensory-based curriculum. The instruction was based on authentic material from films, TV, and plays, such that a practice environment would resemble the context in which language would eventually be performed. The instruction specifically targeted connected speech, word stress, intonation, and seven English segments (/i/, /ɪ/, /u/, /ʊ/, /ə/, /ð/, and /θ/). The

vowel contrasts /i-ɪ/ and /u-u/ are challenging for French speakers to perceive and produce (Iverson & Evans, 2007), and word stress, intonation, and vowel reduction (/ə/) pose persistent challenges for speakers of syllable-timed French, all contributing to perception of accent (Trofimovich & Isaacs, 2012). The English /θ-ð/ contrast does not carry a high functional load (Munro & Derwing, 2006); however, these consonants, usually substituted in the speech of Canadian French speakers with /t-d/, can be challenging due to the absence of these phonemes in French and syllable structure constraints (Méli, 2013).

The primary objective of this study was to examine the benefits of a sensory treatment for attaining nativelike production of segmental and suprasegmental aspects of pronunciation by L2 actors. Nativelikeness was operationalized in terms of listeners' global accentedness ratings (Derwing & Munro, 2015), and specific linguistic dimensions of L2 speech were evaluated through listener judgments of vowel and consonant errors, word stress, rhythm, intonation, and fluency (Saito, Trofimovich, & Isaacs, 2017). The secondary objective was to evaluate additional benefits of sensory-based instruction, namely, whether it could also facilitate improved comprehensibility, greater speaker confidence, as well as actors' marketability and performance effectiveness in relation to the English-language market in North America. These dimensions would be particularly relevant to L2 users who embrace intelligible, comprehensible, and confident performance as learning and teaching goals, and to L2 actors who strive to succeed in an English-speaking market. Comprehensibility was operationalized as listener-based judgments of ease or difficulty in understanding L2 speech (Derwing & Munro, 2015). Actors' self-perceptions of performance were used as measures of speaking confidence (de Saint Léger & Storch, 2009), and performance effectiveness and marketability were defined as listener perceptions of actors' level of performance and their ability to be considered for a broad range of English-speaking acting roles.

## 5. Method

### 5.1 Participants

The participants included two professional Quebec actors, Sebastian (25) and Marianne (31), both pseudonyms. They were part of a voice and speech course given by the first author (a professional actor and voice and accent coach). The course originally had four participants (also actors); however, two were eliminated from analysis due to absences from multiple meetings, which was likely due to their busy work schedule and their already near-native oral skills in English. Marianne and Sebastian graduated from the *Conservatoire d'Art Drama-*

*tique de Montreal* (The Conservatory of Dramatic Art of Montreal), a three-year French acting program, prior to beginning the course. Marianne studied acting for a total of four years, and Sebastian a total of five years. Both actors began studying English at regular French-medium schools in the fourth grade, with two hours a week of instruction and no specific pronunciation training. However, Sebastian noted speaking English with some English-speaking relatives in the years prior to primary school. Before instruction, actors self-rated their proficiency in English speaking, comprehension, writing, and reading using a 9-point scale (1 = *extremely poor*, 9 = *extremely advanced*). Marianne rated herself an 8 on all measures. Sebastian rated his comprehension and reading a 9 and 8, respectively, while his speaking and writing were lower at a 7 and 6, respectively. Marianne's motivation to engage in pronunciation learning was "to feel comfortable enough to be able to have auditions in English because it would diversify [her] acting career." She also expressed a strong desire for accent-free L2 speech, so that she "could sound like a native speaker of English because [she was] a perfectionist." Sebastian's goal was "to be a better actor in general... to better [his] confidence and to learn to appreciate the way [he speaks] in English." Thus, Sebastian wanted to feel confident in his pronunciation so that he could use the language believably on stage, unlike Marianne, who mostly wished to conform to the North American English-speaking industry standard. Both actors seemed highly motivated to improve their English pronunciation.

## 5.2 Teaching approach

The sensory-based curriculum for teaching L2 pronunciation to actors was developed by the first author, based on Knight's (2012) Omnish and "vocal posture" approach to pronunciation and various activities from Celce-Murcia, Brinton, and Goodwin (2010). Each week's instruction covered one unit over 2.5 hours for a total of 10 units, and began with vocal and physical warmups, adapted from Fitzmaurice (2003) and the voice and speech work of the researcher/voice teacher, aiming at increasing breath support and vocal resonance and drawing actors' attention to articulators within the vocal tract (for sample materials, see Appendix A).

The main sensory treatment, which always followed a listening task, was used to present each target (/i/, /ɪ/, /u/, /ʊ/, word stress, intonation, /ə/ and connected speech, and /θ/-/ð/). Although the initial target sequence followed this order, mostly to keep vowel and consonant contrasts and a focus on reduced vowels separate, curriculum implementation did not always allow for strict sequencing (e.g., due to small differences in class time devoted to each topic, student interest). In the end, target sequencing roughly followed the original order but allowed for

ample repetition and review of targets across lessons, which ultimately helped create a pedagogically sound experience for the students. Individual segments were presented using a two-part treatment adapted from Knight (2012). In the first step, actors mimicked the sound system of English through Omnish by creating the general rhythm, intonation, and vocal qualities of North American English based on their own perception of what English sounds like, avoiding the use of lexical items. The researcher then asked guiding questions (e.g., What new sounds did you notice from speaking “fake” English? What new sensations did you feel?). Actors commented on the differences they felt in articulation between Omnish and their everyday speech. They pointed out the exaggerated use of their lips, a high, forward tongue arch, and a larger opening of the mouth. In the second step, actors related these qualities to their own sense memory or sensory cue. For example, when focusing on a high front vowel (e.g., /i/), actors related the highly raised arch of their tongue to the feeling of licking an ice cream cone, which was used by one of the actors to remind herself of the *feeling* of producing front vowels. Another actor noted that it felt like he was scratching the sides of his tongue on his upper molars, calling it his “itchy-tongue mode.” These cues, as actors came up with many, were then reiterated by the teacher within performance practice.

Word stress was presented and practiced using the rubber band technique (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010), where actors varied the expansion and contraction of the band to mimic primary and secondary stresses within a word. Actors were asked to *feel* the differences in vowel length and syllable reduction, as opposed to using notations within their text. Intonation was presented and practiced by asking actors to *feel* pitch changes by using an arm gesture to mimic the upward or downward intonation in the sentence (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010). Targeted in this manner was intonation of yes/no questions, contrasts, open-ended questions, sustained intonation in overlapping or cutoff dialogue, and statement intonation as it relates to stress, with varying degrees of pitch height applied to stressed words within each thought group. Connected speech phenomena, such as consonant linking (e.g., *and\_then*, *hold\_these*), were presented and practiced by calling actors’ attention to the gliding *feeling* of the tongue movement from the alveolar ridge to the space between the front teeth, while emphasizing and mimicking the movement with an arm gesture.<sup>2</sup> Sensory-based teaching was followed up by explicit, form-focused explanations only at the students’ request; this happened approximately five times over the 10-week period, the longest of which took half a session when one student asked for explicit rules targeting connected speech.

---

2. Students only used gesture for intonation practice, not for performance or evaluation. During performance (e.g., in the mock audition context or in sample recording sessions), students used their body as they would in normal language use with natural gestures.



After a clear sensory cue for the target was established, actors began the “cold reading” practice which consisted of short scenes between two characters from authentic scripts that featured the lesson’s target. Taking their time, actors would express the line to a partner without looking down at the text, mimicking performance. The slower pace of the dialogue allowed actors to reestablish the sensation of the target, enabling them to emotionally connect to the text. Finally, each unit ended with a fluency section consisting of audition practice. For example, actors could opt for working on an authentic commercial script, a monologue, or a scene, all of which featured the target in varying environments. The monologues and scenes were chosen by the actors and were recorded and subsequently used for evaluation through listener ratings. The following week, they presented their audition material in front of the class, as though they were auditioning for a part. The other students (all L2 speaking actors) observing the mock audition took notes about the target, audition technique, and believability of performance. After each audition, actors received teacher-moderated peer feedback.

### 5.3 Materials and procedure

The instruction took place over 10 weeks, once per week in a university classroom. Before instruction, actors filled out background questionnaires and were presented with four monologues and six scenes from which they chose one favorite monologue and scene to focus on throughout the course. Monologues were dramatic or comedic speeches (2 minutes) taken from contemporary American plays. Each contained many instances of all targets and showcased a range of emotionality. The scenes (2 minutes) contained two character roles (i.e., male/female pairing), comedic and dramatic elements, and tokens of all targets. One monologue and one scene chosen by actors during Week 1 of instruction (T<sub>1</sub>) were audio-recorded as a baseline for comparison. The same chosen monologues and scenes (i.e., practiced materials) as well as one new monologue and one novel scene (i.e., unpracticed materials) were recorded again at the end of instruction, during Week 11 (T<sub>2</sub>). All performances used for evaluation were read-aloud to mimic authentic audition conditions, where actors would be reading or referring to scripts held in their hands. After each session, actors filled out a short online questionnaire through SurveyMonkey™ used to determine (a) which topic of instruction they found most beneficial after each class (e.g., sensory cue, suprasegmentals, theory), (b) their pronunciation confidence for that week, and (c) the amount of time they practiced outside of class (see Appendix B). At the end of instruction, actors filled out an exit questionnaire to document possible changes in self-reported language proficiency and use. During Week 11, the instructor also conducted 10–15-minute individual exit interviews in English, in which actors noted their favorite and most

challenging aspect of instruction, summarized their experience, and expanded on their level of confidence in English pronunciation at the end of instruction.

#### 5.4 Speech rating

The actors recorded one monologue and one scene at T1 and two monologues and two scenes at T2, with two practiced and two unpracticed recordings per actor, along with 18 distractors. The monologues and scenes were shortened to include the first 45 seconds of performance, excluding initial dysfluencies. This recording length, as opposed to shorter clips, was considered to provide sufficient context for listeners regarding the targeted character, the actor's acting ability, and the storyline. The 30 recordings were presented for rating to two groups of listeners who, in keeping with a focus on nativeness, were all native English speakers. The first group consisted of 10 linguistically trained students, born and raised in English-speaking homes in Canada (8) and the United States (2). At the time of the study, they were enrolled in graduate programs in applied linguistics at an English-medium university. The raters ( $M_{\text{age}} = 31$  years,  $\text{range} = 27\text{--}44$ ), reported normal hearing, familiarity with foreign-accented English, which included but was not limited to experience with French-accented English ( $M = 8.4$ ,  $\text{range} = 6\text{--}9$ ) on a 9-point scale (1 = *no familiarity*, 9 = *extremely familiar*), and experience teaching English ( $M = 5.9$  years,  $\text{range} = 2\text{--}12$ ). The second group included 10 fourth-year students, also born and raised in native-speaking English families in Canada (9) and the United States (1). They were enrolled in an undergraduate degree in fine arts at the same university, with a specialization in theatre (4) or graduates currently working in English performance (6). These raters ( $M_{\text{age}} = 23$  years,  $\text{range} = 21\text{--}27$ ) reported high familiarity with foreign-accented English ( $M = 7.5$ ,  $\text{range} = 5\text{--}9$ ) and extensive acting training ( $M = 8$  years,  $\text{range} = 4\text{--}17$ ). The same audio clips were used with both listener groups.

The linguistically trained listeners used 1000-point sliding scales in a MATLAB-enabled computer interface to evaluate each recording for six dimensions: accentedness (*extremely accented* – *no accent at all*), comprehensibility (*a lot of effort to understand* – *no effort to understand*), vowel and consonant errors (*frequent errors* – *absence of errors*), word stress errors (*frequent errors* – *absence of errors*), intonation (*unnatural* – *natural*), and flow (*extremely disjointed speech* – *natural and fluid speech*). The theatre listeners used the same interface to evaluate each recording for two dimensions: marketability, defined as the actor's ability to be considered for roles across the English-speaking market (*not at all marketable* – *extremely marketable*) and performance effectiveness, defined in terms of how engaging, honest, and well performed the monologues and scenes sounded to the listener (*not at all effective and engaging* – *extremely effective and engaging*). Only

the endpoints were labeled, with no numerical values shown, and the raters were told to use the entire range of each slider.

All sessions were conducted individually in a quiet location using high-quality headsets, with the recordings presented to listeners in a unique randomized order. In those recordings where two actors spoke in the same clip (scenes), to cue listeners to the target speaker, the volume of speech by the target speaker was kept intact while the volume for the secondary speaker was lowered. Listeners were instructed to rate the louder speaker; however, the secondary speaker was still audible, such that the target speaker's performance was contextualized. No listeners reported any problems or confusions associated with speech volume or the target speaker to be rated. Listeners were first trained on the rating criteria by using definitions of each construct with examples; they then performed practice ratings using the samples not included in the target set. The linguistically trained listeners performed the ratings in two blocks (45 minutes each), first evaluating all samples for accentedness and comprehensibility (with both scales available on screen) and then rating all samples (presented in a different order) for the four dimensions (vowels and consonants, word stress, intonation, flow) with all scales visible on screen. The theatre listeners performed both ratings in a single block (45 minutes), with both scales available on screen. Consistent with prior research (e.g., Saito, Trofimovich, & Isaacs, 2017), listeners were not allowed to replay each file but could proceed to the next sample at their own pace.

## 5.5 Data analysis

Rating consistency within each group of listeners was acceptable for the six linguistic measures: accentedness (Cronbach's  $\alpha = .66$ ), comprehensibility ( $\alpha = .62$ ), vowel and consonant errors ( $\alpha = .64$ ), word stress ( $\alpha = .79$ ), intonation ( $\alpha = .77$ ), and flow ( $\alpha = .80$ ); and for the two theatre measures: marketability ( $\alpha = .77$ ) and performance effectiveness ( $\alpha = .78$ ).<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless, to capture listener-specific variability, the ratings given to Marianne and Sebastian were retained as listener-based scores and averaged across each actor's recordings, separately at T1 and T2, to derive mean by-listener ratings. Included among T2 recordings were two familiar (practiced) and two novel (unpracticed) materials per actor, for which the ratings were combined. This allowed us to emulate the natural circumstances of an audition context, where some materials are prepared beforehand while others are

---

3. While removing outlier datapoints (as suggested by a reviewer) improved rating reliability (accentedness  $\alpha = .70$ , comprehensibility  $\alpha = .64$ , vowel and consonant errors  $\alpha = .79$ , word stress  $\alpha = .84$ , intonation  $\alpha = .80$ , flow  $\alpha = .83$ ), analyses based on a smaller dataset resulted in no difference in findings. Therefore, we report all results for the original data.

read “cold.” Although separate analyses for novel versus familiar content would have been interesting, such analyses were deemed inappropriate, on the assumption that ratings based on a small set size would be too specific to each recording rather than reflective of development, which was the focus here. Because the ratings were based on a limited set of recordings and a small speaker sample, all by-listener data were analyzed using nonparametric statistics (Wilcoxon signed-rank tests, Spearman correlations).

The qualitative data from the weekly surveys and exit interviews were coded by two trained coders, with graduate degrees in applied linguistics, according to five categories that emerged from themes in the actors’ comments (i.e., sensory, theory, suprasegmentals, curriculum exercises, confidence) because these were deemed to capture most of the thematic content of the curriculum. Any mention of segments was coded under the sensory category, as they were presented exclusively through the use of Omnish and with reference to sensory cues; therefore, any comments related to Omnish, articulation, segments, or other comments with explicit allusion to sensory work were coded as sensory. A comment was labeled as theory if it dealt with the teaching of explicit rules, phonetic notations or diacritics, or any aspect of focus on form during instruction. Any mention of word stress, connected speech, or intonation were labelled as suprasegmentals, and any comments citing specific activities within the curriculum were labelled as curriculum. Actors’ confidence was coded only when it was mentioned explicitly, and whenever actors noted a change in confidence in open-ended comments. Both coders completed coding independently; intercoder reliability (Cohen’s  $\kappa = .85$ ) exceeded the .70 benchmark for high agreement (Landis & Koch, 1977).

## 6.1 Results

### 6.1 Accentedness and comprehensibility

The first analysis targeted linguistically trained listeners’ ratings of accentedness and comprehensibility (see Table 1). Wilcoxon signed-rank tests, used to compare the ratings across time (T1 vs. T2), indicated that there was a significant positive change in accent for Marianne ( $Mdn_{T_1} = 641$ ,  $Mdn_{T_2} = 736$ ),  $Z = 2.09$ ,  $p = .037$ , but no difference for Sebastian ( $Mdn_{T_1} = 791$ ,  $Mdn_{T_2} = 792$ ),  $Z = 1.07$ ,  $p = .29$ , although both students had room to show changes in ratings (see Table 1). In terms of comprehensibility, both actors made positive gains from T1 to T2, but this difference did not reach significance, either for Marianne ( $Mdn_{T_1} = 883$ ,  $Mdn_{T_2} = 923$ ),  $Z = .15$ ,  $p = .88$ , or Sebastian ( $Mdn_{T_1} = 836$ ,  $Mdn_{T_2} = 874$ ),  $Z = .53$ ,  $p = .59$ . Therefore,

though both actors received higher ratings, only Marianne made significant gains in accentedness over the course of instruction.

**Table 1.** Listener ratings from Time 1 (T1) and Time 2 (T2) for all rated categories

Rating category	Marianne				Sebastian			
	T1		T2		T1		T2	
	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>IQR</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>IQR</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>IQR</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>IQR</i>
Accentedness	641	220	736	270	791	430	792	220
Comprehensibility	883	90	923	120	836	140	874	190
Vowels & consonants	844	90	869	70	846	120	921	90
Word stress	828	100	827	120	920	120	926	130
Intonation	775	170	765	160	909	100	918	170
Flow	858	170	835	90	903	110	952	140
Marketability	306	170	320	220	458	320	472	260
Performance effectiveness	443	270	400	320	587	360	552	170

*Note.* *Mdn* = median, *IQR* = interquartile range (nonparametric measure of variability).

## 6.2 Linguistic and theatrical measures

Similar Wilcoxon signed-rank tests were performed to compare the four linguistic measures and two theatrical measures across time. These tests yielded only one significant difference, namely, for Sebastian in his accuracy of vowel and consonant production ( $Mdn_{T_1} = 846$ ,  $Mdn_{T_2} = 921$ ),  $Z = 2.19$ ,  $p = .028$ . Thus, Marianne's gain in accent could not be linked to a specific linguistic or performance measure, whereas Sebastian appeared to improve in his segmental accuracy, without a concurrent significant change in either accentedness or comprehensibility.

## 6.3 Weekly surveys

Marianne completed all 10 weekly surveys and reported practicing an average of 45 minutes per week outside instruction, while Sebastian completed seven surveys and practiced an average of 15 minutes per week. Because there was no specific recommendation for practice time length, students themselves decided how much they wished to practice weekly. Responses to the weekly surveys, summarized in Table 2, revealed that Marianne found the sensory cue to be most beneficial, reporting 10 positive instances, with one negative comment shown in parentheses in Table 2, totaling 11 comments. Theoretical elements were mentioned the least by Marianne, with just two instances. Conversely, Sebastian found theory to be the

most beneficial, mentioning it 10 times, and the sensory cue to be the least useful, mentioning it only twice.

**Table 2.** Summary of total coded responses from 10 weekly surveys

Category	Marianne	Sebastian
Sensory	10 (1)	2
Theory	1	10
Suprasegmentals	4	2
Curriculum activities	10	6

The following comments, all from actors' responses to open-ended questions, exemplify the contrast in their reactions to the course, with Marianne focusing on the sensory cues and Sebastian prioritizing theoretical aspects of instruction.

- I realize how important it is to concentrate on how I place my mouth when I speak English (Marianne; sensory; Week 8).
- I feel like I am really beginning to understand the theory behind the pronunciation, and that my pronunciation is that much stronger (Sebastian; theory; Week 8).

Actors also found the curriculum beneficial, with Marianne making 10 positive comments, mostly related to the warmup exercises and the mock audition context, and noting the cold reading exercise in three comments. Sebastian expressed six positive comments, all related to the mock audition context, scene work, and the cold reading exercise. Suprasegmentals were also found to be beneficial. Marianne mentioned stress and intonation in four instances across 10 weeks, while Sebastian noted suprasegmentals twice. Most comments on stress occurred within the last three weeks of teaching for both actors, suggesting a shift toward improved integration of the concepts, as illustrated in the following excerpts.

- I feel like trying to know where the stresses are in a word or in a sentence start to become a second nature for me cuz I do it in my everyday life when I read English (Marianne; suprasegmentals; Week 9).
- [The most important part of instruction this week was...] to know that once you find the stress, it simplify the pronunciation of the word, and of the sentence (Sebastian; suprasegmentals; Week 9).

Additionally, when asked to rate their confidence level weekly, Sebastian rated his confidence at “very confident” four times and “neutral” three times in 10 weeks. Three of the four “very confident” ratings came in the last four weeks of instruction. Sebastian was either absent or neglected to fill out the survey for the three

remaining weeks. Marianne reported her confidence to be “neutral” twice early in the instruction, “very confident” six times throughout the middle, and “extremely confident” twice near the end of instruction.

#### 6.4 Exit interviews

Much like the weekly surveys, most of Sebastian’s exit comments focused on theory, discussed five times in the interview. When speaking about his experience with the cold reading exercise, he mentioned the ease in which he was able to integrate the theory into his performance. He also mentioned the technical way of seeing the stress by drawing different sized circles above syllables as being beneficial, in contrast to Marianne’s preferred way of finding stress through the rubber band method, where she felt the expansion and contraction of the sound in her hands. Sebastian’s orientation towards theory is clear in these interview excerpts.

- I really enjoyed the cold reading exercise in general... you would get the theory without noticing it (Sebastian; theory; Exit).
- Its all about the theory. At first it was really hard for me to hear where it was, the stress. And with the little circles and the big circles it really helped me to identify it (Sebastian; theory; suprasegmentals; Exit).

Marianne made two comments noting stress and intonation as being helpful to her pronunciation, and one comment about individual sounds and the sensory-based approach. In these comments, she is responding to the question, “What did you find the most helpful throughout the instruction?”

- Uh well, maybe putting the emphasis on the stress, and um the placement of the mouth [using a sensory cue], and uh, yeah that’s about it (Marianne; stress; sensory; Exit).
- [An example of a helpful part of instruction is] the placement of the mouth [using a sensory cue] for the sound ee (Marianne; segmentals; sensory; Exit).

She concludes with a comment about suprasegmentals in response to the question, “What has surprised you most about your pronunciation?”

- ...it still surprises me, yeah it surprises me since the beginning since last January I feel like when I’m when I’m speaking my sentences are different they aren’t just one tone there’s fluctuation. Because I know where to put the stresses and uh yeah it kind of comes by itself and and yeah as I was telling you the other day when I read now, when I read a sentence I’m like oh okay so this stress would be here you know and I don’t have to do that, and yeah

like reading a sign, and yeah that's new it just comes by itself and its surprising and its great (Marianne; suprasegmentals; Exit).

Much like their commentary in the weekly surveys, the exit interviews informed how the actors approached every aspect of instruction: Marianne aligning with sensory-based teaching and enjoying suprasegmental work, and Sebastian preferring a theoretical perspective.

## 7. Discussion

The goal of this study was to examine the benefits of sensory-based instruction for the development of L2 actors' nativelike speech across several dimensions (vowel and consonant accuracy, word stress, intonation, fluency), and to evaluate whether this instruction also facilitates improved comprehensibility and greater speaker confidence as well as actors' marketability and performance effectiveness in relation to the English-language acting market. Listener ratings and qualitative data revealed that one of the actors (Marianne) made significant gains in her accentedness scores, with such gains attributed to her overall focus on sensory cues as the most helpful aspect of instruction. The other actor (Sebastian) did not show a gain in accentedness but improved significantly in his accuracy of English vowels and consonants, as rated by linguistically trained listeners. Both actors improved in their already high comprehensibility, albeit not significantly, and grew in confidence when speaking and acting in English. In terms of performance ratings, both made slight yet nonsignificant gains in their marketability scores, while their performance effectiveness ratings actually decreased across the two testing times, suggesting that improvements in global and linguistic dimensions of speech may not readily translate to perceptible changes in performance.

The findings overall revealed that classroom-based pronunciation instruction facilitated accentedness and (to a limited extent) also comprehensibility improvement in L2 actors' speech, consistent with prior research (Derwing, Munro, & Wiebe, 1998; Couper, 2006, 2011; Saito & Lyster, 2012), especially with instruction lasting at least 10 weeks (e.g., Couper, 2006, 2011; Derwing et al., 1998) and with contextualized curricula targeting segments, suprasegmentals, and fluency (e.g., Galante & Thomson, 2016). Thus, a pronunciation-specific class can be beneficial for adults looking to improve such global dimensions of speech as accentedness and comprehensibility for a professional purpose.



## 7.1 Nativeness as a learning goal

However, unlike in most current pronunciation research, the instruction described here aimed at improved accent over comprehensibility, in keeping with the needs of the target learners for whom unaccented speech is generally preferred over accented yet comprehensible performance (Fine, 1999). Although both actors made improvements in their accentedness ratings (see Table 1), neither reached their ultimate goal, which was to sound nativelike. Given that both learners were professional actors (highly motivated to pass for native speakers for professional reasons) and were evaluated using highly practiced, read-aloud content, their difficulty with attaining nonaccented L2 speech further highlights that this is a particularly challenging and likely unrealistic objective, at least within the confines of a 10-week, custom-designed course.

It is, of course, possible that the actors' performance reflected the specific tasks used to evaluate their speech (read-aloud scenes and monologues). Reading aloud is precisely the medium through which actors would be auditioning for roles (e.g., reading scenes, performing prepared texts), unlike other learners who need to use their pronunciation spontaneously. If spontaneous speech, such as improvisational scenes, had been elicited, Marianne's accent ratings may have seen a greater increase toward nativelike speech. Levis and Barriuso (2012) noted that reading aloud is a specific skill, drawing on spelling proficiency and associated phonological forms. These researchers compared speech samples from 12 L2 learners in spontaneous and read-aloud contexts, showing that a greater percentage of vowel errors occurred in read-aloud than spontaneous contexts. They attributed this difference to the issue of 15 or more vowel sounds in spoken English being assigned to only five written forms. Thus, due to unrecognizable words or spellings, read-aloud conditions may be disadvantageous to at least some L2 users in research settings and to L2 actors in audition contexts.

## 7.2 Different learning paths

A theme emerging from qualitative data concerned different approaches that the two actors took throughout instruction. Sebastian tended to adopt theory-based learning while Marianne embraced the sensory-based approach. The instruction in this study had elements in line with various types of teaching. For example, each pronunciation target was introduced through a perception task, then explained through a new way of relating the senses to that target, sometimes followed by explicit explanation (at the request of actors), and with controlled and semi-controlled practice and corrective feedback throughout instruction. Sebastian appeared to have embraced the form-focused elements of the instruction, pre-

ferring explicit presentation, notation, and practice of phonetic forms and rules. He was the only actor who regularly asked for explicit rules behind word stress and connected speech, and used a standard vowel chart and IPA symbols. Sebastian's self-reported previous experience with the French phonetic system likely steered him to focus on phonetic forms within the section of the course devoted to explicit teaching. In other words, Sebastian might have been "primed," through prior experience with phonetics and a general propensity for theory-based learning, to attend to explicit teaching of pronunciation targets rather than on the sensory cues associated with them.

On the other hand, Marianne integrated the sensory work with ease and frequently commented on these elements of instruction, including the use of different personal sensory cues. The focus on the sensory cues likely gave Marianne the tools she needed to help her approximate the articulation of English sounds and prosody, leading to an improvement in her overall accent ratings. In regards to intonation and word stress, Marianne also remarked weekly on the kinesthetic and gestural exercises as being the most helpful to her. Sensory-based teaching likely targeted a constellation of features related to L2 articulatory settings, or voice-quality settings, which characterize speech broadly, allowing learners to attend to the "general characteristics of accent" (Esling & Wong, 1983, p. 90). Thus, at least for Marianne, it was likely the sensory-based work targeting her overall speech patterns across a broad range of linguistic dimensions (segmental and suprasegmental) that facilitated her improvement in accentedness, with no single linguistic dimension detected as being relevant to this improvement.

The explicit, theory-based teaching in this study was akin to form-focused instruction (Saito & Lyster, 2012), which involves an explicit focus on specific aspects of pronunciation (such as the /ɪ/-/I/ distinction in English), together with corrective feedback, all within meaningful practice. The sensory method differs from form-focused instruction in that there is no specific focus drawn to one form; instead, an articulatory structure derived from learners' perceptions is applied to a given pronunciation target exclusively through reference to a sensory cue. The sensory method, so defined, is compatible with Couper's (2011) teaching approach, where learners were asked to describe their own conceptions of perceived cross-language differences in speech production. For example, to draw learners' attention to (the elimination of) vowel epenthesis in word final positions in English, Couper led short discussions with learners, allowing them to verbalize different qualities of sounds produced. Such socially constructed meta-language appeared to help learners create new concepts for the pronunciation targets through group discussions and awareness-building activities. In the sensory-based approach, as implemented here, actors also created personal conceptions for each pronunciation target. However, they accomplished this not by

means of explicit cross-language comparisons but through engaging their senses and linking such sensory experiences to the articulation of each target.

### 7.3 Sensory instruction for L2 pronunciation

This study focused on sensory-based instruction, adapted from the techniques used for theatrical voice and speech students, highlighting its benefits for L2 actors using global linguistic measures of speech (accentedness, comprehensibility). However, pronunciation instructors might express concerns about the utility of sensory-based activities and the ease of their implementation. Teachers often rely heavily on corrective feedback (typically in the form of recasts, or reformulations of erroneous utterances) in their treatment of pronunciation in communicative classrooms (Foote, Trofimovich, Collins, & Soler Urzúa, 2016) and may be wary of incorporating new techniques into existing curricula. However, Knight's Omnish technique and the use of sensory cues do not require training in acting or theatre, as the teacher acts as facilitator, asking simple guiding questions (as discussed above) to help students build an internalized, personal sense memory that they can use later. Sensory learning can be used in mixed-level classes or classrooms with learners from heterogeneous language backgrounds, as sensory activities do not require high levels of metalinguistic or specialized knowledge to implement and do not depend on a common set of pronunciation issues across learners. Put differently, all learners – regardless of their background or the makeup of their pronunciation difficulties – can create and use *personalized* sensory cues to associate with the pronunciation of various aspects of the target language, all within meaning-oriented instruction. Omnish, vocal warm-ups, and sensory-based cues can also be practiced for self-study as a supplement to L2 curricula. For example, teachers with time constraints can assign Omnish as a warm-up to any speaking task, with guiding questions for students to answer on their own. Students can then practice implementing muscular structures, first by attending to sensations associated with positional changes in articulators (e.g., tongue, lips, jaw) and then by recording texts before and after using their personal sensory cues and noting possible differences in pronunciation.

The physical, sensory-based exercises included in this study are akin to other activities focusing on learners' kinesthetic, gestural, or whole-body experiences, such as, for example, activities targeting gestural expressions in teaching intonation in haptic-integrated pronunciation instruction (Acton, Baker, Burri, & Teaman, 2013) and physical activities involving the use of a rubber band for teaching word stress (Gilbert, 2012). Just as these already known activities, sensory-based instruction could be incorporated into vocabulary, dialogue/roleplay, and conver-

sation practice. Considering previous findings about the benefits of form-focused instruction (Saito & Lyster, 2012) and awareness-building activities (Couper, 2011) and given the current results about the value of using other tools available to the learner, including the senses, it may be beneficial for pronunciation curricula to include more than one teaching approach. By incorporating sensory-based exercises into pronunciation instruction, language and pronunciation teachers might have a better chance of reaching students with different learning styles and needs.

## 8. Limitations and further research

Because this research was an exploratory study targeting a novel approach to teaching pronunciation, the sample size was necessarily small, which makes it difficult to generalize any learning effects to other L2 actors or learners. Moreover, actors may have unique abilities, such as proficiency in movement, singing, or muscular memory, that predispose them to sensory learning over other learners, and which could act as moderating variables. Additionally, the actor who preferred sensory learning over theory-based instruction was female, and the actor who prioritized form-focused instruction was male. Females, compared to males, may have a higher threshold for touch and tactile sensitivity and greater auditory ability in infant to toddler development, while males may have a higher threshold for visual acuity (McGuinness & Pribram, 1979). Gender biases may thus have contributed to the actors' choice of instruction types. The curriculum, which included multiple targets and featured various types of practice, also made it difficult to determine which instructional aspect had the most impact on actors' pronunciation.

The consistency of listeners' ratings was lower than desired, with two linguistically trained listeners giving drastically lower scores for all measures, which downplayed the extent of actors' improvement over time. To avoid any further data loss and to preserve all listener-based variability as part of by-listener scored data, no outlier data were removed; nevertheless, low rating reliability remains a limitation. One low-rating listener voiced concerns of being uncomfortable evaluating native French speakers for his own lack of experience in speaking French, thus revealing a possible bias stemming from raters' inexperience with accented speech (Carey, Mannell, & Dunn, 2011). Another listener reported this study to be this rater's first experience rating linguistic measures. This comment is consistent with previous research showing that linguistically experienced raters, compared to inexperienced ones, are more reliable when assessing global and linguistic measures of L2 performance (e.g., Saito, Trofimovich, Isaacs, & Webb, 2017). Though all non-theatre listeners had previous training in applied linguistics, they were not

well-versed in rating speech samples, which might have affected their rating severity. In exit questionnaires, most theatre listeners also expressed difficulty in rating performance effectiveness, mentioning its subjective nature and noting that much of the information used to judge a performance is derived from the visual image.

Another possible reason for the lower than desired rater reliability could have been specific to the content of the audio clips. The clips included dramatic interpretations of theatrical texts. To our knowledge, ours is among the first studies that have used acted material for rating purposes. The emotionality present in the recordings may have influenced listeners' perceptions, especially for those without much experience evaluating emotionally charged material. Moreover, several rated clips contained dialogues. Besides featuring emotionally charged material, such dialogic content may have presented listeners with certain difficulties, as evaluating one speaker against the background of another may be more complex than assessing a single speaker. It is therefore possible that the target students' ratings were inadvertently influenced by the performances of their dialogue partners. In future work, it would be important to carefully control rater background and experience variables, to systematically compare raters' perception of monologic versus dialogic performances, and to fine-tune performance measures to include visual information, so that the consistency of assessments used to evaluate actors' performances could be improved.

## 9. Conclusion

The objective of this case study was to evaluate a new approach to pronunciation teaching based on sensory-based techniques for L2 actors whose learning goal primarily involves reducing the degree of L2 accent. The instructional materials combined the teaching of muscular and sensory awareness from theatre and voice training (Knight, 2012) with a focus on segmental and suprasegmental aspects of L2 pronunciation through controlled and semi-controlled practice (e.g., Celce-Murcia et al., 2010) to create a usable, relatable, and context-transferrable curriculum. To our knowledge, this is the first study that reports findings from a sensory-based curriculum for actors and applies this curriculum to L2 pronunciation teaching. Thus, theatrical methods of learning, not only drama-based activities, can facilitate improved L2 pronunciation and increase speaker confidence. As one of the few studies focusing on L2 pronunciation for specific purposes, this study also highlighted the need to include instructional materials and practice contexts that match learners' intended use. Put simply, learners with specific language needs should have opportunities to practice the target language in the same way they intend to use it in their private and professional lives.

## References

- Acton, B., Baker, A., Burri, M., & Teaman, B. (2013). Preliminaries to haptic-integrated pronunciation instruction. In J. Levis & K. LeVelle (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 4th Pronunciation in Second Language Learning and Teaching Conference* (pp. 234–244). Ames, IA: Iowa State University.
- Aiguó, W. (2007). Teaching aviation English in the Chinese context: Developing ESL theory in a non-English speaking country. *English for Specific Purposes*, 26, 121–128. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2005.09.003>
- Banks, J. A. (2006) Democracy, diversity, and social justice: Educating citizens for the public interest in a global age. In G. Ladson-Billings & W. F. Tate (Eds.), *Education research in the public interest: Social justice, action, and policy* (pp. 141–157). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Barnes, M. (2011). Standard speech practices and pedagogy: A snapshot of the moment. *Voice and Speech Review*, 7, 224–234. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23268263.2011.10739543>
- Carey, M. D., Mannell, R. H., & Dunn, P. K. (2011). Does a rater's familiarity with a candidate's pronunciation affect the rating in oral proficiency interviews? *Language Testing*, 28, 201–219. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532210393704>
- Celce-Murcia, M., Brinton, D. M., & Goodwin, J. M. (2010). *Teaching pronunciation: A coursebook and reference guide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Couper, G. (2006). The short and long-term effects of pronunciation instruction. *Prospect*, 21, 46–66.
- Couper, G. (2011). What makes pronunciation teaching work? Testing for the effect of two variables: Socially constructed metalanguage and critical listening. *Language Awareness*, 20, 159–182. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2011.570347>
- Copeman, P. (2012). Performing English: Adapting actor voice training techniques for TESOL to improve pronunciation intelligibility. *English Australia Journal*, 27, 17–33.
- de Saint Léger, D., & Storch, N. (2009). Learners' perceptions and attitudes: Implications for willingness to communicate in an L2 classroom. *System*, 37, 269–285. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2009.01.001>
- Derwing, T. M., & Munro, M. J. (2015). *Pronunciation fundamentals: Evidence-based perspectives for L2 teachers and research*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/llt.42>
- Derwing, T. M., Munro, M. J., & Wiebe, G. (1998). Evidence in favor of a broad framework for pronunciation instruction. *Language Learning*, 48, 393–410. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00047>
- Esling, J. H., & Wong, R. F. (1983). Voice quality settings and the teaching of pronunciation. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17, 89–95. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3586426>
- Fine, P. (1999). Quiet! Action! Speak American! Quebec actors are turning to a U.S. speech therapist to expunge accents unwanted by Hollywood. *The Globe and Mail*, 1–2.
- Fitzmaurice, C. (2003). Structured breathing. *VASTA Newsletter*, 17, 1–3.
- Foote, J. A., Trofimovich, P., Collins, L., & Soler Urzúa, F. (2016). Pronunciation teaching practices in communicative ESL classes. *The Language Learning Journal*, 44, 181–196. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2013.784345>
- Fraser, H. (2001). *Teaching pronunciation: A handbook for teachers and trainers*. Canberra: DETYA.

- Galante, A., & Thomson, R.I. (2016). The effectiveness of drama as an instructional approach for the development of second language oral fluency, comprehensibility, and accentedness. *TESOL Quarterly*.
- Gibson, E. J. (1969). *Principles of perceptual learning and development*. New York: Appleton-Century-Croft.
- Gilbert, J. B. (2012). *Clear speech: Pronunciation and listening comprehension in North American English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139523172>
- Hagen, U. (1991). *Challenge for the actor*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Hardison, D. M., & Sonchaeng, C. (2005). Theatre voice training and technology in teaching oral skills: Integrating the components of a speech event. *System*, 33, 593–608. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2005.02.001>
- Iverson, P., & Evans, B. G. (2007). Learning English vowels with different first-language vowel systems: Perception of formant targets, formant movement, and duration. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 122, 2842–2854. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.2783198>
- Knight, D. (1997). Standard speech: The ongoing debate. In M. E. Hampton & B. Acker (Eds.), *The vocal vision: Views on voice* (pp. 155–184) New York, NY: Hal Leonard Corporation.
- Knight, D. (2012). *Speaking with skill: An introduction to Knight-Thompson speech work*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics*, 33, 159–174. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2529310>
- Leigh, S. A. (2016). Testing an approach to teaching Italian lyric diction to opera singers: An action research study (Unpublished master's thesis). Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Toronto, Ontario.
- Levis, J. M., & Barriuso, T. A., (2012). Nonnative speakers' pronunciation errors in spoken and read English. In J. Levis & K. LeVelle (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 3rd Pronunciation in Second Language Learning and Teaching Conference* (pp. 187–194). Ames, IA: Iowa State University.
- McGuinness, D., & Pribram, K. H. (1979). The origins of sensory bias in the development of gender differences in perception and cognition. In M. Bortner (Ed.), *Cognitive growth and development: Essays in memory of Herbert G. Birch* (pp. 3–56). New York, NY: Brunner/Mazel.
- Méli, A. (2013). Phonological acquisition in the French-English interlanguage. In A. Díaz-Negrillo, N. Ballier, & P. Thompson (Eds.), *Automatic treatment and analysis of learner corpus data* (pp. 207–226). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/scl.59.13mel>
- Munro, M. J. (2003). A primer on accent discrimination in the Canadian context. *TESL Canada Journal*, 20, 38–51.
- Munro, M. J., & Derwing, T. M. (2006). The functional load principle in ESL pronunciation instruction: An exploratory study. *System*, 34, 520–531. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2006.09.004>
- Polatajko, H. J., Kaplan, B. J., & Wilson, B. N. (1992). Sensory integration treatment for children with learning disabilities: Its status 20 years later. *OTJR: Occupation, Participation and Health*, 12, 323–341.
- Saito, K., & Lyster, R. (2012). Effects of form-focused instruction and corrective feedback on L2 pronunciation development of /ɪ/ by Japanese learners of English. *Language Learning*, 62, 595–633. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2011.00639.x>

- Saito, K., Trofimovich, P., & Isaacs, T. (2017). Using listener judgements to investigate linguistic influences on L2 comprehensibility and accentedness: A validation and generalization study. *Applied Linguistics*, 38, 439–462. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amv047>
- Saito, K., Trofimovich, P., Isaacs, T., & Webb, S. (2017). Re-examining phonological and lexical correlates of second language comprehensibility: The role of rater experience. In T. Isaacs & P. Trofimovich (Eds.), *Second language pronunciation assessment: Interdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 141–156). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Schiffman, J. (2004). Spotlight on speech/voiceover/dialects: The rain in Maine. *Backstage*. Retrieved from <<http://www.backstage.com/news/spotlight-on-speechvoiceoverdialects-the-rain-in-maine>>
- Skinner, E. (1942/2000). *Speak with distinction: The classic Skinner method to speech on the stage*. New York, NY: Hal Leonard Corporation.
- Spolin, V. (1986). *Theater games for the classroom: A teacher's handbook*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Stanislavski, C. (1936). *An actor prepares*. New York, NY: Rutledge/Theatre Arts Books.
- Stern, S.L. (1980). Drama in second language learning from a psycholinguistic perspective. *Language Learning*, 30, 77–100. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1980.tb00152.x>
- Stevens, S.G. (1989). A “dramatic” approach to improving the intelligibility of ITAs. *English for Specific Purposes*, 8, 181–194. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0889-4906\(89\)90029-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0889-4906(89)90029-X)
- Thirsk, J., & Solak, H.G. (2012). Vocal clarity through drama strategy. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 343–346. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.05.119>
- Tokumoto, M., & Shibata, M. (2011). Asian varieties of English: Attitudes towards pronunciation. *World Englishes*, 30, 392–408. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2011.01710.x>
- Trofimovich, P., & Isaacs, T. (2012). Disentangling accent from comprehensibility. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 15, 905–916. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728912000168>
- Wennerstrom, A. (1992). Content-based pronunciation. *TESOL Journal*, 1, 15–18.

## Appendix A. Sample sensory materials

### Omnish

1. Find a private or semi-private space in the room.
2. Close your eyes, if you feel more comfortable, and begin to exaggerate your impression of how English sounds. Remember not to use words, but your perception of the sounds you hear in English. For example, recall sounds you may hear in TV or Film.
3. After one minute, stop and reflect on what you feel. Where is your tongue? How do your lips feel? What positions of the mouth or muscles that you used feel different from how you usually speak? What feels the same? Do your articulators work harder in some places than others?
4. Make a list of the main positions of the mouth that you found in the Omnish exercise. Add to that list any sound qualities that you found important or new, i.e., long (vowel) sounds, more pitch variation.





### Sensory cue

1. Using what you found from your list, construct a vocal posture and hold that posture. Feel free to explore this position.
2. Close your eyes and feel the sensation that this position elicits.
3. What does this feel like? Relate this feeling to an image, feeling, or situation that you can relate to. Does it feel like an action, such as a yawn? Or, does it feel like an image, object, situation, or general state of mind? This is your own personal sensory cue or image.

### Teacher's guide for sensory materials

1. Ask the students to find a corner of the room or spread out enough to be able to have their own small private/semi-private space.
2. Ask the students to name some of their favourite English speaking characters in television shows or films. Or, ask students to think of an English speaker in their life or on TV that they are familiar with.
3. Then, ask students to create, from their memory and perception an impression of this speaker or impression of English without using actual words. The teacher could mimic this exercise to show them that they just need to pronounce the sounds of English and not worry about speaking actual words. If real words come out here and there, that is okay! It's important to do this after warm-ups where the students will already have a mind-set of fun. You can remind them that the sillier the better. Students' playfulness and exaggeration will actually help them benefit more from this exercise. This fake language is called Omnish. Depending on the comfortability of the students, they may prefer to have their eyes closed. They may also prefer to do this at home first as homework to explore in the privacy of their own home.
4. After 1 minute, ask the students to stop. Questions to ask:
  - What did you notice about the sounds you made in your “fake” English?
  - What sounds did you do quite a lot?
  - What differences did you feel from how you speak your first language?
  - What did you notice about your tongue position or where your tongue was in your mouth?
  - What did you notice about your lips?
5. Repeat the Omnish again in order to see if they notice the differences or can go even further without words.
6. Ask the students to stop after another 30 seconds. This can also be repeated one more time if you are using it as a warm-up for articulators.
7. Ask students again what they feel in their mouth, and how it compares with their usual way of speaking English. Whatever the class comes up with as far as the differences of their articulators becomes their personal articulatory starting point. In other words, have them write down those qualities they notice, (e.g., higher tongue, more nasality, more lip movement).

8. Ask the students what it feels like. Give examples of: Does the tongue position feel more forward? Does it feel like licking an ice cream cone? A lollipop? Starting to yawn? Whatever they come up with will become their personal sensory cue for that session or long term practice.
9. Have them write down or practice repeating this feeling by using this position in dialogue right after the sensory exercise.
10. If they are over articulating or need more articulation, ask them to decrease or increase their articulation by percentages. For example, if a student found that they prefer to use their lips more so in articulation around diphthongs, but the speech sound unnatural, ask them to decrease their musculature by 20%. See how far they can decrease it, while maintaining their intended pronunciation.

Additional samples of teaching materials can be requested by emailing the first author.

## Appendix B. Actor weekly survey

\* 1. Name

\* 2. How strongly do you feel you grasped the information in this week's lesson?

Not Strongly at all, I didn't get it.	Somewhat strong, I am still processing.	Relatively strong, I understood.	I feel I really grasped the material.	I feel I excelled at the material.
○	○	○	○	○

\* 3. How confident do you feel in your pronunciation this week?

Not at all confident after this week's class	Slightly confident, but mostly not confident	Neutral	Very confident.	Extremely confident. I am excited to use what I learned in everyday speech.
○	○	○	○	○

\* 4. What is the one thing you remember the most from the lesson this week?

\* 5. What is the one thing from class that was the most helpful for you in your pronunciation?

\* 6. How much time did you practice pronunciation outside of class this week?

\* 7. Please briefly describe your thoughts, experiences, things you've noticed regarding your pronunciation thus far.

## Address for correspondence

Suzanne Cerreta  
 Concordia University  
 Department of Education  
 1455 de Maisonneuve Blvd. West  
 Montréal QC H3G 1M8  
 Canada

## **Co-author information**

Pavel Trofimovich  
Concordia University  
Department of Education  
pavel.trofimovich@concordia.ca