



ASp
la revue du GERAS

77 | 2020
Varia

Jungle Listening: A course in decoding English for psychology students

Alice Henderson et Richard Cauldwell



Édition électronique

URL : <http://journals.openedition.org/asp/6366>

DOI : 10.4000/asp.6366

ISSN : 2108-6354

Éditeur

Groupe d'étude et de recherche en anglais de spécialité

Édition imprimée

Date de publication : 1 mars 2020

Pagination : 63-77

ISSN : 1246-8185

Référence électronique

Alice Henderson et Richard Cauldwell, « Jungle Listening: A course in decoding English for psychology students », *ASp* [En ligne], 77 | 2020, mis en ligne le 10 mars 2020, consulté le 11 mars 2021. URL : <http://journals.openedition.org/asp/6366> ; DOI : <https://doi.org/10.4000/asp.6366>

Ce document a été généré automatiquement le 11 mars 2021.

Tous droits réservés

Jungle Listening: A course in decoding English for psychology students

Alice Henderson et Richard Cauldwell

Foreword

- 1 Le principe d'isochronie qui régit le système rythmique de l'anglais est l'un des défis principaux de l'apprentissage de cette langue par les apprenants francophones : un système qui repose sur l'accentuation de syllabes à intervalles réguliers pose des défis considérables en production comme en compréhension pour des locuteurs ayant comme référence un système syllabique.*
- 2 Cet article rend compte d'une expérience pédagogique adoptant une approche originale de l'enseignement de la compréhension de l'oral dans un dispositif hybride tout en tenant compte des contraintes académiques d'évaluation. À travers des exercices fondés sur la déconstruction du système isochronique, le cours permet aux étudiants de reconstruire le lien phonético-sémantique et ainsi de surmonter leurs difficultés de compréhension orale. En effet, l'objectif est de donner aux étudiants des compétences de décodage des sons de l'anglais afin d'améliorer leur compréhension globale du sens. Cette expérience, destinée à des étudiants de psychologie approchant de la fin de leur parcours universitaire, répond à la fois à des besoins exprimés par ces derniers et à l'un des objectifs des formations hybrides, à savoir le développement de l'autonomie.*
- 3 Le compte-rendu revient sur les différentes étapes du cours, lesquelles ont lieu en présentiel ou à distance sur une plateforme pédagogique, avec une approche qui, malgré une évaluation finale permettant de répondre aux exigences de la formation, se démarque des formations classiques par l'accent qu'elle met sur la pratique récurrente visant à développer des compétences (teaching) davantage que sur l'évaluation desdites compétences à travers un projet final (testing). (Léa Boichard, Université Savoie Mont Blanc)*

1. Context

- 4 In the autumn of 2016, one of the authors (Henderson) was asked to design and deliver a semester-long English listening comprehension course for students on the first year of a 2-year Master's of Psychology degree at the Université Savoie Mont Blanc (USMB). One hundred and ten students had passed a highly competitive entry process to get on the MA course. Undergraduate students in Psychology at USMB are obliged to read research articles in English for their Psychology classes as of their 1st year at university. Therefore instead of focusing on their reading comprehension, which is already assumed to be sufficient, the English objective by the end of the Master programme was to attain level B2 in listening comprehension, according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages¹ (CEFR). Students were told that their M1 autumn semester, consisting of nine, two-hour class sessions and 20 hours of related on-line work, would focus on teaching them two new ways of working on both listening comprehension (LC) and auditory perception (AP). The goal was to set students up with learning tools and practices so that they could attain or maintain a B2 level for the duration of the Master's programme.
- 5 These two new ways went beyond merely assessing a student's level of listening comprehension at a given time. Instead, they focussed on noticing features of spoken language (metalinguistic awareness) and noticing how students are dealing with those features (metacognitive awareness). Underlying both approaches is the idea that noticing is a valuable element in instructed language learning, where learning is broadly defined as acquiring a skill or knowledge. While Schmidt's (1995) Noticing Hypothesis ("what learners notice in input is what becomes intake for learning" p. 20) has been widely criticized, weaker forms of the hypothesis have now found acceptance (see Ünlü 2015, for a review).² In terms of what is learned, the authors hold that noticing will facilitate the acquisition of metalinguistic knowledge, as well as competence (Swain 1995, Truscott 1998). One of the course's specific goals, therefore, was to give students metalinguistic knowledge which they would then use in dealing with authentic speech. This knowledge would constitute an intellectual platform from which to notice, label, and learn to cope with the realities of spontaneous speech, making it more likely that they attain level B2 by the end of their 2-year degree programme.

2. Student profile

- 6 Students had studied English on average for just over ten years and half of them claimed to use other languages regularly (e.g. Italian, Arabic, Spanish, German). They seemed to be a suitable group for an awareness-raising approach to listening comprehension (LC) and auditory perception (AP), because even though their level of English was quite varied (from A2 to C1³), given their undergraduate training in psychology, they knew *intellectually* what learning involved.
- 7 In a pre-course written survey designed for the course, they all stated that they used English in their studies. Thirty-one per cent indicated that they currently used it in their personal lives and 11% already used it in a professional context. When asked to imagine their future use of English, more said they would use it in a professional

context (76%), fewer using it in their studies (53%) and – interestingly – the figure for those saying they would use it in their personal lives rose by eighteen points to 49%.

8 Students were also asked the open-ended question “What difficulties do you have in listening to and understanding English?”:

9 - 58% mentioned speed (*fast, rapid, quickly*) or clarity

10 *when the speaker speaks fast or doesn't articulate*

11 *when words are not completely pronounced (e.g. "gonna eat") in conversation.*

12 - 36% mentioned accents

13 - 60% mentioned words: a lack of vocabulary; unknown, specific or technical words

14 *I don't know enough vocabulary*

15 *specific words from specific topics.*

3. Rationale and design of the course

16 Discussions between language and psychology teachers revealed priorities for the syllabus and content to be developed. It was decided that it should:

17 - prepare students for encounters with natural normal fast speech, embracing the wildness and messiness of normal everyday speech;

18 - be appropriate for a wide range of abilities;

19 - focus on teaching not testing;

20 - go beyond the careful speech model used in most language learning textbooks, and not be an inverted pronunciation course or a course about connected speech rules (catenation, glides, intrusive r, etc.);

21 - avoid massive amounts of marking;

22 - meet institutional requirements: weekly on-line work; an invigilated, time-limited final assessment.

23 The course rationale is based on two key priorities which meet the above requirements:

24 - improving students' ability to decode the speechstream;

25 - giving students a metalanguage to deal with authentic speech on their own.

26 A framework for the syllabus was constructed around Terrier's 4-step approach to LC work (2011) and Cauldwell's approach to decoding speech (AP). Combining the two was a strategic compromise for the teachers, providing something more traditional-seeming to reassure students, while branching out with Cauldwell's innovative approach to the speech stream.

27 Terrier's approach requires students to:

28 1. transcribe an audio document (to show what they understand);

29 2. compare their transcription with the original text and to copy in capital letters
30 what they did not understand or hear correctly;

31 3. listen again while looking at their self-corrected transcription;

32 - analyse their errors or the places where they didn't understand or hear correctly:

33 - word or expression I know when I read it but not when I hear it;

- 34 - word or expression I know when I hear it but not when I read it;
- 35 - word or expression I don't know when I hear it or read it;
- 36 - I had trouble identifying separate words.
- 37 Teaching auditory perception in Cauldwell's approach is based on the principle that there is something to teach, and that it can be taught using the Presentation, Practice, Production methodology. The 'something to teach' is the word cluster (e.g. <where there were>) and the variety of sound shapes that it can have. The conceptual tool that is used to teach the variety of sounds of each cluster is a botanic metaphor which identifies three speech styles:
- 38 - Greenhouse style: the domain of citation forms, where words are like individual plants lovingly presented, separate from other words;
- 39 - Garden style: the domain of connected speech rules, where words in are genteel contact, which requires a gentle merging of edges;
- 40 - Jungle style: where words are mashed into an unruly mess, some very severely reduced (and not just at their edges – e.g. *actually* becomes *ashi* – and others disappear completely – e.g. *couple of guys* becomes *couple guys*.) The Jungle is the domain of everyday normal speech which is poorly catered for in traditional language teaching.
- 41 Both approaches focus on the bottom-up aspects of listening but in different ways. Terrier's approach gets learners to systematically tackle listening in order to identify – and start to improve – their weak points in relation both to language items and also to skills and strategies. Cauldwell, on the other hand, encourages teachers and learners to dig deeply into the detail of the sound substance, to experiment with the phonological structure of words and phrases. Both aim to increase learners' metalinguistic awareness, in particular their meta-phonological awareness, as this plays an important role in the learning of a second, third or further non-native language (Wrembel 2011).

3.1. Decoding vs listening comprehension

- 42 Listening comprehension activities focus on the content or meaning of an audio extract. Decoding is the process of recognising the words in whatever form they occur (whether complete or crushed) in the stream of speech. The length of extracts for LC work can vary widely, for example, from 10 seconds to a 2-hour film and questions usually target understanding for gist or for detail. In contrast, decoding focuses on deciphering the sound substance and the unit of work for decoding is usually a very short extract of a recording, a few seconds long.

3.2. Teaching not testing

- 43 One frequent criticism of LC pedagogy is that it is primarily concerned with testing rather than teaching. It has proved very difficult to shed completely the procedures of testing – for example, gap-fill retains the hallmark of a testing technique regardless of how it is treated pedagogically. To address this issue and reorient teaching to the acquisition of truly transferable concepts and skills, the two teachers chose to adapt materials designed by Cauldwell (2016, 2018) which provide explicit information about the varying sound shapes of very frequent word clusters (e.g. *where there were*) spoken fast. Cauldwell also introduces metalanguage and a conceptual window on speech,

equipping teachers and students with the tools for observation (or the listening equivalent of observation) and discussion of the different sound shapes of words that they hear. The materials in *Jungle Listening: Survival Tips for Fast Speech* do retain LC components, but their purpose is to serve as an introduction to focus on decoding fast speech.

- 44 Part of the difficulty in decoding English lies in the fact that rhythmic constraints result in prominent zones and what Cauldwell refers to as “squeeze zones” or “crush zones” (2018: 152), where vowels are reduced, and consonants and/or entire syllables disappear. These zones often involve word clusters, defined by Carter and McCarthy (2006: 828ff) as groups of words from two to six in length which occur frequently across a wide range of speech styles and topics. They vary in length from the two-word *you know* and *i mean* to the six-word *do you know what I mean*. As well as function words (prepositions, articles, personal pronouns, conjunctions) verbs such as *know*, *think*, *want*, *can*, and *have* occur in such word clusters (cf. Carter & McCarthy, 2006). These word clusters are quite likely to occur between prominences, in the squeeze/crush zones of speech units. Thus, one reason for the focus on word clusters is that being able to decode them will give students high surrender value – precisely because of their frequency, and their range/coverage (the likelihood that they will occur across a wide range of text types).

3.3. Catering to different levels

- 45 A second reason for this focus on bottom-up processing is that it is suitable for groups of students who have different levels of English. Research by Field (2008a, 2008b) has shown that learners of all levels, including advanced, have greater difficulty with function words than content words. Difficulty in recognizing function words also appeared to be independent of level of English. Certain learners rated as having a high level of overall proficiency continued to exhibit large differentials between their ability to identify content words and their ability to identify function words (Field 2008a: 426).
- 46 The requirement to assign weekly on-line work as part of the blended learning format⁴ seemed a perfect opportunity to develop comprehension and decoding exercises for students. More broadly, the course is an example of how a hybrid format can be used for the development of autonomy and metacognitive skills in relation to listening.

3.4. Class organization

- 47 The students were assigned to one of four groups, of between fifteen and thirty students; group sizes differ because students could choose the day and time which best suited their schedule, which included their obligatory, professional internship outside the university. This English class was blended in that students had 2-hours of class each week with a teacher in addition to 20 hours of on-line work over the term, via the electronic learning platform Moodle. The on-line work was closely connected to the work done in class and was part of the continuous assessment.

3.5. Assessment

- 48 Institutional and professional constraints made it obligatory for a final exam to be part of the assessment – for two main reasons. First, entry to this Master’s degree is competitive; the English class, like all other classes, had to use the entire range of marks and identify the weaker students. Second, students who get a Master’s degree in psychology in France are then allowed to apply for a license to practice,⁵ making it the only field within the Humanities which carries this professional, deontological responsibility; graduates who apply for and gain national certification will be able to work on and with other human beings. Within this framework, the ability to handle scientific English well is recognized in their national, deontological code as an essential professional skill (AEPU et al. 1996), whereby psychologists must regularly update their knowledge of the field.
- 49 Therefore, it was agreed that the mark for Practical Work (done at home and with access to all forms of assistance) would carry less weight – only 40% of the overall semester mark – than the mark for the invigilated, time-constrained Final Exam (60%). To reconcile these constraints with the language teachers’ preference for a process-approach, the Practical Work involved a 10% participation mark simply for completing the on-line work each week, and 30% for a Listening Logbook (their “data”; obligatory but not marked and could be written in French) and a Reflective Essay written in English (their analysis of their “data”; marked for language and content).
- 50 The Final Exam was also divided into two sections: (1) a short piece of writing where they summarized a presentation by a group of students, and (2) a traditional listening comprehension exercise at level B2 on a psychological topic. Each section was invigilated and limited to 60 minutes. While the nature of the final assessment is likely to have influenced students’ willingness to adopt an AP focus, the teachers hoped that the process-orientation of the Practical Work counter-balanced this. Overall, they felt that the combination of assessments met institutional constraints, satisfied the desired focus on awareness-raising, and were directly compatible with the key goal of the semester: to develop strategies and skills in listening comprehension, through perception work.

4. Materials

- 51 Cauldwell’s (2016) *Jungle Listening: Survival Tips for Fast Speech* consists of ten units, each of which focuses on a commonly occurring word-cluster which is presented in a short dialogue lasting less than ten seconds. This is the dialogue for the cluster <all the way>, where uppercase letters denote prominent syllables and lowercase letters non-prominent syllables:
- 01 A: i mean he RAN all the way to the STATION
 02 B: ALL the WAY
 03 B: UP THERE
 04 A: all the WAY up THERE
 05 B: IN CREDible
- 52 The dialogue is fabricated, so it goes against most contemporary ideas of authenticity, but the goal is to focus on sound patterns which students typically struggle with. In pursuit of the teaching goal, the recording contains different sound shapes of the

target cluster. Line 01 in particular includes the target cluster at a fast speed, crushed between the prominent syllables RAN and STA. There is a very simple listening comprehension question (optional) because the main work is directed at getting learners to handle (decode) the target cluster at a variety of speeds, including very high speeds. The goal is for them to be able to hear and decode it whenever they encounter it. This is done by using ‘vocal gymnastic’ activities. These look and sound like pronunciation work, but they have a listening goal, to make learners familiar and comfortable with high-speed English. These activities include listen to and repeat different versions (Greenhouse, Garden and Jungle) of the target cluster:

Greenhouse	Garden	Jungle
ALL THE WAY TO THE	ALL the WAIter the	or the wetter the
ɔ:l.ðə.weɪ.tu:.ðə	ɔ:.ðə.weɪ.tə.ðə	ɔ.ðə.we.tə.ðə

- 53 After the listen and repeat activity, the students perform these different versions as a musical round in small groups, so that they are mouthing all versions in quick succession, against the noise of other students who are in different parts of the round, saying the cluster simultaneously in Greenhouse, Garden and Jungle modes.
- 54 Lastly there are the options of (a) students create their own dialogues using the cluster in variations of this dialogue (e.g. ‘ran’ becomes ‘swam’) (b) students are directed to the internet and do gap-fill exercises (c) students use internet search engines in Noticing and Exploring activities in which they find and comment on (e.g. this is a Garden version, that is a Jungle version) other instances of the cluster.

5. Course implementation

- 55 A typical, two-hour classroom session was organized as follows, with blocks B & C being inverted when teachers felt it would better suit the students:

Table 1: Three-block organization of a typical class session

Block A 10-40 minutes	Recap of previous class' content Discuss/explain parts of on-line homework Feedback on work
Block B 10-20 minutes	Practice manipulating the sound substance: Read the dialogue in pairs Listen & repeat (greenhouse, garden, jungle) The round (chanting) Re-write/Modify the dialogue & say it aloud/act it out
Block C 40-80 minutes	Group work on a psychological topic Presenting group discussion to whole class

- 56 At the start of the semester, students determined their level in English listening comprehension using a self-evaluation tool⁶ and/or DIALANG.⁷ In the initial class session, we explained Terrier's approach in their L1 (French) and the accompanying slideshow was made available on their Moodle. Before the second session they were to use that information to watch the appropriate explanatory slideshow provided on their Moodle. Each slideshow explained in detail how to use Terrier's approach to work with on-line resources specific to their level. For example, in the slideshow for level A2/B1 Randall's ESL Lab is presented. The circled sections of the slide show where to retrieve the original transcript, as access to this is essential in Terrier's approach (see figure 1).

Figure 1: Modified slide showing where to retrieve transcript of sound file

- 57 LC and AP work were both done autonomously. However, the students freely chose the resources appropriate to their LC level, whereas the AP work was the same for all students and was done via their Moodle. This is where “Noticing and Exploring” materials from Cauldwell (2016) were adapted to an on-line format. Each weekly Moodle section had three steps, which had to be done in order (see figure 2).

Figure 2: Typical weekly section of a Moodle course, with 3-step Jungle Listening work

- 58 The Survival Tip, in the form of a Moodle book, presented Cauldwell's explanation of a sound substance feature, with one feature being the focus of each week's set of exercises (see figure 3).

Figure 3: Example of a weekly Survival Tip as a page of a Moodle book

Survival Tip #1 Rhythmic bursts 1 – Words are squeezed in front of prominences

PREVIEW EDIT REPORTS GRADE ESSAYS

1.4 Explanation: Window on speech: 3-part pattern
The table below shows the speech unit you just heard:

▶ 0:00 / 0:04 🔊 ⏪ ⏩ ⏴ ⏵

This speech unit has a very common rhythmic shape: the 3-part pattern.
Words are squeezed together in column 3, the syllable in column 2 is loud and clear, and the syllable in column 1 is reasonably clear (more clear than in column 3) because the speaker is slowing down before a pause.

3	2	1
so you won't be	HERE	then
ba ba ba ba	BAM	bam
[squeeze]	BANG!	[relax]

The 'ba ba ba BAM bam' row in the table shows the rhythm of the speech unit, and the last row gives a summary of this explanation.

continue

- 59 A set of Noticing exercises came after the Survival Tip and usually asked students to visit the youglish.com site, to "notice" that feature, and write about it in a box (see figure 4):

Figure 4: Example of a weekly Noticing exercise as a page of a Moodle book

Go to [this site](#) and listen to at least 10 other examples of the speech unit *won't be here*. What do you notice about the other examples? Are they pronounced in a greenhouse, garden or jungle style? Is there a voice or an accent which you prefer?

Please write your response below.

Rich text editor toolbar: Bold, Italic, Text color, List, Link, Unlink, Image, Underline, Strikethrough, X₂, X², Bulleted list, Numbered list, Indent, Outdent, Font size, Font color, Undo, Redo, Source, Table, Text.

- 60 The format of Exploring exercises included more traditional fill-in the blanks exercises (A, B) for 10-20 second extracts, but always included questions which asked them to use the tools and which encouraged intellectual and skill-focused engagement with the sound substance (C, D):

A: Read the transcript below. Some of the words are missing. Listen to the extract and fill them in.

B: Follow the transcript as you listen to the extract. Some words in the transcript are wrong - correct them.

C: Carefully compare your answer to the original transcript below. How close is your version? Did you find similar sounding words or phrases?

D: Which "squeeze zones" or "jungly bits" were difficult for you? Write them here and remember to listen for them in other video and sound files. For example: I think of it as a - so you won't - so you can.

6. Students' interactions with the materials

- 61 Most questions in the Moodle sections of the course were not self-correcting and this lack of immediate, on-line, individualised feedback to what they wrote was frustrating to many students. However, this perception was counterbalanced in the classroom by the follow-up discussions of on-line work, hence making the most of the hybrid format. On-line, our students did participate and reflect on their work. For example, in this reply the student is trying to explain what they found difficult in matching the sound substance to words:

In the first question, it was difficult for me to hear "if you want to" and "so you can't use". In the second question, it was difficult to hear "so you won't to seeing it" (I'm not sure of my answer there); then, after "my favourite place", I have the impression that there is something but I don't really know if it is a breath or a word (but I think it is a breath). Finally, "I think of it" was also difficult and I'm not sure of my answer there neither.

- 62 To provide continuity between their on-line work and in-class sessions, examples of student replies to the on-line Noticing and Exploring exercises were presented for discussion in the first hour of the next class, for example:

"Greenhouse style is more used by people who wants to be heard and convincing"

"I have found the garden style is more used when the speaker has to explain a concept and so on"

"To emphasise a point ... then it will be exaggeratedly long - aaaaaalllll the waaaaaaay to the. To link a sentence to a key point and then it will be in jungle mode"

"I came to recognize the expression with practice and by hearing them all the time. So I think this is a good exercise. However, at the same time I was prepared to hear the expression."

- 63 During the in-class discussion, the teacher could ask students if they agreed with the comment. On the other hand, the Exploring exercises asked students to focus on a feature of the sound substance. Students attempted to transcribe short sections which they heard; these appear below in italics, after the original text they heard:

- The next morning we climbed out of the cave: *clim out, climbed high*

- And hiked all the way to the top of the glacier: *I told, I tall to, hight tall with, hide all over to, hike all the way to*

- 64 In the classroom discussion or debriefing, the teacher had to carefully choose the level of technical, metalinguistic language which would be useful for the students (Fraser, 2006). For example, it was not necessary to use the term deletion or elision in the <climbed out> example. Some of the alternative hearings of the <hiked all the way to> example also show that linking of final consonant to initial vowel was affecting their understanding. This Consonant+Vowel linking is a feature they have in their native language, so increased awareness of this connected speech feature should be quite learnable.

- 65 To briefly summarize the description of this blended learning course, students had exercises to do on-line, elements of which were recycled in the following class. These exercises centred on improving their listening comprehension and auditory perception, but work was also done on speaking and writing during the class sessions.

7. Evaluation

7.1. Students

- 66 In a post-course questionnaire, students' evaluations of the course were positive:
- 67 - 100% reported that this class was different from what they had previously experienced.
- 68 - 81% reported that they were satisfied with the English class.
- 69 - 72% reported that the class helped them to make progress in English.
- 70 - 75% reported that the botanic metaphor (Greenhouse/Garden/Jungle) helped them understand their own listening difficulties.
- 71 - 65% reported that they were better able to understand fast speech.
- 72 The 100% figure for the 'difference' of the course is not surprising: the Jungle Listening materials are quite unlike other listening materials (as far as we are aware). A similar reaction from learners is reported by Sweeney (2017) whose students claimed that they had never focussed on word clusters before, and they felt that 'this was bad'.
- 73 In an open-ended question about what they liked in the course, three of the Psychology students clearly referred to the Jungle Listening approach:
- 74 - "Training with contractions because it helps me to better understand and say them."
- 75 - "The metronome work, because it makes us move from Greenhouse to Jungle while speaking."⁸
- 76 - "The exercises where we had to repeat jungly words, it helps train our ears."
- 77 Such positive comments about the botanic metaphor confirm the potential of metaphor to support changes in learners' meta-linguistic awareness.

7.2. Teachers

- 78 Two teachers taught the course, one of whom expressed initial anxiety. However, as she saw the students were willing to cooperate and could visibly see "the merits and benefits of the approach", she felt less anxious. She reported: "I think I had to see students absorb the material and method and make it their own and see *them* believe in it, to fully believe in it myself!" [teacher's original italics]. Her curiosity and love of a challenge soon took over: "*we should* shake things up a bit from time to time in the classroom" [teacher's original italics].
- 79 The same teacher also pinpointed a concern which many teachers may have, especially if they operate within certain, preferred teaching methodologies:
- The main challenge for me was to depart from an integrated-skills, task- or project-based approach, where the main objective of the course is the scaffolded achievement of (often collaborative) meaning-focused tasks such as recording a psychology podcast, writing an experimental report, or creating a video to raise awareness on gender stereotypes.

8. Conclusion

80 The blended learning course described here was designed to go beyond other contemporary approaches to teaching listening. It recognises the fact that it is not enough simply to do multiple listening comprehension exercises where the focus is entirely on meaning. While other courses may take strategies as the prime focus (Vandergrift & Goh 2012), the primary focus of this course is on the detailed nature of the sound substance of speech, and how this sound substance relates to the words intended by the speaker. It has a major emphasis on teaching rather than testing ('these words can have these different sounds'), and on practising the skills of handling these different sounds. It also recognises the value of giving students metalanguage and tools to describe the difficulties they have with matching the stream of speech to words – even if this metalanguage comprises just the three words Greenhouse, Garden and Jungle.

Acknowledgment

The authors would like to thank Ms F. Freund and her students for agreeing to participate in this study.

BIBLIOGRAPHIE

- AEPU, ANOP, & SFP. 1996. *Code de déontologie des psychologues*. Retrieved from <<http://www.codededeontologiedespsychologues.fr/LE-CODE.html>> on 19/01/2020.
- CARTER, Richard & Michael MCCARTHY. 2006. *Cambridge Grammar of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/S1360674307002535
- CAULDWELL, Richard. 2016. *Jungle Listening: Survival Tips for Fast Speech*. Birmingham: speechinaction. Retrieved from <<https://www.speechinaction.org/jungle-listening-survival-tips-for-fast-speech/>> on 19/01/2020.
- CAULDWELL, Richard. 2018. *A Syllabus for Listening – Decoding*. Birmingham: Speechinaction.
- FIELD, John. 2008a. "Bricks or mortar: which parts of the input does a second language listener rely on?". *TESOL Quarterly* 42/3, 411–32. doi:10.1002/j.1545-7249.2008.tb00139.x
- FIELD, John. 2008b. *Listening in the Language Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511575945
- FRASER, Helen. 2006. "Helping teachers help students with pronunciation: a cognitive approach". *Prospect* 21/1, 80–96. Retrieved from <http://www.ameprc.mq.edu.au/docs/prospect_journal/volume_21_no_1/21_1_5_Fraser.p> on 19/01/2020.
- SCHMIDT, Richard W. 1995. "Consciousness and foreign language learning: A tutorial on the role of attention and awareness". In Schmidt, R.W. (Ed.), *Attention and Awareness in Foreign Language Teaching and Learning (Technical Report No. 9)*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i at Manoa, 1–64.

- SCHMIDT, Richard W. 2010. "Attention, awareness, and individual differences in language learning". In CHAN, W. M. et al., *Proceedings of CLaSIC 2010*, Singapore, December 2–4. Singapore: National University of Singapore, Centre for Language Studies, 721–737.
- SWAIN, Merrill. 1995. "Three functions of output in second language learning." In COOK G. & B. SEIDLHOFER (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honour of H. G. Widdowson*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 125–144.
- SWEENEY, Shaun. 2017. "Grasping the nettle of fast speech: developing listening skills". [web log comment]. Retrieved from <<https://teacherdevelopmentlab.wordpress.com/2017/04/18/grasping-the-nettle/>> on 19/01/2020.
- TERRIER, Linda. 2011. *Méthodologie linguistique pour l'évaluation des restitutions et analyse expérimentale des processus de didactisation du son : recommandations pour un apprentissage raisonné de la compréhension de l'anglais oral par les étudiants francophones du secteur LANSAD*. Retrieved from <<http://thesesups.ups-tlse.fr/1554/1/2011TOU30267-1.pdf>> on 19/01/2020.
- TRUSCOTT, J. 1998. "Noticing in second language acquisition: a critical review". *Second Language Research* 14/2, 103–135. doi:10.1191/026765898674803209
- ÜNLÜ, Asli. 2015. "How alert should I be to learn a language? The noticing hypothesis and its implications for language teaching". *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences* 199, 261–267. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.515
- VANDERGRIFT, Larry & Christine C. GOH. 2012. *Teaching and Learning Second Language Listening: Metacognition in Action*. New York: Routledge. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511667152
- WREMBEL, Magdalena. 2011. "Metaphonetic awareness in the production of speech". In PAWLAK, M., E. WANIEK-KLIMCZAK & J. MAJER (Eds.), *Speaking and instructed foreign language acquisition*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 169–182.

NOTES

1. The CEFR "was designed to provide a transparent, coherent and comprehensive basis for the elaboration of language syllabuses and curriculum guidelines, the design of teaching and learning materials, and the assessment of foreign language proficiency. It is used in Europe but also in other continents." See <https://www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages>.
2. Noticing may have conscious and unconscious aspects, but both can contribute to learning; Schmidt himself (2010) now accepts that learning may include unconscious processes, especially in adults.
3. The majority self-evaluated their level at A2/B1 while 20% claim B2/C1 level. In France, 16-year olds are supposed to have reached B1 level and initially, the Ministry wanted university graduates to reach level C1, but this target has been abandoned.
4. The term 'blended learning' refers broadly to a course partly delivered on-line, in this case via Moodle.
5. <http://www.enseignementsup-recherche.gouv.fr/cid66177/psychologue-une-profession-reglementee-en-france.html>
6. <http://edl.ecml.at/LanguageFun/Selfevaluateyourlanguageskills/tabid/2194/language/Default.aspx>
7. <https://dialangweb.lancaster.ac.uk/>

8. A metronome was used once in the middle of term, as a fun way to gradually increase the speed at which students repeated word clusters and dialogues. The goal was to help them to align automatically with the given beat. It seemed to help them to produce more noticeable alternations between prominent and 'squeezed' zones.

AUTEURS

ALICE HENDERSON

Alice Henderson is an Associate Professor and member of the LIDILEM research group at Université Grenoble - Alpes, France, where she teaches English for Specific Purposes to Science and Technology students. Her main research interests are English pronunciation learning and teaching, content-language integrated learning and language policy. She has been involved in teacher training in France, Norway, Poland, and Spain. alice.henderson@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr

RICHARD CAULDWELL

Richard Cauldwell has taught English in France, Hong Kong, Japan and the UK. His most recent affiliation was with the University of Birmingham. Since 2001 he has been teaching, writing and publishing *Speech in Action*. His publications have been shortlisted for prizes many times, and twice he has won a British Council ELT for innovations in English Language Teaching. richardcauldwell@me.com