The Role of Linguistic Ideologies in Current Practices of English Phonology Teaching in France[1]

Kizzi Edensor
University of Caen Normandie, France
Christelle Exare
University of Lille, France

Abstract

Linguistic ideologies refer to collective beliefs and attitudes about language that can influence teaching approaches and often reflect broader social and institutional interests, as described by Silverstein and Kroskrity. In French universities, English phonology instruction typically favours native speaker models and written standards, shaping narrow curricula and assessment practices. A survey was conducted across 25 French universities, collecting responses from 44 instructors using a set of 58 questions. The resulting data suggest that prescriptive practices prevail, with little integration of phonological variation into main courses, which often remain influenced by The *Guierrian* School (Ballier, "Du dictionnaire"). Findings indicate that pedagogical choices and curriculum changes depend on institutional policy and the ideology centred on the primacy of written forms. This article examines four constituent elements of this doxa and highlights the need for a shift towards pedagogies that value linguistic diversity and better reflect actual usage, particularly in contrast to the less explicit practices observed in schools.

Les idéologies linguistiques désignent les croyances et attitudes collectives relatives à la langue, qui peuvent influencer les approches pédagogiques et reflètent souvent des intérêts sociaux et institutionnels plus larges, comme le décrivent Silverstein et Kroskrity. Dans les universités françaises, l'enseignement de la phonologie anglaise privilégie généralement le modèle des locuteurs natifs et les normes écrites, ce qui se traduit par des programmes et des pratiques d'évaluation restreintes. Une enquête a été menée dans 25 universités françaises, recueillant les réponses de 44 enseignants à l'aide d'un questionnaire de 58 questions. Les données obtenues suggèrent que les pratiques normatives prévalent, avec une prise en compte limitée de la variation phonologique dans les enseignements, qui s'inscrivent souvent dans les travaux de l'école de Guierre (Ballier, "Du dictionnaire"). Les résultats indiquent que les choix pédagogiques et les changements de programme dépendent de la politique institutionnelle et de l'idéologie centrées sur la primauté des formes écrites. Cet article examine 4 éléments constitutifs de cette doxa et évoque la nécessité d'une évolution vers des pédagogies qui valorisent la diversité linguistique et reflètent mieux l'usage réel, en particulier par rapport aux pratiques moins explicites observées dans les écoles.

Keywords

ideologies, norms, English, phonology, university, France
Idéologies, Normes, Anglais, Phonologie, Université, France

Introduction

Linguistic ideologies significantly shape English phonology teaching practices in France, influencing pedagogical approaches through deeply ingrained beliefs about language structure, use, and legitimacy. As defined by Silverstein (193), linguistic ideologies consist of "sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalisation or justification of perceived language structure and uses." This definition emphasises the distinction between scientific claims and ideological beliefs, noting that while they may occasionally align, they typically operate within separate conceptual frameworks. Kroskrity (95) further elaborates on this by describing linguistic ideologies as "beliefs, feelings, and conceptions about language structure and use which often index the political, economic interests of individual speakers, ethnic and other interest groups, and nation-states." These ideologies extend beyond mere cognition to encompass emotions, power dynamics, and identity, making them particularly relevant to

[1] DOI: 10.61736/alizes.563

aspects of language such as accent and pronunciation. Kroskrity's inclusion of speech highlights the applicability of these ideologies to phonological teaching, where accent plays a central role.

Woolard identifies authenticity and anonymity as key ideologies that sustain linguistic authority: authenticity ties varieties to specific speakers and identities, whereas anonymity presents dominant norms as "voices from nowhere" that belong to everyone (Gal and Woolard, as cited in Woolard 12). This tension explains the persistent prestige of Received Pronunciation (RP) or Standard British English (SBE) despite its artificiality. While ideologies are inevitable, their pedagogical enactment matters most. Didactic transposition delay (Quessada) reveals how linguistic research lags behind classroom practice, as accepted phonetic realities remain treated as "errors" in pedagogy.

This research focuses on linguistic ideologies which shape English phonology teaching practices in French universities. This paper analyses four key ideologies, supported by data from a 2022 survey of 44 instructors across 25 institutions: (1) native-speakerism versus intelligibility, (2) reliance on British IPA (International Phonetic Alphabet) norms, (3) graphocentric primacy, and (4) rationalist-nationalist influences. The survey comprised 58 questions on working conditions, disciplinary backgrounds, theoretical choices, and pedagogical practices. The most illustrative responses are examined here. Given the relatively limited number of respondents (n = 44), the quantitative results are interpreted as indicative rather than statistically representative, and are used to support a qualitatively oriented analysis. For a deeper understanding of the subject, the anonymised dataset is openly available in the Nakala repository (Exare).[2]

Native-Speakerism vs. Intelligibility

In the context of English as a Second Language (ESL) teaching, linguistic ideologies are evident in the ongoing debate between the nativeness principle, which promotes native-like pronunciation as a goal, and the intelligibility principle, which emphasises clear, understandable speech regardless of accent (Levis, "Changing Contexts").

The nativeness principle prioritises achieving pronunciation that mimics that of native speakers, often idealistically represented by a specific prestige variety. Native-speakerism (Holliday) refers to the ideological bias that privileges native speakers as the ultimate authorities on language use, often marginalising non-prestige and non-native varieties and innovations. Throughout much of the twentieth century, pronunciation teaching focused on native-speaker norms, typically based on a narrow reference accent (Celce-Murcia et al.). This model is problematic, as even native speakers often do not conform to it and may need to modify their speech, leading to inconsistencies in both identity and pedagogical expectations.

The intelligibility principle, as articulated by Levis ("Changing Contexts"), focuses on producing speech that is comprehensible to a wide audience, irrespective of accent conformity. Kenyon (as quoted in Murphy and Baker) observed that speakers of various English varieties – including Eastern, Southern, and General American, Northern and Southern British, and Standard Scottish – experience no difficulty understanding one another when each variety is spoken with clarity (Levis, *Intelligibility*). This early recognition of mutual intelligibility across native varieties contributed to later efforts to promote teaching for intelligibility. To move

[2] The data were collected from May 2022 to October 2022 using the Google Form platform. Emails to four mailing lists (ALOES, ARDAA, SAES, and LinguistList) and individual emails were sent by the second author. The 58 questions were organised into three sections: teaching context, disciplinary practices (e.g. choice of reference authors), and pedagogical practices and assessment (e.g. course formats, teaching approaches, and evaluation methods).

beyond the native-speakerism paradigm, the intelligibility principle emerged as an alternative framework. While there is no single definition of intelligibility, Smith and Nelson define it as a listener's ability to recognise words and phrases. This shifts the focus from conformity to native norms and broader comprehensibility across diverse listener backgrounds. According to Munro and Derwing, intelligibility refers to the accurate understanding of a speaker's intended message and is often assessed through orthographic transcription tasks. Crucially, Munro and Derwing distinguish three dimensions of non-native speech – intelligibility (words accurately transcribed), comprehensibility (perceived ease, via Likert scales), and accentedness (deviation from native norms) – revealing that noticeable accents need not compromise intelligibility. While native norms remain central to these measures, teaching should shift towards embracing variation to promote mutual understanding (Baratta and Halenko). To support intelligibility-based teaching, Levis (*Intelligibility* 186) proposes six practical guidelines: (1) prioritise features linked to communication and broader language use; (2) focus on mispronunciations that hinder processing; (3) emphasise accurate pronunciation of key lexical items; (4) address errors with high functional load; (5) target frequent errors over infrequent ones; and (6) concentrate on features that are teachable and attainable. These guidelines emphasise communicative clarity and realistic goals.

The tension between the two principles underscores how ideologies shape not only what is taught but also how language legitimacy is perceived and enforced in educational settings. The intelligibility principle challenges the nativeness principle on two main grounds: first, that achieving native-like pronunciation is often unrealistic for ESL learners, and second, that native-like speech is not required for intelligible communication. Despite growing support for this perspective, both principles still influence pronunciation pedagogy (Levis, *Intelligibility*). Native norms remain aspirational for many L2 speakers and teachers, especially in EFL contexts, indicating that native-speakerism persists (Holliday).

This extends to English teaching, where British English, particularly RP, is preferred due to geographical proximity and historical tradition (Michari; Barrera-Pardo and López-Soto; Cruttenden). A French 1995 decree (*Ministère de l'Éducation nationale 1995*) states: "In Europe, the most commonly taught variety of English in secondary school, particularly in the first year, is a moderate, unmarked form of British English. This variety, despite being spoken by a minority, is widely understood" (quoted in Michari and Glain). RP's codification in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, facilitated by the IPA, positioned it as a prestige accent associated with elite institutions like public schools (Milroy; Macaulay). Political and academic centres in London, Oxford, and Cambridge shaped the standard accent, symbolising prestige through education and literacy. Early works distinguished RP from regional accents, conferring moral value via *good* and *bad* English (Wyld), which were later said to be as fictitious as Santa Claus (Peterson 23). Bex and Watts criticise Honey for perpetuating these categories, which lack linguistic validity. Drummond (35) notes that, at the time, dictionaries shifted to prescriptivism, based on personal preference rather than evidence, with Walker claiming that provincial speech was impure. Hierarchical organisation of accents persists, with negative attitudes towards urban varieties such as Cockney and Birmingham accents (Drummond 232). Literary examples from Chaucer to Dickens reflect this use of dialects for class signification. In a globalised world, new varieties challenge norms (Percy). Kachru's Inner, Outer, and Expanding Circles recognise the legitimacy of all users (Glain, *Phonologies*). Jenkins' Lingua Franca Core reflects this pluricentric legitimacy. This pluricentric reality challenges the mutually exclusive dichotomy between *native-speakerism* and *intelligibility*. Rather than limiting models to the two main standard varieties (RP and General American, GA), we should recognise all regularly acquired pre-literacy varieties as "native" – from Indian English to Singaporean English – and expose learners to them. Non-native accents often reflect interference from written norms (e.g. interlanguage fossilisation), compromising intelligibility

more than nativeness itself does. While codification requires legitimacy, standard language ideology hinders variability by promoting a single "correct" form, at odds with the dynamic nature of language.

The tension between the nativeness and intelligibility principles finds an echo in the variety that is taught in English phonology classes in France. British English, as an Inner Circle norm (see Kachru's Three Concentric Circles model of World Englishes), is still preferred to other varieties, even to General American. However, recent research, such as that conducted by Ferragne et al., shows that French higher-education learners of English speak varieties of English that are perceived as General American for 60% of the 300-subject sample and as RP for 35% of the sample.

Michari (15) notes that official French documents recommend awareness of British and American varieties but use British phonemes in materials, embedding SSBE (Southern Standard British English), equivalent to SBE (Standard British English), as the default. In higher education, instructors technically have more freedom, but textbooks focus on British English and Traditional RP.[3] Arguably, if RP is to be taught, only Mainstream (Wells, *Accents of English* 279) or Contemporary RP[4] should be considered. However, it seems that no French manuals reflect recent changes. For example, *sure* and *tour* are transcribed as /ˈʃʊə/ and /ˈtʊə/, which represent outdated forms (Wells, "Whatever happened to RP?"). In addition, Upton ("British English" 252) criticises the practice of presenting RP alone as the default without explanation, especially given its connotations of affectation or elitism (Hughes et al.). Learners should be informed of social implications.

One of the first elements the questionnaire sought to capture was an overview of the types of English taught and the role of variation in university teaching. Of the 44 participants, 27 instructors reported speaking only SBE – a model deeply rooted in the RP tradition – while 22 chose SBE as the single norm for phonemic transcription.

Reliance on (Inconsistent and Labile) IPA Transcriptions from British Dictionaries

Historically, the nativeness principle traces its roots to the first wave of pronunciation teaching in the 1850s–1880s, when native-speaking teachers were deemed essential for enthusiastic interaction with learners (Murphy and Baker). This era was succeeded by the formation of the International Phonetic Association (IPA) in Paris, which established phonetic training as a compulsory and useful core principle. The Guierrian School (*École de Guierre*) emerged in the 1970s, initially aligned with generative phonology's rule-based approach but maintaining a conservative focus on British dictionary transcriptions (EPD/Jones 18th ed.) against perceived Anglo-Saxon variability. Broader university teaching drifted towards intelligibility, Jenkins' Lingua Franca Core, and corpus data, whereas Guierre's enduring influence reinforced graphophonemic rigidity. Given this epistemological heritage, English phonology teaching in France in the 2020s continues to rely heavily on the nativeness principle, promoting rigid and perennial views of *good* English pronunciation. This approach reflects a monolithic view of language (Clyne) that is resistant to incorporating variation and change.

However, resistance to change (Upton, "British English") – or defiance against change – has a counterpart: a major inconsistency resulting from labile norms and standards in IPA transcriptions of English segments. For instance, Table 1 compares IPA phonetic symbols for

[3] Traditional RP (or trad-RP for Upton, "Received Pronunciation," 239–240) is generally viewed as old-fashioned and dated.

[4] Contemporary RP refers to a more modern form of RP, distinct from earlier versions and primarily spoken by younger, upper-class individuals (Glain, *Variations*; Lindsey).

five words across five English pronunciation dictionaries published between 1991 and 2025. It shows that transcriptions for words like *price*, *trap*, *pricey*, *interest*, and *happy* vary significantly, with differences in symbols such as /praɪs/ versus /prájs/. Note the following sets of variants:

- / i, ɪ, ij/ in the second syllable of *happy*
- /ɪ, ə, ɛ, e, ɨ/ in the second syllable of *interest*
- /aɪ, áj, ʌɪ/ in *price*
- /æ, a, á/ in *trap*.

Interestingly, according to Routledge, British English shows a break from traditional transcriptions, whereas American English preserves the transcriptions of earlier dictionaries.

Table 1. Transcriptions of five English words in five phonetic dictionaries published between 1991 and 2025

	CEPD 14th	CEPD 18th	LPD 3rd	Cube	Routledge
	Jones. Edited by Gimson and Ramsaran	Jones. Edited by Roach, Setter, and Esling	Wells	Szigetvári and Lindsey	Upton and Kretzschmar
price	praɪs	praɪs	praɪs	prájs	BR: prʌɪs AM: praɪs
trap	træp	træp	træp	tráp	BR: trap AM: træp
pricey	-	ˈpraɪ.s|i	ˈpraɪs|i	prájsɪj	BR: ˈprʌɪs|i AM: ˈpraɪsi
interest	ˈɪntrəst ˈɪntərest ˈɪntrɪst	BR: ˈɪn.trəst ˈɪn.trest ˈɪn.trɪst AM: ˈɪn.trɪst ˈɪn.trəst ˈɪn.trest	ˈɪntr əst ˈɪntr ɪst ˈɪntr est ˈɪnt ə rest AM: ˈɪnt̬ ə rest	íntrɛst	BR: ˈɪntrɪst ˈɪnt(ə)rɛst AM: ˈɪnt(ə)rəst
happy	ˈhæp|ɪ	ˈhæp|.i	ˈhæp i	hápɪj	BR: ˈhap|i AM: ˈhæpi

The allophones [i] and [ɨ] have been used for around 60 years. They reflect the variation in tenseness of the phoneme /ɪ/ in weak syllables along a phonetic continuum ranging from [ɨ] to [iː]. Although [i] is an allophone rather than a phoneme, it is curiously and commonly transcribed within slashes, as British listeners may use this tenseness cue to enhance the perceptual contrast between *his home* (/hɪz ˈhəʊm/) and *he's home* (/hi z ˈhəʊm/). [ɨ] is sometimes used for the phonetic reduced form /ɪ/ in weak syllables. It is more central than /ɪ/, as evidenced by the 2015 IPA chart.[5] The [ɨ] symbol was used by phonology teachers in the Department of English at the University of Montpellier in the 1990s (especially in 1992).

[5] This is logical as reduction runs parallel to centralisation, as described by Lindblom, among others.

However, it is rarely encountered in dictionaries and manuals, raising the question of why /i/ has been adopted in teaching and not [ɪ].

Relying on acoustic data, both Fabricius and Harrington support Wells's claim (*Accents of English*), considering *happy* tensing as a major phonetic change of the twentieth century. However, Lindsey (31–33) goes so far as to say that word-final /i/ (e.g. *happy*) does not actually exist. He claims that the transcription /hápɪj/ should be used, stressing that the lax vowel /ɪ/ can appear before a consonant, but never before a vowel or at the end of a syllable.

This reveals substantial disagreement among scholars. The lack of consistency in the use of IPA symbols was identified by Lilly and Viel, who discussed the transcription of the *dress* vowel as /e/ rather than /ɛ/, based on acoustic data. These inconsistencies highlight the complexity of representing human speech and the ideological underpinnings of scholarly choices, including resistance to updates like /ɛ/ for *dress* and /a/ for *trap*, which have been accepted in French competitive exams but are absent from many manuals (Cruttenden; Carley and Mees 69). Note that Carley and Mees justify retaining traditional symbols for familiarity, updating only the *square* vowel to /ɛː/ due to its divergence from /eə/.

In the survey, two questions addressed the issues of adopting evolutions in broad and narrow segmental transcription. The first questioned the Routledge Dictionary's use of the lax vowel /æ/ transcribed as /a/ in SBE[6] and /æ/ in GA (see *happy* above).

The respondents displayed a tendency towards conservatism in their pedagogical choices, highlighting adherence to conventional norms, with only 11 out of 44 reporting that they transcribe the *trap* vowel as /a/ in their teaching practice. This symbol was officially proposed and documented in Cruttenden but was only recently accepted as an alternative transcription for French competitive teaching exams.[7]

Two main reasons were put forward to justify the reluctance to change, or even to accept, another symbol for the *trap* vowel. Firstly, eight of 44 respondents cited what could be termed a "scientific truth" as their primary reason. They argued that using the symbol /a/ for the *trap* vowel may be scientifically incorrect. For instance, /a/ is used for French *patte*, so there is a need to represent and preserve the opposition between the two languages. The *trap* vowel is said to be realised differently. Three instructors would be willing to use the symbol in allophonic transcription and for non-standard varieties, but not for a phoneme. Others wrote that the symbol is inaccurate and conflicts with their collected data. Secondly, 21 of the 44 respondents reported relying on established norms. They stated that using the symbol /a/ for the *trap* vowel is not feasible, at least not yet, until further instructions come from above. They tend to adhere to official guidelines (*Rapports de jury de concours*), standardised teaching materials produced within their departments for collective use, and the two reference dictionaries (Jones 18th ed.; Wells, *Longman Pronunciation Dictionary*). They indicated that they wait for instructions from higher authorities before using the /a/ symbol. They also underlined that they have too little teaching time to address the issue and that it is unnecessary to complicate matters by adopting a norm not reported in dictionaries or course books.

These results suggest that teachers exhibit considerable caution regarding the materials they include in their courses, sometimes extending beyond concerns of legitimacy. Both Wells and Lindsey explain that teachers generally show reluctance to adopt changes in their teaching materials, often preferring to maintain established practices to ensure stability and familiarity.

---

[6] The questionnaire used the more recent term "SBE" for "Southern British English."

[7] Competitive exams are pivotal in the French teaching system. The CAPES (*Certificat d'Aptitude au Professorat du Second Degré*) is a national exam, qualifying teachers for middle and high schools in France, similar to the PGCE (Postgraduate Certificate in Education). The *Agrégation* is more selective, allowing access to higher-level teaching roles with greater status and a lighter workload. Other countries may not have such normative expectations with English accents for future teachers. For a detailed discussion on accent norms and acceptability in the French education system, see Michari and Glain.

The question of legitimacy is therefore still relevant; the fewer reference books that include these phonological changes, the less they are perceived as legitimate – a perception often reinforced through written sources, as discussed (see below: graphocentric primacy). Teachers and assessors may feel a sense of responsibility towards their students while experiencing divided loyalties towards the teaching community. They believe they must teach the most widely recognised forms to ensure their students are not penalised due to their university teacher's individual decisions, which may conflict with – or be subject to – the CAPES and *Agrégation* collective universal rules governing the competitive exam.

Omitting distinctions like /a-æ/ or /ɛ-e/ reinforces abstraction, distancing transcription from real-world speech use. This lack of consistency means that IPA symbols do not fully represent the complexity and variability of speech. Instead, they often reflect scholars' ideologies, linguistic schools, or theoretical models – terminology meant to foster agreement – and vary according to the language varieties taught.

The second question in the survey concerned the *price* vowel. Following Cruttenden (143) and contrary to Fox (75–111), the Routledge dictionary introduces the IPA symbols [ʌɪ] for phonetic variants of the *price* diphthong. In response to questions about knowledge and use of the transcription, 33 of 44 participants reported being aware of this phonological evolution, yet only 15 of 44 reported teaching it. Those who replied negatively to integrating recent phonemic changes into their courses mentioned the two reasons given above: a lack of codification and insufficient acoustic or perceptual evidence to justify change (the shift from the open first element /a/ to a more central vowel /ʌ/).

The ongoing debate over the use of phonetic symbols in dictionaries and phonology coursebooks remains vigorous. The impressive variation in terminology and typologies reflects the fact that describing human speech is a complex task. No wonder little consensus has been reached so far. Durand et al. and Durand rightly point out that the IPA, although useful and necessary, is far from being sufficient for any fine-grained description of human speech. There is not only a debate over which accent to use as the standard for teaching but also over which phonetic symbols to choose. Only recently, in France, the phonemes for the lexical keywords (Wells, *Accents of English*) *dress* and *trap*, /ɛ/ and /a/, respectively, have been accepted in the French competitive exams (CAPES and Agrégation) alongside the more traditional transcriptions of /e/ and /æ/. This suggests persistent resistance to change (already identified in Trapateau and Duchet's study of eighteenth-century dictionaries). Consequently, these IPA symbols are seen as less legitimate. In any case, variation is seldom integrated into core courses which are largely based on the Guierrian School approach (Ballier, "Du dictionnaire'').

Graphocentric primacy

A central concept is "graphocentric primacy" (Ballier, "Quelques problèmes métalinguistiques"), which prioritises written forms as the primary reference for language instruction and analysis. Duchet continues to explicitly defend this for English pronunciation in France, arguing that lexical memorisation through written forms justifies deriving pronunciation rules from letter-sound equivalences. However, he claims that stress knowledge is foundational – ironically seeking to deduce it from written English norms rather than speech. This reveals the Guierrian School's fundamental flaw: forcing oral accentuation to fit graphophonemic moulds. Graphocentrism legitimises and codifies usage through orthography, often leading to confusion between letters and sounds in learners' minds. In the French education system, which places strong emphasis on writing, a paradox emerges: phonology, while intended to describe spoken forms, remains anchored in writing, including phonetic transcription itself. Ballier ("Quelques problèmes métalinguistiques" 4) notes that "several facts can illustrate the representational difficulties linked to the importance of writing in the French

school system. […] In the beginning was the written word. The very notions of 'vowels' and 'consonants' refer to writing."

This extends to the standard language ideology (Lippi-Green 67), defined as "a bias towards an abstracted, idealised, homogenous spoken language... drawn primarily from the speech of the upper, middle class." Such an ideology not only elevates dominant varieties but also marginalises others, fostering discriminatory practices such as glottophobia – the devaluation of individuals based on their accent or linguistic variety (Blanchet, *Discriminer les accents*) – and accentism (Drummond). Blanchet (*La glottophobie en France* 2) traces graphocentrism to the historical development of French orthography by elites, noting that "an academician records in his texts, 'it will be necessary to develop a spelling system that will allow the literate to be distinguished from the ignorant and from simple women'." The prioritisation of written norms perpetuates linguistic insecurity and a culture in which deviations are mocked, even in casual interactions (Blanchet, *Accents et glottophobie*).

Graphocentricity likely explains why transcription has an important place in phonology classes. On a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 indicates low importance, and 5 represents extreme importance, 19 out of 44 respondents rated transcription as the latter. With regard to graphophonemic rules, it appears that French Departments of English studies continue to uphold traditional models, rather than following scientific research and researchers' recommendations. As noted above, this is reminiscent of the primacy of writing and the legitimacy of linguistic evolutions that are not yet included in textbooks. For instance, the main references are the Guierrian School, with 23 of 44 respondents reporting it as their main source, along with Roach's coursebook (26 of 44 respondents), which dates from 2009 and therefore no longer includes recent changes. Eighteen of the 44 participants consider graphophonemic rules a very important part of their teaching. It can be noted that the new CAPES examination (Bac +3) includes a phonology question that, judging by the specimen paper, is once again based on graphophonemics.[8]

A Rationalist-Nationalist Approach

One ideology behind standardisation is historically tied to the rise of *nation-states*, in which a uniform language symbolises national unity (Lange). To underline the relationship between France and its language – and, by extension, second language learning ideologies – Geeraerts explores how France's standardisation processes invoke national identity through two competing models: the rationalist model, viewing standardisation as a tool for unity, emancipation, and participation in national life; and the romantic model, which criticises this as exclusionary, emphasising linguistic diversity and speakers' rights to express unique identities through non-standard varieties.

In France, a rationalist-nationalist approach codifies French as the official language, linking it to national identity and marginalising regional varieties. While across the world, bilingualism and multilingualism are the norm rather than the exception (Grosjean), in France, historical, cultural, and political factors have long contributed to the marginalisation of bilingual situations, which likely affects the teaching and learning of modern languages. Creole languages, for instance, remain undervalued both among their speakers (Véronique) and within academia (Kihm). The *Haby* and *Savary* circulars, which aimed to promote linguistic diversity, had little to no impact in the French Overseas Territories (Véronique 136), where Creoles continue to be socially and institutionally subordinated to French. A similar situation applies to patois and regional languages, which are not taught in schools. Although some regional languages may be offered as optional subjects on the *baccalauréat* syllabus – mainly in regions

[8] Available from: https://www.devenirenseignant.gouv.fr/exemples-de-sujets-des-concours-externes-bac3-de-recrutement-d-enseignants-1405 (consulted on 27 October 2025).

marked by strong diglossic traditions, such as Brittany or Alsace – this remains the exception. As Boyer notes, despite the Deixonne Law of 1951, intended to support regional language education, enrolment in the Occitan option declined between 1978 and 1985. The law was repealed in 2000, and its provisions were incorporated into the *Code de l'Éducation* (Article L312-10). In practice, the availability of regional language instruction remains highly uneven across France. Escudé (83) questions what France has done with its historically rooted multilingualism, noting that there is indeed social demand for the teaching and learning of Occitan. However, such demands for recognition of regional languages have been neglected over time. In Corsica, for instance, local calls for bilingualism and co-official status for Corsican have gone largely unheard, and despite proactive local policies (Arrighi), success appears unlikely.

Legendre's Senate report similarly denounces the decline of minority language teaching and the monopoly of English as the first foreign language, exposing the gap between ambitious educational discourse and the less glorious reality of practice. This monolingual ideology shapes not only L1 but also L2 English phonology teaching, demanding uniform "correct" models over legitimate variation.

Language often serves as a symbolic defence against perceived external threats – such as the dominance of English, a by-product of globalisation. As Fenet argues, the external linguistic threat actually provides an opportunity to further marginalise regional languages. French thus plays a central role in the denial of minority recognition, reflecting a deep-seated, institutionalised dual apprehension: on the one hand, fear of losing French culture and identity, and on the other, fear that foreign cultures might become dominant, whether economically or culturally.

Ballier ("Malaise dans la langue dominante" 118) notes a comparable phenomenon abroad – the "Balkanisation of native English," whereby English becomes foreign to its own speakers. This national-level anxiety mirrors individual psychological barriers in language learning, where identity issues can inhibit progress (Gatbonton et al.). Learners may resist acquiring a foreign language out of fear of self-loss. Overcoming these identity-based constraints is thus essential for successful language learning in France.

This stance recalls the tendency to favour one accent or variety over others, thereby denying or devaluing the identity associated with stigmatised accents or languages. Prior to standardisation, a language's variational space operated without a strict hierarchy, with different varieties coexisting, each governed by its own norms and functions. Standardisation restructured this space by elevating one variety to the status of the standard, which is characterised by prestige and authority, while reclassifying others as dialects or non-standard forms. This process introduced societal notions of linguistic legitimacy and illegitimacy (Milroy and Milroy). As a result, regional and minority languages have been marginalised and remain largely excluded from official status, despite some recent symbolic gestures towards recognition.

This hierarchical privileging of one variety over others not only shapes perceptions of linguistic legitimacy but also has clear social consequences. The process of standardisation often leads to bias against non-standard varieties, influencing social attitudes, access to resources, and individual identity. In response, speakers of marginalised varieties may resist or challenge these norms, asserting their linguistic and cultural identities.

Phonology teaching in French higher education has traditionally focused on the study and transcription of segmental and suprasegmental units within a predominantly European framework. Analyses of intonation represent a key domain of *didactic transposition delay,* where linguistic research lags behind classroom practice, which often seems to follow Halliday,

O'Connor, and Arnold's model, which is preferred over Pierrehumbert's TOBI system.[9] In contrast, infra-segmental units described by American or cross-Atlantic researchers – such as phonological features (Chomsky and Halle) or articulatory gestures (Browman and Goldstein) – have received little attention. The field has also shown a certain reluctance towards acoustic approaches and has made limited use of scientific or digital tools in both research and pedagogy. Among the 44 university teachers surveyed, the majority do not integrate technological tools into their phonetics teaching. Specifically, 35 never use voice synthesis, 26 attach little importance to students' use of speech analysis software, and 32 consider spectrogram-based analysis of speech errors to be of little relevance.

In this respect, France presents a paradox: it was once a cradle of experimental phonetics, led by pioneers such as Abbé Rousselot (1846–1924). Yet despite this rich legacy, contemporary language teaching in France has been slow to integrate major twenty-first-century advances in international linguistic research. As a result, evidence-based and research-informed pedagogical approaches remain significantly behind current global standards. For example, while other contexts have embraced digital speech analysis tools, corpus-based phonological research, and data-driven pronunciation models, these remain rarely implemented in French higher education.

The consequences and interplay of these ideologies are profound, enforcing a binary between legitimate and illegitimate forms (Milroy and Milroy) and fostering linguistic hierarchy. Milroy (535) notes that "an extremely important effect of standardisation has been the development of consciousness among speakers of a correct, or canonical, form of a language." This awareness extends beyond specialists to the entire speech community, enforcing adherence to the standard as ideologically and socially charged. Language use thus reinforces societal inequalities, acting as a gatekeeping tool in social and economic domains, particularly since the nineteenth century due to eighteenth-century prescriptivism (Milroy). Lippi-Green points out the role of language ideology in constructing linguistic otherness, in which identity is shaped through contrast with opposing others, thereby affecting everyday interactions: "accent is how *the other* speaks" (165).

Linguists must draw attention to these ideologies in teaching, learning, and evaluation to promote awareness and challenge negative effects. However, Woolard warns that activism can backfire as ideologies are embedded in broader structures. Milroy and Milroy (171) remind us that "no perspective is ideology-free." The ideologies discussed in the article remain powerful in France, where variation is often shunned and a "predominantly monolithic view of languages" persists (Clyne).

In fact, the monolithic view of languages has two sides. First, one language is deemed better than others, and as such, should be taught first and foremost. As mentioned above, English is the language everyone must learn in France. French and English are the two main linguistic options offered to learners in secondary schools and consequently in higher education. The Halimi Report (Halimi 20) observes that French families generally choose English as their children's first foreign language because they recognise its dominant role as a global language of communication. However, this choice often reflects a lack of alternatives rather than genuine preference. For instance, a family wishing for their child to study Spanish as their first foreign language (L2) and German as their second (L3) in secondary school may not find an institution that offers such an option. The report laments this "hyper-central position" of English, which restricts linguistic diversity and limits educational choice in France.

Second, a foreign language is taught for one main function. In secondary schools, English as a

[9] The "voicing" distinction exemplifies this further: English (and any natively acquired variety) relies primarily on aspiration, yet the written form misleadingly suggests that *pain* (English) and *pain* (French) begin with identical consonants.

second language is taught within the European framework (CEFR), where it is viewed primarily as an economic tool for European citizens – not only to communicate but also to make a tangible impact on their economy and society from a utilitarian perspective. This aligns with task-based and action-based approaches, which focus on using language to act on the world. Similarly, in higher education, phonology is taught to help students pass their competitive exams and succeed in becoming English teachers. When asked, "What is the main purpose of phonology classes in the first year of a student's degree?" instructors reported feeling pressured by the "competitive exam" objectives. The questionnaire indicates that equal weight is given to exam preparation and to the opportunity to use English in one's working life. 20 of 44 respondents reported that their main objective in teaching English phonology is to prepare students to take (and pass) the competitive exam. At the same time, 21 out of 44 want them to improve their phonological skills to speak better English in their professional lives.

The reality of French society today is challenging the monolithic view of languages, as France is currently home to more than 88,500 non-native learners in elementary and secondary schools. Plurilingualism should be considered part of the future both in France and worldwide (Matsuda).

Discussion and Conclusion

The 2022 survey of 44 instructors at 25 French universities reveals that prescriptivism and rigidity persist in English phonology teaching. Variation remains marginal, with most courses following the Guierrian School tradition (Ballier, "Du dictionnaire''). This persistence reflects institutional inertia and what Quessada calls the Didactic Transposition Delay: spoken English evolves rapidly, but teaching practices change slowly. As Murphy and Baker (37) note, "it takes time for specialists' contributions to influence wider audiences."

Deep-rooted linguistic ideologies reinforce resistance to change. Legitimacy in pronunciation teaching depends heavily on written codification and the standard accent ideology (Mugglestone). Following Blanchet's (*Discriminer les accents* 35) view of ideology as a hegemonic system excluding alternative perspectives, teachers tend to reject non-codified forms. Consequently, curricula remain tied to mid-twentieth-century Received Pronunciation, producing a version of English often disconnected from actual spoken usage (Ballier, "Quelques problèmes métalinguistiques"; Blanchet, *Accents et glottophobie*; Lindsey).

At an institutional level, a paradox exists between the nativeness principle upheld in universities and exams and the intelligibility principle promoted in schools where CEFR-based assessments prioritise communication over accent accuracy. Teachers and trainees navigate conflicting models of legitimacy. Prioritising intelligibility over nativeness would better align pronunciation teaching with learners' communicative needs and global English use.

This contradiction is evidenced in recent developments. Research groups such as ALOES[10] supported the inclusion of updated IPA transcriptions (e.g. /a/ for *trap*, /ɛ/ for *dress*) in the 2022 CAPES exam. However, despite their presence in elementary school guidelines, phonology teaching in secondary schools often appears superficial. This tension highlights a wider misalignment between linguistic change and educational practice.

The data also show a reliance on inconsistent and evolving IPA transcriptions from British dictionaries, with many instructors reluctant to adopt updated symbols without official sanction. Many respondents expressed their desire to adhere to the principles of phonological communities by embracing change and teaching evolving phonemes. However, there is also a

[10] *Association des anglicistes pour les études de la langue orale dans l'enseignement supérieur, secondaire et primaire:* association of Anglicists for the study of spoken English in higher, secondary, and primary education https://aloesfrance.wordpress.com/, founded in 1982.

concurrent fear that students could be penalised for using new symbols that are not yet widely adopted and diffused. Graphocentric habits further complicate matters, as many teachers link pronunciation closely to spelling.

Underlying these issues is a rationalist-nationalist framework equating linguistic uniformity with social cohesion. English dominates as the default foreign language, marginalising regional languages and creoles despite formal protections. Teaching aims are evenly split between exam success and workplace utility, framed within a utilitarian, CEFR-aligned vision of language as an economic tool. Meanwhile, digital and acoustic tools are underutilised, marking a retreat from France's experimental phonetics heritage.

Together, these forces create barriers to education and social mobility, stifling inclusive approaches needed for World Englishes and lingua franca communication. Moving forward requires foregrounding intelligibility, normalising contemporary RP alongside other valid models, streamlining transcription to reflect speech rather than spelling, and loosening nationalist ideologies to embrace multilingual repertoires. With over 88,500 non-native pupils in French schools (Brun 2025), this need is urgent.

English phonology teaching in France stands at a crossroads. Clinging to prescriptive British norms risks irrelevance in a multilingual society. Embracing evidence-based, communicative practice can promote equity and relevance. Such change demands curricular reform, new resources, and critical reflection on the ideologies that shape teaching. As Woolard reminds us, ideology is inevitable; awareness is the first step to transformation. Longitudinal studies tracking pedagogical evolution, learner outcomes, and technology use will be essential for guiding future progress. Reassessing these ideologies is essential to move towards a dynamic, inclusive approach to phonology instruction – one that reflects current spoken realities, values intelligibility, and bridges the gap between academic norms and communicative practices in schools.[11]

Bibliography

Arrighi, Jean-Marie. "Langue corse : situation et débats." *Ethnologie française*, vol. 38, no. 3, 2008, p. 507-516.

Ballier, Nicolas. "Quelques problèmes métalinguistiques en phonologie de l'anglais." *Corela. Cognition, représentation, langage*, vol. 2, no. 1, 2004.

Ballier, Nicolas. "Malaise dans la langue dominante." *Langues dominantes, langues dominées*, edited by Laurence Villard and Nicolas Ballier, Publications de l'Université de Rouen et du Havre, 2008, p. 115-128.

Ballier, Nicolas. "Du dictionnaire lexico-phonétisé aux corpus oraux, quelques problèmes épistémologiques pour l'école de Guierre." *Histoire Épistémologie Langage*, vol. 38, no. 2, 2016, p. 23-40.

Baratta, Alex, and Nicola Halenko. "Attitudes towards Regional British Accents in EFL Teaching: Student and Teacher Perspectives." *Linguistics and Education* 67: 101018, 2022.

Barrera-Pardo, David, and Teresa López-Soto. "Language Input and Choice of English Pronunciation Models in Local Contexts." *Proceedings of the XVIth International Congress of Phonetic Sciences*, Barcelona, 2003.

Bex, Tony, and Richard John Watts. *Standard English: The Widening Debate*. Routledge, 1999.

Blanchet, Philippe. *La glottophobie en France : Discriminations linguistiques et inégalités sociales*. Lambert-Lucas, 2017.

[11] Thanks to the anonymous reviewers for their work and helpful comments.

Blanchet, Philippe. *Discriminer les accents, discriminer les personnes : La glottophobie*. Lambert-Lucas, 2018.

Blanchet, Philippe. *Accents et glottophobie : Pour une linguistique hospitalière*. Lambert-Lucas, 2021.

Boyer, Henri. "Problématique du discours militant sur l'enseignement d'une langue minorée." *Études de Linguistique Appliquée*, vol. 60, no. 22, 1985.

Browman, Catherine P., and Louis Goldstein. "Towards an Articulatory Phonology." *Phonology Yearbook*, vol. 3, 1986, p. 219-250.

Brun, Laurence. "88 500 élèves allophones nouvellement arrivés scolarisés en 2023-2024 : neuf sur dix bénéficient d'un enseignement en français langue seconde." *Note d'Information*, DEPP, no. 25-42, 2025.

Carley, Patricia, and Ian Murray Mees. *English Phonetics and Pronunciation Practice*. 2nd ed., Routledge, 2024.

Celce-Murcia, Marianne, Donna M. Brinton, and Janet M. Goodwin. "History of ESL Pronunciation Teaching." In *Teaching American English Pronunciation*, edited by Marianne Celce-Murcia, Donna M. Brinton, and Janet M. Goodwin, Oxford University Press, 2010, p. 45-68.

Chomsky, Noam, and Morris Halle. *The Sound Pattern of English*. Harper & Row, 1968.

Clyne, Michael, editor. *Pluricentric Languages: Differing Norms in Different Nations*. De Gruyter Mouton, 1991.

Council of Europe. Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) 2021, rm.coe.int/cadre-europeen-commun-de-reference-pour-les-langues-apprendre-enseigne/1680a4e270.

Cruttenden, Alan. *Gimson's Pronunciation of English*. 8th ed., Routledge, 2014.

Duchet, Jean-Louis. *Code de l'anglais oral*. Ophrys, 2018.

Drummond, Rob. *You're All Talk: Why We Are What We Speak*. Scribe, 2023.

Durand, Jacques, Bernard Laks, and Chantal Lyche. "La phonologie du français contemporain : usages, variétés et structures." *Romanische Korpuslinguistik: Korpora und gesprochene Sprache*, edited by Claus D. Pusch and Wolfgang Raible, Gunter Narr, 2001, p. 93-106.

Durand, Jacques. "La phonétique classique : l'Association Phonétique Internationale et son alphabet." *Phonologie et phonétique : forme et substance*, edited by Noël Nguyen, Sophie Wauquier-Gravelines, and Jacques Durand, 2005, p. 25-60.

Escudé, Pierre. "La langue occitane, entre société et école." *Europa Ethnica*, vol. 69, no. 3/4, 2012, p. 78-84.

Exare, Christelle. *Anonymised Survey Dataset – English Phonology Teaching Practices in French Higher Education (2022).* Nakala, 2026, https://doi.org/10.34847/NKL.29D8C6TJ.

Fabricius, Anne. "Weak Vowels in Modern RP: An Acoustic Study of Happy-tensing and Kit/Schwa Shift." *Language Variation and Change*, vol. 14, no. 2, 2002, p. 211-237.

Fenet, Alain. "La question des minorités en France – entre déni et compromis." *Europa Ethnica*, vol. 69, no. 3/4, 2012, p. 42-60.

Ferragne, Emmanuel, Anne Guyot-Talbot, Hannah King, and Sylvain Navarro. "Exploring the Accent Mix Perceptually and Automatically: French Learners of English and the RP–GA Divide." *Languages*, vol. 9, no. 2, 2024, p. 50.

Fox, Susan. *The New Cockney: New Ethnicities and Adolescent Speech in the Traditional East End of London*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

Geeraerts, Dirk. “Cultural Models of Linguistic Standardisation.” In *Cognitive Models in Language and Thought: Ideology, Metaphors and Meanings*, edited by René Dirven, Roslyn Frank, and Martin Pütz, De Gruyter Mouton, 2003, p. 25-68.

Gal, Susan, and Kathryn A. Woolard. “Constructing Languages and Publics: Authority and Representation.” In *Languages and Publics: The Making of Authority*, edited by Susan Gal and Kathryn A. Woolard, St. Jerome Publishing, 2001, p. 1-23.

Gatbonton, Elizabeth, Pavel Trofimovich, and Michael Magid. “Learners’ Ethnic Group Affiliation and L2 Pronunciation Accuracy: A Sociolinguistic Investigation.” *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 39, no. 3, 2005, p. 489-511.

Glain, Olivier. *Variations et changements en langue anglaise : Évènements historiques, perspectives humaines et sociales*. Presses Universitaires de Saint-Étienne, 2021.

Glain, Olivier. *Phonologies du temps et de l’espace : Vers une langue orale authentique*. 2018. Université Jean Moulin – Lyon 3, HDR dissertation.

Grosjean, François. *Studying Bilinguals*. Oxford University Press, 2008.

Guierre, Lionel. “Essai sur l’accentuation en anglais contemporain : Éléments pour une synthèse.” Thèse de doctorat, Université Paris VII, 1979.

Halimi, Suzy. “Apprendre les langues, apprendre le monde.” Rapport présenté au ministre de l'Éducation nationale, de la jeunesse et de la vie associative par le Comité stratégique présidé par Suzy Halimi, 2012.

Halliday, Michael A. K. *Intonation and Grammar in British English*. 1967. Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, 2015.

Harrington, Jonathan. “An Acoustic Analysis of ‘Happy-tensing’ in the Queen’s Christmas Broadcasts.” *Journal of Phonetics*, vol. 34, no. 4, 2006, p. 439-57.

Honey, John. Language is Power: The Story of Standard English and Its Enemies. Faber & Faber, 1997.

Holliday, Adrian. “Native-speakerism.” *ELT Journal*, vol. 60, no. 4, 2006, p. 385-87.

Hughes, Arthur, Peter Trudgill, and Dominic Watt. *English Accents and Dialects*. 5th ed., Hodder Arnold, 2012.

Jenkins, Jennifer. *The Phonology of English as an International Language*. Oxford University Press, 2000.

Jones, Daniel. *English Pronouncing Dictionary.* 14th ed., edited by A. C. Gimson and Susan Ramsaran, Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Jones, Daniel. *Cambridge English Pronouncing Dictionary.* 18th ed., edited by Peter Roach, Jane Setter, and John Esling, Cambridge University Press, 2016, 2022.

Kachru, Braj B. “Standards, Codification and Sociolinguistic Realism: The English Language in the Outer Circle.” *English in the World: Teaching and Learning the Language and Literatures*, edited by Randolph Quirk and Henry G. Widdowson, Cambridge University Press, 1985, p. 11-30.

Kenyon, John S. “Correct Pronunciation.” *American Speech* 4, 1928, p. 150-153.

Kihm, Alain. “Les difficiles débuts des études créoles en France (1870-1920).” *Langue française*, no. 63, 1984, p. 42-56.

Kroskrity, Paul V. “Language Ideologies: Emergence, Elaboration, and Application.” *The Routledge Handbook of Linguistic Anthropology*, edited by Nancy Bonvillain, Routledge, 2016, p. 95-108.

Lange, Christina. “Standardisation: Standards in the History of English.” *English Historical Linguistics: Volume 1*, edited by Anthony Bergs and Laurel J. Brinton, De Gruyter Mouton, 2012, p. 994-1006.

Legendre, Jacques. *Suite d'une mission d'information sur l'enseignement des langues vivantes dans l'enseignement scolaire*. Rapport du Sénat - Commission des Affaires Culturelles, no. 73, 1995, www.senat.fr/notice-rapport/1995/r95-073-notice.html. Accessed 12 March 2026.

Levis, John M. "Changing Contexts and Shifting Paradigms in Pronunciation Teaching." *TESOL quarterly*, vol. 39, no. 3, 2005, p. 369-377.

Levis, John M. *Intelligibility, Oral Communication, and the Teaching of Pronunciation*. Cambridge University Press, 2018.

Lilly, Richard, and Michel Viel. "Représentation et réalité en phonologie anglaise." *Études Anglaises*, vol. 54, no 4, 2001, p. 387-400.

Lindblom, Björn. "Explaining phonetic variation: A sketch of the H&H theory." *Speech Production and Speech Modelling*, edited by William J. Hardcastle and Alain Marchal, Kluwer, 1990, p. 403-439.

Lindsey, Geoff. *English after RP: Standard British Pronunciation Today*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2019.

Lippi-Green, Rosina. *English with an Accent: Language, Ideology, and Discrimination in the United States*. 2nd ed., Routledge, 2012.

Macaulay, Robert K. S. "RP R.I.P." *English World-Wide*, vol. 9, no. 1, 1988, p. 115-124.

Matsuda, Aya. "World Englishes and Pedagogy." *The Handbook of World Englishes*. 2nd ed., edited by Cecil L. Nelson, Zoya G. Proshina, and Daniel R. Davis, Wiley-Blackwell, 2019, p. 686-702.

Michari, David. "Choisir un accent en classe d'anglais : Que disent les textes officiels ?" *La Clé des Langues*, 2024.

Michari, David, and Olivier Glain. "Accents in a Monocentric Culture: The Historical Transmission of English Pronunciation Norms in French Education." *7th Prescriptivism Conference*, Aix-en-Provence, France, 2024.

Milroy, James, and Lesley Milroy. *Authority in Language: Investigating Standard English*. 4th ed., Routledge, 2012.

Milroy, Lesley. "Language Ideologies and the Consequences of Standardization." *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, vol. 5, no. 4, 2001, p. 530-55.

Ministère de l'Éducation nationale. Arrêté du 22 novembre 1995 relatif aux programmes de la classe de 6e des collèges. Bulletin Officiel de l'Éducation Nationale, no. 48 du 28 décembre 1995.

Mugglestone, Lynda. *Talking Proper: The Rise of Accent as Social Symbol*. 2nd ed., Oxford University Press, 2007.

Munro, Murray J., and Tracey M. Derwing. "Foreign Accent, Comprehensibility, and Intelligibility in the Speech of Second-Language Learners." *Language Learning*, vol. 45, no. 1, 1995, p. 73-97.

Murphy, Joseph M., and Alison A. Baker. "History of ESL Pronunciation Teaching." *Pronunciation in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, edited by John Levis and Shannon McCrocklin, Iowa State University, 2015, p. 36-65.

O'Connor, J. D., and G. F. Arnold. *Intonation of Colloquial English*. 2nd ed. Longman, 1973.

Percy, Carol. "Standardisation: Codifiers." *English Historical Linguistics. Vol. 1*, edited by Alexander Bergs and Laurel J. Brinton, De Gruyter Mouton, 2012, p. 1006-1020.

Peterson, Elizabeth. *Making Sense of "Bad English": An Introduction to Language Attitudes and Ideologies*. Routledge, 2020.

Pierrehumbert, Janet B. *The Phonology and Phonetics of English Intonation*. 1980. MIT, PhD dissertation.

Quessada, Pierre. *La didactique de la prononciation : Entre théorie et pratique*. L'Harmattan, 2008.

Roach, Peter. *English Phonetics and Phonology*. 4th ed., Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Silverstein, Michael. “Language Structure and Linguistic Ideology.” *The Elements: A Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels*, edited by Paul Clyne, William F. Hanks, and Carol L. Hofbauer, Chicago Linguistic Society, 1979, p. 193-247.

Smith, Larry E., and Carolyn L. Nelson. “International Intelligibility of English: Directions and Resources.” *World Englishes*, vol. 4, no. 3, 1985, p. 333-42.

Szigetvári, Péter, and Geoff Lindsey. “CUBE: Current British English Searchable Transcriptions.” Eötvös Loránd University (ELTE), Department of English Linguistics, 2025. seas.elte.hu/cube. Accessed 28 March 2026.

Trapateau, Nicolas, and Jean-Louis Duchet. “Change from Above and Resistance to Change in the Early Prescriptive Pronouncing Dictionaries of English.” *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia*, vol. 54, no. s1, 2019, p. 315-336.

Upton, Clive. “Received Pronunciation.” *Varieties of English: The British Isles*, edited by Clive Upton and Bernd Kortmann, De Gruyter Mouton, 2008, p. 217-30.

Upton, Clive. “British English.” *The Handbook of English Pronunciation*, edited by Marnie Reed and John M. Levis, John Wiley & Sons, 2015, p. 251-268.

Upton, Clive, and William A. Kretzschmar Jr. *The Routledge Dictionary of Pronunciation for Current English*. Routledge, 2017.

Véronique, Georges Daniel. “Les créoles français : déni, réalité et reconnaissance au sein de la République française.” *Langue française*, no. 167, 2010, p. 127-140.

Walker, John. *A Critical Pronouncing Dictionary, and Expositor of the English Language*. G.G.J. and J. Robinson, 1791.

Wells, John C. *Accents of English*. Vols. 1-3, Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Wells, John C. “Whatever Happened to Received Pronunciation?” *II Jornadas de Estudios Ingleses*, edited by David Barrera-Pardo and Teresa López-Soto, Universidad de Jaén, 1997, p. 19-28.

Wells, John C. *Longman Pronunciation Dictionary.* 3rd ed., Pearson Longman, 2008.

Woolard, Kathryn A. “Language Ideology.” *Annual Review of Anthropology*, vol. 50, 2021, p. 355-371.

Wyld, Henry Cecil. *A Short History of English*. John Murray, 1907.

Kizzi Edensor

Kizzi Edensor (kizzi.edensor@unicaen.fr) is a senior lecturer, habilitated to supervise research (HDR) at the University of Caen, Normandy, France, specialising in regional accents in the UK and Ireland. Her research and teaching interests include L2 English learning, particularly perception and pronunciation, as well as prosody acquisition by non-native speakers. She developed *Englishville*, a website that helps L2 learners practice intonation using a real-time 3D spectrogram for visual feedback.

Kizzi Edensor (kizzi.edensor@unicaen.fr) est actuellement maîtresse de conférences HDR (habilitée à diriger des recherches) à l’Université de Caen Normandie, France. Elle est spécialiste des accents régionaux au Royaume-Uni et en Irlande. Ses activités de recherche et d’enseignement portent sur l’acquisition de l’anglais langue seconde, en particulier la perception et la prononciation, ainsi que sur l’acquisition de la prosodie chez les locuteurs non natifs. Elle a développé *Englishville*, un site permettant aux apprenants d’anglais L2 de s’entraîner à l’intonation grâce à un spectrogramme 3D en temps réel offrant un retour visuel.

Christelle Exare

Christelle Exare (christelle.exare@univ-lille.fr) is a lecturer at the University of Lille, France. She teaches English for Specific Purposes to pre-service teachers and teacher trainers at the *INSPÉ des Hauts-de-France*. Most of her research is centred around the phonetic acquisition of L1 and L2

English. With Pr. Jacqueline Vaissière, she has developed *Cleanaccent©,* a phonetic trainer for French children learning English as a second language.
Christelle Exare (christelle.exare@univ-lille.fr) est maîtresse de conférences à l'Université de Lille, France. Elle enseigne l'anglais de spécialité à des étudiants se destinant aux métiers de l'enseignement, ainsi qu'à des formateurs d'enseignants à l'INSPÉ des Hauts-de-France. Ses travaux de recherche portent principalement sur l'acquisition phonétique de l'anglais en L1 et en L2. En collaboration avec Pr. Jacqueline Vaissière, elle a développé *Cleanaccent©*, un dispositif d'entraînement phonétique destiné aux enfants francophones apprenant l'anglais comme langue seconde.