

УДК 811.111'34:378

DOI 10.58423/2786-6726/2026-2-206-222

ISSN 2786-6726 (Online), ISSN 2786-6718 (Print)

Received: 08.03.2026

Accepted: 14.04.2026

Published: 30.05.2026

*Kateryna Lysenko, Natalia Nesterenko*

## **Designing an intensive English pronunciation remediation module for first-year philology students**

### **1. Introduction**

The first encounter with a language is, in practical terms, an encounter with its sound system. Learners hear speech before they can rely on stable orthographic cues, and they often attempt to reproduce what they hear long before they can explain it. For this reason, pronunciation should not be treated as peripheral in professional philological education, especially in programmes that train future translators and language teachers (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010; Derwing–Munro, 2015).

For the purposes of this article, pronunciation remediation refers to a structured period of intensive phonetic instruction delivered during the first semester of undergraduate philology training and aimed at establishing stable segmental and suprasegmental pronunciation patterns before extensive communicative practice.

The aim of this article is to develop and theoretically substantiate a practice-oriented model of intensive first-semester pronunciation remediation for first-year philology-major students based on contemporary pronunciation pedagogy and sustained classroom experience.

Accordingly, the study addresses the following research questions:

- 1) What methodological considerations support intensive early pronunciation remediation in philology-major programmes?
- 2) How can such remediation be integrated into overloaded first-semester curricula?
- 3) What pedagogical structure can support the implementation of an intelligibility-oriented corrective module?

*Acta Academiae Beregsasiensis, Philologica 2026/2: 206–222.*

This article addresses the persistent instructional challenge of initial English pronunciation remediation in the first year of a philology higher education programme. It considers why systematic phonetic work is often absent from first-year curricula, what risks this creates for student outcomes, and how an intensive corrective-introductory model can be integrated into the first semester without abandoning broader programme requirements. The central claim is not that grammar or speaking topics are unnecessary. Rather, it is that, in philology-major contexts, pronunciation requires protected curricular space, particularly at the beginning of university study, when students' habits are still being consolidated (Levis, 2005; Saito-Plonsky, 2019).

A further conceptual point concerns what "good pronunciation" means. Research distinguishes between accentedness, comprehensibility, and intelligibility, and shows that intelligibility and ease of understanding are suitable instructional targets even when native-like pronunciation is unrealistic or unnecessary (Munro-Derwing, 1995; Derwing-Munro, 1997). In this article, the proposed remedial approach is therefore framed as intelligibility-oriented and competence-based: it aims to establish consistent phonological control, including prosodic stability, as part of the broader communicative competence expected of philology-major students (CEFR, 2020).

## **2. Methodology**

This article employs a qualitative conceptual design methodology. The proposed model is developed through the synthesis of contemporary pronunciation pedagogy literature, analysis of curricular constraints characteristic of first-year philology programmes, and reflective generalisation of sustained classroom experience in pronunciation instruction. The study does not report controlled experimental intervention; rather, it offers a pedagogically grounded conceptual framework intended to systematise and theoretically justify an intensive pronunciation remediation model for philology-major contexts.

## **3. Globalisation and the role of English**

The global community has entered an era of intensified globalisation, and processes related to linguistic and cultural development continue to acquire new forms. Expansion of trade and economic relations, the growth of the Internet as global infrastructure, and wider opportunities for international mobility have all contributed to increased demand for foreign language learning (Crystal, 2003; Blommaert, 2010).

In many contexts it has become ordinary to encounter multilingual speakers who use more than one language in everyday life. Within this multilingual ecology, English frequently functions as a professional and everyday "default" medium

(Crystal, 2003). Importantly, a substantial proportion of communication in English takes place among speakers for whom English is not a first language. This has consequences for pronunciation pedagogy because intelligibility across diverse speaker groups becomes a realistic target and because a single “native” norm is not always an adequate reference point for all communicative situations (Jenkins, 2000; Seidlhofer, 2011).

From a teaching perspective, globalisation does not automatically increase learners’ phonological accuracy. It does, however, increase the visibility of pronunciation as an interactional variable: in multilingual settings, pronunciation strongly affects how quickly listeners can process speech and how much effort comprehension requires. Therefore, if English is taught as a language of sustained real-world communication, pronunciation should be made teachable and assessable rather than left to chance (Levis, 2005; Derwing–Munro, 2015).

#### **4. Pronunciation as a core component**

Because learners first perceive and process the language through sound, one of a teacher’s central tasks is to support the development of pronunciation skills. In interaction, pronunciation functions as a salient marker: it shapes listeners’ perceptions, influences the rhythm of turn-taking, and affects comprehension under time pressure. Empirical studies consistently show that foreign accent, comprehensibility, and intelligibility are related but not identical; a speaker may sound strongly accented yet remain intelligible, or – especially under stress or rapid speech – may become difficult to understand even when segmental errors are limited (Munro–Derwing, 1995; Derwing–Munro, 1997).

Pronunciation is often among the first features noticed in spoken interaction and may influence interlocutors’ perceptions of speaker competence before propositional content is fully processed. This does not imply that native-like pronunciation is required; rather, stable phonological control contributes to communicative credibility and reduces listener effort (Levis, 2005; Derwing–Munro, 2015).

If systematic pronunciation work is not undertaken at the outset, the articulatory system becomes accustomed to non-target routines. Over time these routines may become automatised, and later correction becomes more demanding. The practical risk is that speech remains persistently non-target-like in segmental choices, rhythm, or prosody, and that learners struggle to monitor their own output because perceptual categories remain underdeveloped (Saito, 2012; Derwing–Munro, 2015).

Pronunciation instruction is therefore not merely optional in philological education. Framework descriptors for phonological competence include not only sound articulation but also prosody (stress and intonation), which means that pronunciation overlaps with pragmatic meaning and discourse organisation (Celce-

Murcia et al., 2010; CEFR, 2020). For philology majors, this overlap is particularly relevant because they are trained to model language and, often, to teach it.

## **5. The complexity of L2 pronunciation acquisition**

The task of acquiring accurate pronunciation is complex and multidimensional. Even when learners practice articulation, word pronunciation, and intonation – and learn to discriminate sounds perceptually – pronunciation cannot be treated as a “completed” goal. It requires sustained practice and reinforcement across contexts and tasks (Derwing–Munro, 2015).

One reason is that L2 phonological learning involves both perception and production. If learners cannot reliably hear a contrast, they are less likely to produce it consistently, and production practice may stabilise inaccurate categories. Classic perceptual training research demonstrates that targeted listening practice can improve perception of difficult contrasts, providing a basis for production improvements (Logan et al., 1991). Later syntheses likewise emphasise that instruction can facilitate development but that effects depend on design features such as intensity, feedback, and the perception–production balance (Saito, 2012; Lee et al., 2015; Saito–Plonsky, 2019).

A second reason is that pronunciation includes suprasegmental organisation. Even when individual sounds are acceptable, mis-timed stress or inappropriate intonation may reduce comprehensibility because listeners rely on prosodic cues to parse speech and infer pragmatic meaning (Celce–Murcia et al., 2010; CEFR, 2020). For Ukrainian learners, segmental and suprasegmental challenges can interact with L1 transfer. Work on Ukrainian learners’ pronunciation highlights the need for targeted phonetic–phonemic work and careful attention to the mechanics of sound production (Poliakova et al., 2024).

From an instructional perspective, this complexity implies that “work on pronunciation throughout the entire programme” and “an intensive introductory correction phase” should not be treated as mutually exclusive. Evidence suggests that pronunciation instruction does work, but it tends to work best when it is systematic rather than incidental (Lee et al., 2015; Saito–Plonsky, 2019). The question becomes how to distribute phonetic work across the first year so that early baselines are established and later development is sustained.

## **6. Approaches to teaching phonetics**

In first-year English teaching materials, several approaches to teaching and correcting pronunciation can be observed. Some textbooks present a phonetic course immediately in the first unit and later shift attention toward grammar and lexis;

others distribute phonetic content gradually, introducing a few sounds per lesson while grammar and speaking topics proceed in parallel (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010).

A practical pedagogical question concerns which format may be more effective: an early corrective course or ongoing work throughout the learning period. A research-informed answer is that both can be justified, but neither is guaranteed to succeed if pronunciation is left to ad hoc correction. Meta-analyses indicate that explicit pronunciation instruction has a positive overall effect. The implication is not that one must choose a single format. Rather, educators can use an initial intensive stage to establish baselines and then embed continued pronunciation work into later communicative practice (Lee et al., 2015; Saito-Plonsky, 2019).

In institutional settings with limited first-semester time, an early intensive stage has a specific pedagogical function: it can establish stable articulatory routines and perceptual categories before students engage in extensive spontaneous speaking. When students speak a lot early on without stable control, they may strengthen inaccurate patterns through repetition. Conversely, when controlled correction precedes expansive speaking, later communicative practice can build on a more intelligible baseline (Saito, 2012; Derwing-Munro, 2015).

This reasoning also provides a framework for considering what content to prioritise during the corrective phase. It supports focusing on those contrasts and prosodic patterns most relevant to intelligibility and to frequent communicative contexts rather than on low-frequency details that have minimal impact on listener understanding (Jenkins, 2000; Levis, 2005).

## **7. Major vs. non-major students**

To evaluate pronunciation priorities realistically, it is necessary to distinguish between major and non-major learning contexts. In non-philological programmes – medicine, physics, and many STEM fields – English is frequently taught as English for Specific Purposes. Instruction is typically oriented toward functional professional communication: access to domain-specific vocabulary, early genre competence, and basic interaction routines (Basturkmen, 2010). In such settings, a full corrective pronunciation course may not appear to be an urgent necessity, particularly when time is limited and assessment focuses on written skills or professional lexis.

Philology-major contexts are different. Future philologists, translators, and language teachers are expected to operate with a higher level of phonological control and to sustain intelligible, stylistically appropriate spoken English. This expectation is consistent with proficiency frameworks that explicitly describe phonological competence and prosody (CEFR, 2020). It is also consistent with research-based pedagogy that treats pronunciation not as an accessory but as part of communicative competence (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010; Derwing-Munro, 2015).

Classroom experience also highlights a practical consequence: if one adopts a non-major logic for philology-major students (i.e., early focus on basic dialogues and professional vocabulary while postponing pronunciation correction), then by the time pronunciation becomes an explicit focus, students may already have reinforced non-target patterns. At that point, correction becomes more complex and may compete with higher-level communicative goals. The argument therefore supports an explicit early corrective stage, while accepting that higher-level pronunciation work must still continue later (Lee et al., 2015; Saito-Plonsky, 2019).

## **8. Problems in first-year phonetic training**

For philology-major groups, neglecting early pronunciation remediation may create significant methodological challenges. One practical response is the development of an initial corrective course with explicitly allocated hours. Classroom experience shows that without dedicated time, it is difficult to achieve systematic correction, and the lack of such time increases the likelihood of pronunciation difficulties persisting after the first year of study (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010; Derwing-Munro, 2015).

Classroom experience indicates that incoming first-year students frequently arrive with uneven phonetic knowledge. Common issues include failure to distinguish long vs. short vowels, confusion between diphthongs and monophthongs, and only a general awareness of transcription and intonation. For Ukrainian learners, these difficulties are plausible given the differences between Ukrainian and English phonological systems and the typical influence of orthography-based learning. Research focusing on Ukrainian students similarly discusses the specificity of sound instruction and the need for targeted phonetic attention (Poliakova et al., 2024).

These difficulties are not purely technical. They affect interaction: unstable stress and intonation can obscure information structure, while segmental instability can increase listener effort. For this reason, initial university instruction should not assume that school learning has established an adequate baseline. Instead, it should begin with diagnostic awareness and structured remediation (Munro-Derwing, 1995; Derwing-Munro, 1997).

A further challenge is teacher workload. If the programme does not allocate time for phonetic remediation, individual instructors are left to choose between doing nothing (which is unsatisfactory) and correcting “whenever possible” (which is often unsystematic). Research-based pedagogy frames the latter as insufficient if it remains incidental and is not backed by controlled practice and feedback (Levis, 2005; Saito-Plonsky, 2019).

### **9. Limitations of current curricula**

For some time, pronunciation remediation has not been treated as a visible curricular issue, and first-year programmes often do not explicitly allocate a separate component for phonetic correction. In many institutional contexts, programme descriptions and syllabi prioritise grammatical and thematic content, while systematic phonetic work is expected to occur implicitly within general language practice classes. As a result, pronunciation correction tends to become occasional rather than systematically organised.

In some institutional contexts, the first semester may be limited to approximately 14 teaching weeks and remain heavily loaded with grammatical and thematic content, including expectations to cover the English tense system, passive forms, and sequence of tenses alongside extensive speaking topics.

Even without specifying statistical data at the local level, the general methodological problem remains relevant: if the semester is saturated with material and pronunciation is not given sufficient attention, phonetic correction usually takes a back seat, giving way to grammar and thematic conversations. In such conditions, instructors may prioritise content that is easily testable in traditional formats, leaving pronunciation as an implicit expectation. Research and professional discussion in pronunciation pedagogy repeatedly note that this is a structural rather than individual problem: pronunciation is recognised as important, but it is often marginalised in actual teaching (Levis, 2005; Derwing–Munro, 2015).

The described overload may reduce the likelihood of stable learning outcomes. When curricular ambitions exceed the available time and feedback infrastructure, the risk of superficial coverage increases and stable skill development becomes less likely. This is especially true for pronunciation, which typically requires high-frequency practice and feedback rather than occasional explanation (Lee et al., 2015; Saito–Plonsky, 2019).

### **10. An intensive corrective course as a solution**

In response to the methodological and curricular challenges outlined above, this article proposes an author-developed intensive corrective–introductory pronunciation module designed for first-year philology-major students. The model presented below is not adopted from a single pre-existing framework but represents a pedagogically systematised instructional design developed through sustained teaching practice and aligned with contemporary pronunciation pedagogy research.

Within the proposed model, the first month to six weeks is dedicated primarily to English sounds and to systematic practice of problematic combinations. In the model, students are trained to discriminate intonation patterns and reproduce them through repeated practice that progresses from isolated words to short tone groups (small

syntagms) and then to sentences by means of “phonetic reading.” This constitutes a controlled production pathway that stabilises phonological routines before learners expand into spontaneous speech. One important condition supporting the effectiveness of the corrective course is the availability of authentic audio materials. Recording one’s own speech can also have a positive effect: audio recordings of read or reproduced fragments, followed by analytical listening, help students develop auditory control and self-correction. Such practices are described both in Ukrainian publications (audio recording, self-control, use of digital tools) and in studies on educational projects with podcasting (Lord, 2008; Poliakova et al., 2024).

Phonetic laboratories are a separate resource. However, for them to be truly effective, not only premises are needed, but also technical organisation: the possibility of individual listening with headphones, parallel recording, and quick comparison of the “sample/own recording” directly in the classroom.

Modern technologies can reinforce this logic through individualised feedback. In particular, computer-assisted pronunciation training (CAPT) and automatic speech recognition (ASR) are considered tools for practice and self-correction, provided that the accuracy of the system and the design of the feedback are methodically balanced (Neri et al., 2002; McCrocklin–Levis, 2025).

From a research perspective, the rationale for such intensity is consistent with at least three strands of evidence. First, meta-analyses show that explicit pronunciation instruction has a positive overall effect, which supports systematic course design rather than incidental correction (Lee et al., 2015; Saito–Plonsky, 2019). Second, synthesis work suggests that instruction can support development both for segmentals and suprasegmentals, particularly when learners receive repeated practice and feedback (Saito, 2012; Derwing–Munro, 2015). Third, perceptual training research supports the role of structured listening and categorisation practice in establishing difficult phonetic contrasts (Logan et al., 1991).

Choral or semi-choral repetition in phonetics may appear unproductive without an understanding of its instructional function. A trained phonetics instructor uses the format to combine high-frequency repetition with individual attention. While the group repeats quietly, the instructor can focus on micro-corrections with individual students, ensuring the practice remains controlled rather than chaotic (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010).

Articulatory explanations in this model are explicitly described as approximative: they are meant to guide action and to support imitation rather than to provide exhaustive phonetic theory. Explanation is paired with demonstration of sound models, both live and recorded. Training then proceeds through active listening and conscious imitation—methods consistent with research and professional guidance on pronunciation teaching (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010; Saito, 2012).

Authentic audio is treated as a core component of the proposed model. Reliance on simple teaching texts without audio support is insufficient at this stage, because learners need repeated exposure to realistic pronunciation and prosody. This point is consistent with intelligibility-oriented pedagogy, where reliable models help learners calibrate production and strengthen listening discrimination (Levis, 2005; Derwing–Munro, 2015).

A practical extension of this audio-based approach is student self-recording. When students record their own reading or memorised fragments on mobile devices and subsequently perform analytic listening, positive learning effects are often observed. While local outcomes need empirical confirmation, the underlying mechanism is compatible with work on student podcasting and audio production supporting pronunciation practice and reflective learning (Lord, 2008).

Finally, although phonetic laboratories may be available, their equipment is often configured for purposes other than pronunciation training. The minimal technical demand identified is the ability to listen in headphones during classes and to record and replay student speech in parallel with the model. These are plausible requirements for classroom phonetics work. In addition, technology-enhanced pronunciation learning – including CAPT and ASR – can support independent practice if feedback is pedagogically meaningful and limitations are recognised (Neri et al., 2002; McCrocklin–Levis, 2025).

## **11. Organisation of the first lessons and assessment**

With regard to the “conversational” mode of the first practical classes, the proposed model temporarily limits spontaneous production within the framework of intensive correction until the student has acquired a minimum of phonetic control. The idea is not to “prohibit speaking,” but to give methodological priority to controlled practice and guided training, which, as reviews show, are more likely to produce a measurable effect on pronunciation than unsystematic practice without feedback (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010; Saito–Plonsky, 2019). The logic underlying this strategy is that spontaneous speaking functions as a consolidation mechanism, whereby learners repeatedly implement the patterns they have currently acquired. In the event of such instability or non-target status, early spontaneous speech may serve to reinforce these patterns. Consequently, the implementation of a temporary restriction on spontaneity can be interpreted as a prioritisation of controlled phonetic practice over meaning-focused interaction (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010; Saito–Plonsky, 2019).

Upon completion of the corrective module (typically by mid–late October), students receive a summary grade for the phonetics course in the form of a credit/pass assessment or a module grade. Although the present article primarily

focuses on methodological considerations, the evaluation of students' pronunciation development is based on several structured tasks designed to reflect the intelligibility-oriented framework of the course.

Assessment may include controlled reading of a short text containing specific phonetic targets, such as vowel length contrasts, consonant oppositions, and word stress patterns. In addition, students perform short phrase repetition tasks aimed at practising and demonstrating prosodic features, including rhythm and intonation contours. The final component can involve a brief prepared monologue, during which pronunciation is evaluated primarily in terms of comprehensibility and communicative clarity rather than conformity to native-speaker norms. This approach reflects contemporary research emphasising intelligibility as the principal criterion in second-language pronunciation assessment (Derwing–Munro, 1997; CEFR, 2020).

The logic of time redistribution within the semester (postponing part of the grammatical and thematic material, transferring part of it to the second semester, moving certain components to independent work) needs to be agreed upon with the programme. A possible compromise involves shifting part of grammar practice and speaking-topic preparation to independent study and transferring selected grammatical and lexical components to the second semester, where institutional scheduling may allow greater flexibility.

At the level of curricular design, the proposed approach can be understood as a decision about pedagogical alignment. Within the limited timeframe of the first semester and in view of the professional objectives of linguistic training, it is necessary to determine which competencies should be stabilised at the earliest stage of study. In the model described here, the first semester is expected to include not only grammar and speaking topics that are typically assessed in the examination, but also the correction of pronunciation and the acquisition of basic English phonetic competence (Derwing–Munro, 2015; Lee et al., 2015).

## **12. Further development in the second semester**

In the second semester, pronunciation work continues through drama classes, where pronunciation practice becomes more complex and expressive. Authentic audio remains a required support, and students are taught to encode emotions and reactions prosodically in ways appropriate for English. This aligns with the view that prosody is central to communicative competence and is explicitly described in phonological competence scales as part of language ability (CEFR, 2020).

Drama-based instruction offers a structured environment for repetition with meaning. It can move beyond isolated sounds toward performance conditions where learners practice timing, stress, and intonation in extended, pragmatic contexts. Drama-oriented instruction can support gains in oral fluency and comprehensibility

and can influence perceived accentedness in some contexts (Galante-Thomson, 2017). It is worth mentioning that within the proposed framework, drama-based work is expected to be most effective when an initial corrective stage has already established a baseline; otherwise, performance may become a vehicle for rehearsing persistent non-target patterns. This caution is congruent with pronunciation pedagogy that treats early controlled practice as a basis for later communicative expansion (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010; Derwing-Munro, 2015).

The model also incorporates dramatised classroom activities, including the staging of short sketches and brief plays (for example, off-stage sketches). The specific repertoire may vary depending on instructional context and students' level. From a methodological perspective, the key requirement is that the selected texts remain sufficiently short to allow repeated rehearsal, while containing a rich range of prosodic cues that can support work on rhythm, stress, and intonation. Whenever possible, rehearsal is accompanied by audio models, which provide students with reliable reference patterns for pronunciation and prosodic structure.

### **13. Conclusions**

This article provides an analytically expanded articulation of a long-standing but still unresolved problem in philology-major programmes: how to ensure that first-year students develop a stable, intelligible pronunciation baseline when curricula are densely structured and phonetic remediation is not always protected. Its central argument is that systematic first-semester remediation should not be treated as a marginal add-on but as a foundation for subsequent language development among philology-major students (Munro-Derwing, 1995; Derwing-Munro, 2015; Saito-Plonsky, 2019).

The proposed solution is an intensive corrective-introductory module conducted in the first month to six weeks, grounded in authentic audio, guided imitation, controlled "phonetic reading," and self-recording practices. Evidence syntheses in pronunciation pedagogy support the general feasibility of instruction having a measurable effect, particularly when instruction is systematic and includes feedback (Saito, 2012; Lee et al., 2015). The article also identifies technical conditions that can make in-class remediation more effective (headphones; parallel model/learner recording and replay) and notes that modern CAPT/ASR tools may expand practice opportunities if feedback is interpretable and limitations are acknowledged (Neri et al., 2002; McCrocklin-Levis, 2025).

Finally, neglecting systematic pronunciation remediation may have broader curricular implications. When classroom time allocated to the main foreign language remains limited and phonetic correction is not structurally integrated into the programme, pronunciation development risks becoming inconsistent and

largely dependent on individual instructor initiative. This may reduce the overall coherence of pronunciation training within philology-major curricula.

## Література

1. Полякова, О. В. – Дольник, І. М. – Щербина, А. В. 2024. Специфіка постановки звуків англійської мови українським студентам. *Наукові записки. Серія: Філологічні науки* 210: pp. 241–246. <https://doi.org/10.32782/2522-4077-2024-210-35>
2. Basturkmen, H. 2010. *Developing courses in English for specific purposes*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230290518>
3. Blommaert, J. 2010. *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511845307>
4. CEFR 2020. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment – Companion volume*. Council of Europe.
5. Celce-Murcia, M. – Brinton, D. M. – Goodwin, J. M. 2010. *Teaching pronunciation: A course book and reference guide (2nd ed.)*. Cambridge University Press.
6. Crystal, D. 2003. *English as a global language (2nd ed.)*. Cambridge University Press.
7. Derwing, T. M. – Munro, M. J. 1997. Accent, intelligibility, and comprehensibility: Evidence from four L1s. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 19/1: pp. 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001010>
8. Derwing, T. M. – Munro, M. J. 2015. *Pronunciation fundamentals: Evidence-based perspectives for L2 teaching and research (Language Learning & Language Teaching, Vol. 42)*. John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/llt.42>
9. Galante, A. – Thomson, R. I. 2017. The effectiveness of drama as an instructional approach for the development of second language oral fluency, comprehensibility, and accentedness. *TESOL Quarterly* 51/1: pp. 115–142. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.290>
10. Jenkins, J. 2000. *The phonology of English as an international language: New models, new norms, new goals*. Oxford University Press.
11. Lee, J. – Jang, J. – Plonsky, L. 2015. The effectiveness of second language pronunciation instruction: A meta-analysis. *Applied Linguistics* 36/3: pp. 345–366. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amu040>
12. Levis, J. M. 2005. Changing contexts and shifting paradigms in pronunciation teaching. *TESOL Quarterly* 39/3: pp. 369–377. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588485>
13. Logan, J. S. – Lively, S. E. – Pisoni, D. B. 1991. Training Japanese listeners to identify English /r/ and /l/: A first report. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 89/2: pp. 874–886. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.1894649>
14. Lord, G. 2008. Podcasting communities and second language pronunciation. *Foreign Language Annals* 41/2: pp. 364–379. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2008.tb03297.x>
15. McCrocklin, S. – Levis, J. M. 2025. Automatic speech recognition and pronunciation learning. *Language Teaching*: pp. 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444825100852>
16. Munro, M. J. – Derwing, T. M. 1995. Foreign accent, comprehensibility, and intelligibility in the speech of second language learners. *Language Learning* 45/1: pp. 73–97. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1995.tb00963.x>

17. Neri, A. – Cucchiari, C. – Strik, H. – Boves, L. 2002. The pedagogy–technology interface in computer-assisted pronunciation training. *Computer Assisted Language Learning* 15/5: pp. 441–467. <https://doi.org/10.1076/call.15.5.441.13473>
18. Saito, K. 2012. Effects of instruction on L2 pronunciation development: A synthesis of 15 quasi-experimental intervention studies. *TESOL Quarterly* 46/4: pp. 842–854. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.67>
19. Saito, K. – Plonsky, L. 2019. Effects of second language pronunciation teaching revisited: A proposed measurement framework and meta-analysis. *Language Learning* 69/3: pp. 652–708. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12345>
20. Seidlhofer, B. 2011. *Understanding English as a lingua franca*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0243>

## References

1. Poliakova, O. V. – Dolnyk, I. M. – Shcherbyna, A. V. 2024. Spetsyfyka postanovky zvukiv anhliiskoi movy ukrainskym studentam [Specific Features of Teaching English Sound Production to Ukrainian Students]. *Naukovi zapysky. Seriya: Filolohichni nauky* 210: pp. 241–246. <https://doi.org/10.32782/2522-4077-2024-210-35> (In Ukrainian)
2. Basturkmen, H. 2010. *Developing courses in English for specific purposes*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230290518>
3. Blommaert, J. 2010. *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511845307>
4. CEFR 2020. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment – Companion volume*. Council of Europe.
5. Celce-Murcia, M. – Brinton, D. M. – Goodwin, J. M. 2010. *Teaching pronunciation: A course book and reference guide (2nd ed.)*. Cambridge University Press.
6. Crystal, D. 2003. *English as a global language (2nd ed.)*. Cambridge University Press.
7. Derwing, T. M. – Munro, M. J. 1997. Accent, intelligibility, and comprehensibility: Evidence from four L1s. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 19/1: pp. 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001010>
8. Derwing, T. M. – Munro, M. J. 2015. *Pronunciation fundamentals: Evidence-based perspectives for L2 teaching and research (Language Learning & Language Teaching, Vol. 42)*. John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/llt.42>
9. Galante, A. – Thomson, R. I. 2017. The effectiveness of drama as an instructional approach for the development of second language oral fluency, comprehensibility, and accentedness. *TESOL Quarterly* 51/1: pp. 115–142. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.290>
10. Jenkins, J. 2000. *The phonology of English as an international language: New models, new norms, new goals*. Oxford University Press.
11. Lee, J. – Jang, J. – Plonsky, L. 2015. The effectiveness of second language pronunciation instruction: A meta-analysis. *Applied Linguistics* 36/3: pp. 345–366. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amu040>
12. Levis, J. M. 2005. Changing contexts and shifting paradigms in pronunciation teaching. *TESOL Quarterly* 39/3: pp. 369–377. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588485>

13. Logan, J. S. – Lively, S. E. – Pisoni, D. B. 1991. Training Japanese listeners to identify English /r/ and /l/: A first report. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 89/2: pp. 874–886. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.1894649>
14. Lord, G. 2008. Podcasting communities and second language pronunciation. *Foreign Language Annals* 41/2: pp. 364–379. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2008.tb03297.x>
15. McCrocklin, S. – Levis, J. M. 2025. Automatic speech recognition and pronunciation learning. *Language Teaching*: pp. 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444825100852>
16. Munro, M. J. – Derwing, T. M. 1995. Foreign accent, comprehensibility, and intelligibility in the speech of second language learners. *Language Learning* 45/1: pp. 73–97. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1995.tb00963.x>
17. Neri, A. – Cucchiari, C. – Strik, H. – Boves, L. 2002. The pedagogy–technology interface in computer-assisted pronunciation training. *Computer Assisted Language Learning* 15/5: pp. 441–467. <https://doi.org/10.1076/call.15.5.441.13473>
18. Saito, K. 2012. Effects of instruction on L2 pronunciation development: A synthesis of 15 quasi-experimental intervention studies. *TESOL Quarterly* 46/4: pp. 842–854. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.67>
19. Saito, K. – Plonsky, L. 2019. Effects of second language pronunciation teaching revisited: A proposed measurement framework and meta-analysis. *Language Learning* 69/3: pp. 652–708. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12345>
20. Seidlhofer, B. 2011. *Understanding English as a lingua franca*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbealo243>

### **Designing an intensive English pronunciation remediation module for first-year philology students**

**Kateryna Lysenko**, candidate of philological sciences. Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Department of Foreign Languages for Mathematical Faculties, assistant. [lysenkokath@gmail.com](mailto:lysenkokath@gmail.com), ORCID: 0000-0001-7655-1878.

**Natalia Nesterenko**, candidate of philological sciences. Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Department of English Philology and Intercultural Communication, associate professor. [troyachka52@gmail.com](mailto:troyachka52@gmail.com), ORCID: 0009-0001-0199-5420.

Increased mobility and digitally mediated interaction have intensified the everyday use of English, sharpening expectations for intelligible spoken performance in philology programmes. Pronunciation is framed as an intelligibility-oriented competence: it combines reliable segmental contrasts with prosodic control, reduces listener effort, and supports higher-level listening and speaking. This article argues that first-semester pronunciation remediation should be treated as a protected curricular component rather than as an incidental correction practice, because early non-target articulatory and prosodic routines tend to stabilise and are costly to restructure later (Levis, 2005). Drawing on classroom experience with Ukrainian first-year students and typical L1-related difficulties in vowel quantity, diphthongs, and prosody (Poliakova et al., 2024), the paper analyses why pronunciation work is often displaced by grammar-heavy syllabi and why ad hoc feedback in general practice classes rarely yields durable change. As a methodological

response, it proposes an intensive corrective–introductory module during the first month to six weeks, combining operational articulatory guidance, perception-supported imitation, and structured “phonetic reading” from words to short intonation groups and sentence-level patterns (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010). The sequence is practice-intensive. The model foregrounds authentic audio, student self-recording for analytic listening, and clear criteria for summative credit after the corrective block. It also discusses class organisation, including a temporary limitation on spontaneous speaking in the earliest sessions to prevent the reinforcement of unstable routines. Subsequent development is envisaged in the second semester through drama-based practice targeting prosody and pragmatic expressiveness, provided that a corrective baseline has been established. Where resources allow, laboratory practice and digital tools are considered supports for guided feedback rather than substitutes for instructor-led correction.

**Keywords:** *pronunciation teaching, phonetic remediation, intelligibility, first-year students, CAPT/ASR, drama-based pedagogy.*

### **Розроблення інтенсивного модуля корекції англійської вимови для студентів-філологів першого курсу**

**Лисенко Катерина**, кандидат філологічних наук. Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка, кафедра іноземних мов для математичних факультетів, асистент. lysenkokath@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0001-7655-1878.

**Нестеренко Наталія**, кандидат філологічних наук. Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка, кафедра англійської філології та міжкультурної комунікації, доцент. trojachka52@gmail.com, ORCID: 0009-0001-0199-5420.

Зростання мобільності та цифрово опосередкованої взаємодії інтенсифікували повсякденне використання англійської мови, посиливши очікування щодо зрозумілості усного мовлення у філологічних освітніх програмах. Вимова розглядається як компетентність, орієнтована на зрозумілість: вона поєднує надійне розрізнення сегментних контрастів із просодичним контролем, зменшує зусилля слухача та сприяє розвитку навичок аудіювання й говоріння на вищому рівні. У статті обґрунтовано, що корекцію вимови в першому семестрі слід розглядати як захищений компонент освітньої програми, а не як випадкову корекційну практику, оскільки ранні нецільові артикуляційні та просодичні навички мають тенденцію до закріплення, а їх подальша перебудова потребує значних зусиль (Levis, 2005). Спираючись на аудиторний досвід роботи з українськими студентами першого курсу та типові труднощі, пов'язані з впливом рідної мови, зокрема у сфері довготи голосних, дифтонгів і просодії (Poliakova et al., 2024), у статті проаналізовано, чому робота над вимовою часто витісняється граматично перевантаженими силабусами і чому ситуативний зворотний зв'язок на загальних практичних заняттях рідко забезпечує стійкі зміни. Як методичну відповідь запропоновано інтенсивний корекційно-вступний модуль тривалістю від одного місяця до шести тижнів, який поєднує практичні артикуляційні інструкції,

перцептивно підтриману імітацію і структуроване «фонетичне читання» — від слів до коротких інтонаційних груп і моделей на рівні речення (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010). Така послідовність є практикоорієнтованою та інтенсивною. У моделі особливу увагу приділено автентичним аудіоматеріалам, самозапису студентів для аналітичного прослуховування та чітким критеріям підсумкового заліку після корекційного блоку. Також розглянуто організацію занять, зокрема тимчасове обмеження спонтанного мовлення на найперших заняттях для запобігання закріпленню нестабільних навичок. Подальший розвиток передбачено в другому семестрі через драматизаційні практики, спрямовані на просодію та прагматичну виразність, за умови, що корекційна база вже сформована. За наявності ресурсів лабораторна практика й цифрові інструменти розглядаються як засоби підтримки керованого зворотного зв'язку, а не як заміна корекції під керівництвом викладача.

**Ключові слова:** навчання вимови, фонетична корекція, зрозумілість, студенту першого курсу, САПТ/ASR, драматизаційна педагогіка.

### Intenzív angol kiejtésjavító modul tervezése elsőéves filológushallgatók számára

**Liszenkó Katerina**, a filológiai tudományok kandidátusa. Tarasz Sevcsenko Kijevi Nemzeti Egyetem, Idegen Nyelvek a Matematikai Karok Számára Tanszék, asszisztens. lisenkokath@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0001-7655-1878.

**Neszterenkó Natália**, a filológiai tudományok kandidátusa. Tarasz Sevcsenko Kijevi Nemzeti Egyetem, Angol Filológiai és Interkulturális Kommunikáció Tanszék, docens. troyachka52@gmail.com, ORCID: 0009-0001-0199-5420.

A mobilitás növekedése és a digitálisan közvetített kommunikáció terjedése az angol nyelv mindennapi használatának erősödéséhez vezetett, ami a filológiai képzési programokban is fokozta az érthető szóbeli nyelvhasználattal kapcsolatos elvárásokat. A tanulmány a kiejtést érthetőségközpontú kompetenciaként értelmezi: olyan készségként, amely a szegmentális kontrasztok biztos megkülönböztetését a prozódiai kontrollal kapcsolja össze, csökkenti a hallgató kognitív erőfeszítését, és támogatja a magasabb szintű hallás utáni szövegértés és beszédkészség fejlődését. A tanulmány amellett érvel, hogy az első félévi kiejtéskorrekciót a képzési program önálló komponenseként kell kezelni, nem pedig alkalmoszerű javítási gyakorlatként, mivel a korán kialakuló, nem célnyelvi artikulációs és prozódiai mintázatok könnyen rögzülnek, későbbi átstrukturálásuk pedig jelentős erőfeszítést igényel (Levis, 2005). Az ukrán elsőéves hallgatóktól gyűjtött tantermi tapasztalatokra, valamint az anyanyelvi hatással összefüggő tipikus nehézségekre — különösen a magánhangzó-hosszúság, a diftongusok és a prozódia területén — támaszkodva (Poliakova et al., 2024) a tanulmány azt vizsgálja, miért szorul háttérbe gyakran a kiejtéssel kapcsolatos munka a nyelvtani ismeretekkel túlterhelt tantervekben, és miért eredményez ritkán tartós változást az általános gyakorlati órákon alkalmazott alkalmoszerű visszajelzés. Módszertani válaszként a tanulmány olyan intenzív korrekciós-bevezető modult javasol, amely egy hónaptól hat hétig tart és gyakorlati artikulációs

útmutatást, percepcióra épülő imitációt és strukturált „fonetikai olvasást” ötvöz – a szavaktól a rövid intonációs csoportokon át a mondatszintű mintákig (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010). A folyamat erősen gyakorlatorientált és intenzív. A modell középpontjában az autentikus hanganyagok, a hallgatói önfelvételek elemző visszahallgatása, valamint a korrekciós blokkot követő záró értékelés világos kritériumai állnak. A tanulmány az óraszervezés kérdéseire is kitér, többek között a spontán beszéd ideiglenes korlátozására a legelső órákon, hogy megelőzhető legyen a bizonytalan kiejtési minták rögzülése. A további fejlesztés a második félévben dramatizációs gyakorlatokon keresztül valósulhat meg, amelyek a prozódia és a pragmatikai kifejezőkészségre irányulnak, feltéve, hogy a korrekciós alap már kialakult. Amennyiben rendelkezésre állnak a szükséges erőforrások, a laboratóriumi gyakorlatok és a digitális eszközök az irányított visszajelzés támogatására szolgálhatnak, de nem helyettesítik az oktató által vezetett korrekciót.

**Kulcsszavak:** *kiejtéstánítás, fonetikai korrekció, érthetőség, elsőéves hallgatók, CAPT/ASR, drámaalapú pedagógia.*