Ilmiy tadqiqotlar va ularning yechimlari jurnali
Aoka guvohnoma № 323759 ISSN: 3060-4818

PHONETIC SHIFTS IN ESL LEARNERS

Kasimova Yulduz Malikovna
Namangan davlat pedagogika instituti
Xorijiy tillar kafedrasi kattaoʻqituvchisi
E-mail: kasimovayulduz1977@gmail.com.
Telefon: +998 99 817 08 68

A'loxanova Ravzaxon Abdurashid qizi
Namangan davlat pedagogika instituti
ijtimoiy fanlar fakulteti Xorijiy tillar kafedrasi
"Xorijiy til va adabiyoti (ingliz tili)" ta'lim yo'nalishi
4-kurs XTA-BU-22-guruh talabasi
Email: msralokhanova@gmail.com
Telefon: +998938980306

Abstract: This article explores phonetic shifts in ESL (English as a Second Language) learners, focusing on how learners' native language influences pronunciation patterns in English. The study analyzes common phonological processes, including substitution, deletion, insertion, and stress shifts. It also discusses cognitive, neuro-linguistic, and socio-cultural factors that contribute to phonetic deviations. Practical pedagogical strategies are provided to improve pronunciation accuracy in ESL classrooms.
Keywords: phonetic shifts, ESL learners, pronunciation, phonology, language interference, stress patterns, articulation.

Аннотация: Данная статья исследует фонетические изменения у изучающих английский язык как второй язык. Анализируются типичные фонологические процессы, такие как замена, опущение, вставка и смещение ударения. Также рассматриваются когнитивные, нейролингвистические и социокультурные факторы, влияющие на произношение. Представлены практические методические рекомендации.
Ключевые слова: фонетические изменения, произношение, фонология, интерференция, ударение.

Annotatsiya: Ushbu maqolada ingliz tilini ikkinchi til sifatida oʻrganayotgan oʻquvchilarda fonetik siljishlar tahlil qilinadi. Asosiy fonologik jarayonlar – almashtirish, tushirib qoldirish, qoʻshish va urgʻu oʻzgarishlari koʻrib chiqiladi. Shuningdek, kognitiv, neyrolingvistik va ijtimoiy omillar ham tahlil qilinadi.
Kalit soʻzlar: fonetik siljishlar, talaffuz, fonologiya, til interferensiyasi, urgʻu.

Introduction

Phonetic shifts in ESL learners represent a complex and significant aspect of second language acquisition (SLA). Learners do not begin with a blank phonetic slate; instead, they bring a fully developed phonological framework from their first language (L1), which shapes their perception and production of English sounds [5, p.45]. This interaction, commonly referred to as language transfer or interference, is central to understanding why certain pronunciation deviations occur systematically.

When encountering unfamiliar English sounds, learners attempt to map them onto the closest equivalents in their L1 phonological system. For instance, English interdental fricatives /θ/ and /ð/ are absent in many L1s, and learners commonly substitute them with /s/, /z/, or /d/ [10, p.34]. Such

substitutions are cognitively motivated strategies rather than random errors, reflecting attempts to maintain intelligibility. Similarly, consonant cluster simplifications, epenthesis, and vowel mispronunciations are predictable adaptations learners use to cope with articulatory complexity [4, p.70].

In addition to segmental elements like vowels and consonants, suprasegmental features—stress, rhythm, and intonation—play a vital role in communication. English is a stress-timed language, meaning stressed syllables occur at regular intervals, while unstressed syllables are reduced [4, p.67]. Learners from syllable-timed language backgrounds, such as Uzbek, often struggle with this rhythm, producing speech that may sound monotonous or halting, reducing intelligibility.

Intelligibility, rather than native-like pronunciation, is increasingly emphasized in modern SLA pedagogy. A learner's accent is not inherently problematic; rather, effective communication and clarity are the primary objectives [6, p.90]. Teachers are encouraged to focus on predictable pronunciation patterns, helping learners achieve clarity without unnecessary pressure to eliminate their accent entirely.

This article aims to provide a comprehensive overview of phonetic shifts in ESL learners, analyzing causes, types, cognitive and social factors, and pedagogical implications. By bridging theoretical research and classroom application, it offers strategies for teachers to improve learners' pronunciation skills systematically, fostering intelligible and confident English speech.

Theoretical Background: Phonetics and phonology form the foundational theoretical framework for understanding pronunciation [1, p.12]. Phonetics examines the physical production and perception of speech sounds, including articulatory, acoustic, and auditory aspects. Articulatory phonetics analyzes how organs such as the tongue, lips, and vocal cords produce specific sounds. Acoustic phonetics studies the frequency, intensity, and waveform properties of sounds, while auditory phonetics considers how humans perceive and process these sounds.

Phonology, in contrast, focuses on the systematic organization of sounds in a language. It investigates how sounds contrast to form meaning, combine into larger units, and function within a linguistic system. For example, the distinction between /p/ and /b/ in English is phonemic, as it differentiates word meanings (pat vs bat) [3, p.21].

A major challenge for ESL learners is when the phonological system of their L1 differs significantly from English. Sounds absent in the L1 are often misperceived and misproduced, leading to predictable phonetic shifts [10, p.56]. First language interference can be positive, when L1 similarities facilitate learning, or negative, resulting in errors. Negative transfer is particularly evident in substitution patterns, stress placement, and vowel reduction errors.

The relationship between perception and production is central: learners must first discern sound differences before producing them accurately [3, p.21]. Misperceived sounds are likely to be pronounced incorrectly, reinforcing phonetic shifts. The Critical Period Hypothesis suggests that younger learners generally acquire more native-like pronunciation, although adults can attain high intelligibility through structured practice [8, p.102].

Phonetic shifts are often categorized as follows:

-Substitution: Replacing unfamiliar sounds with familiar ones (/θ/ → /s/ or /t/)

-Deletion: Omitting sounds, particularly in consonant clusters (next → nex)

-Insertion (Epenthesis): Adding extra sounds to simplify pronunciation (school → eschool)

-Stress shift: Applying incorrect stress patterns, affecting intelligibility [4, p.70]

-Vowel reduction errors: Failure to reduce unstressed vowels to schwa /ə/, disrupting natural rhythm

These shifts are influenced by cognitive factors (memory, attention, auditory discrimination), neuro-linguistic factors (brain plasticity, neural adaptation), sociolinguistic factors (exposure, motivation, interaction with native speakers), and instructional factors (teaching methods, feedback) [5, p.102].

Methodology: This study employed a mixed-method research design, combining both quantitative and qualitative approaches to gain a comprehensive understanding of phonetic shifts in ESL learners. A

total of 40 participants, aged 18–22, were selected from Namangan State Pedagogical Institute, all of whom had intermediate-level English proficiency based on institutional language assessment records. The participants were chosen using purposive sampling, ensuring representation of learners from various linguistic backgrounds, primarily Uzbek and Russian, which allowed the researchers to observe the influence of L1 interference on English pronunciation.

Data collection involved three main components:

1. Pronunciation tests: A structured set of words and sentences was designed to elicit common phonetic errors. The test focused on sounds that typically cause difficulty for ESL learners due to L1 interference, such as the English interdental fricatives /θ/ and /ð/, consonant clusters, and unstressed vowel reduction [3, p.45; 4, p.67]. Test items included minimal pairs, polysyllabic words, and sentence-level tasks to evaluate both segmental and suprasegmental features. Each participant was recorded reading aloud under controlled conditions to ensure accurate analysis.

2. Questionnaires: A self-report questionnaire was administered to gather data on learners' English exposure, study habits, language attitudes, and self-perceived pronunciation challenges. Items measured frequency of exposure to English media (films, podcasts, social media), daily practice routines, and perceived difficulties in both listening and speaking [5, p.102]. This allowed researchers to correlate environmental and cognitive factors with observed pronunciation patterns.

3. Classroom observation and semi-structured interviews: The researcher conducted in-class observations during oral tasks, role-plays, and presentations. Semi-structured interviews with 10 participants explored personal strategies, challenges, and perceptions regarding pronunciation. These qualitative methods enabled an in-depth understanding of learner strategies, the impact of stress and rhythm patterns, and social or affective factors influencing speech production.

Data analysis combined descriptive and inferential statistical methods. Quantitative data from pronunciation tests were analyzed to calculate the frequency and percentage of different error types, while qualitative thematic analysis identified recurring patterns, underlying causes, and learners' adaptive strategies. Additionally, correlations between English exposure, cognitive skills (auditory discrimination, working memory), and pronunciation accuracy were examined to assess the role of environmental, cognitive, and instructional factors in shaping phonetic shifts [11, p.63].

This methodological framework ensured rigor and validity by triangulating data from multiple sources, allowing for both systematic measurement of phonetic errors and rich, contextual insights into learner experiences.

Results: The analysis revealed that phonetic shifts are pervasive among ESL learners, confirming the significant influence of L1 interference on pronunciation. The most frequent errors observed were substitution errors, occurring in approximately 75% of participants, particularly for English interdental fricatives /θ/ and /ð/, which were often replaced by /s/, /z/, or /d/ [3, p.45]. Deletion errors were observed in 60% of learners, mainly in complex consonant clusters, e.g., texts pronounced as texs. Epenthesis, the insertion of vowels to simplify clusters, occurred in 55% of learners, commonly inserting /i/ or /ə/ (e.g., school → eschool). Stress-related errors were also widespread, affecting 70% of participants, reflecting difficulties in acquiring English stress-timed rhythm [4, p.67].

Vowel reduction errors were particularly noticeable among learners from syllable-timed L1 backgrounds. Instead of reducing unstressed vowels to schwa /ə/, participants often pronounced all vowels fully, disrupting natural prosody and rhythm. Qualitative observations confirmed that learners frequently relied on L1 phonological mapping, over-articulating vowels, simplifying consonant clusters, and applying L1 stress patterns in English sentences.

Correlation analysis indicated a positive relationship between English exposure and pronunciation accuracy. Learners who regularly engaged with English media demonstrated fewer phonetic errors, more accurate stress placement, and improved fluency [11, p.63]. Classroom observations showed that

learners with minimal exposure exhibited monotonous speech, overgeneralized stress, and difficulty with sentence intonation, highlighting the role of sociolinguistic and environmental factors.

Overall, the findings confirm that phonetic shifts in ESL learners are systematic rather than random and arise primarily due to L1 interference, limited exposure to English, and insufficient prosody training. These results align with previous research, emphasizing the predictability of phonetic deviations and the importance of targeted pronunciation instruction [10, p.34; 12, p.45].

Discussion: The study's findings indicate that phonetic shifts are a natural and inevitable part of second language acquisition. Substitution, deletion, epenthesis, stress shift, and vowel reduction are not merely errors but adaptive strategies employed by learners to cope with unfamiliar phonological structures. These shifts often reflect an underlying attempt to maintain intelligibility, aligning with theories of L1 interference and cross-linguistic influence [10, p.56].

L1 interference was particularly influential in segmental errors. For instance, Uzbek and Russian speakers replaced English /θ/ and /ð/ with familiar consonants due to the absence of these sounds in their L1. Deletion and epenthesis patterns reflected articulatory simplification strategies, supporting Flege's Speech Learning Model, which posits that unfamiliar L2 sounds are mapped onto the closest L1 phonetic categories [9, p.78].

Suprasegmental errors, including stress shifts and improper vowel reduction, were also widespread. These findings support the observation that learners from syllable-timed L1 backgrounds struggle with stress-timed English rhythm, leading to unnatural intonation and decreased speech intelligibility [4, p.70]. Qualitative analysis revealed that learners often consciously applied L1 prosodic rules when producing English sentences, which may initially facilitate communication but can reduce fluency and naturalness over time.

Cognitive factors such as auditory discrimination and working memory were shown to influence the ability to perceive and produce L2 sounds accurately. Learners with higher auditory sensitivity made fewer substitution errors and displayed better vowel differentiation, highlighting the importance of perception in pronunciation acquisition [5, p.102]. Neuro-linguistic flexibility, particularly in younger learners, facilitated more accurate stress and intonation patterns, aligning with Critical Period Hypothesis research [8, p.102].

Sociolinguistic factors were also crucial. Learners immersed in English-speaking environments or who engaged consistently with English media demonstrated better pronunciation accuracy and prosody. Motivation and learner attitudes further modulated error patterns, as highly motivated learners were more willing to self-correct and practice difficult sounds.

The discussion emphasizes that phonetic shifts are multi-causal, integrating L1 influence, cognitive capacity, social context, and instructional support. These findings corroborate prior studies emphasizing the systematic nature of pronunciation errors and the potential for targeted pedagogical interventions to reduce persistent shifts [12, p.45; 13, p.67].

Conclusion

Phonetic shifts in ESL learners are a natural, systematic component of second language acquisition, arising from the interaction between a learner's L1 and English phonological systems. They manifest in substitution, deletion, insertion, stress shifts, and vowel reduction, influenced by cognitive, neuro-linguistic, sociocultural, and instructional factors.

Rather than being viewed solely as errors, phonetic shifts should be considered developmental stages, reflecting adaptive strategies to accommodate unfamiliar phonemes and prosodic patterns [10, p.34; 11, p.63]. Effective pronunciation teaching focuses on intelligibility rather than native-like accuracy, emphasizing clarity and comprehensibility in real-life communication contexts.

Pedagogical implications include structured minimal pairs training, prosody-focused exercises, shadowing, recording/self-analysis, peer collaboration, and extensive exposure to authentic English

input. Tailoring instruction to learners' linguistic backgrounds, cognitive abilities, and motivational levels maximizes effectiveness. With consistent practice, feedback, and meaningful communicative activities, ESL learners can significantly reduce phonetic shifts, achieving more natural, intelligible, and confident speech.

In summary, understanding the causes, types, and mechanisms of phonetic shifts allows educators to implement targeted and evidence-based strategies, improving learners' pronunciation and overall communicative competence in English.

References

1. Bakla, A. (2014). Putting pen to paper. Academic paragraph writing. Ankara: Blackswan Publishing.
2. Bickford, A. C., & Floyd, R. (2006). Articulatory phonetics: Tools for analysing the world's languages (4th Ed.). Dallas, TX: SIL International.
3. Brazil, D. (1994). Pronunciation for advanced learners of English. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
4. Chun, D. M. (2002). Discourse intonation in L2: From theory and research to practice. California,
5. Santa Barbara: John Benjamins. 68/ APPLIED LINGUISTICS IN ELT CLASSROOMS
6. Crystal, D. (2008). A dictionary of phonetics and linguistics (6th ed.). Malden, MA: The Author.
7. Demirezen, M. (1999). The foreign accent problem in the pronunciation of non-native foreign language teachers, First International ELT Research Conference. Challenges for Language Teachers towards the Millennium, Çanakkale Turkey- 27-29 May 1999.
8. Kreidler, C. W. (2004). The Pronunciation of English: A course book. Oxford. The Author.
9. Major, R. C. (2001). Foreign accent: The ontogeny and phylogeny of second language phonology.
10. McCord, S. (1988, November 3). Reading for meaning, and not just the sounds: Done, gone and lone. The New York Times.
11. Richards J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2002). Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics (3rd ed.). London: Longman Pearson Education.
12. Roach, P. (Ed.). (1991). English phonetics and phonology: A practical course (2nd Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
13. Skandera, P., & Burleigh, P. (2005). A manual of English phonetics and phonology: Twelve lessons with an integrated course in phonetic transcription. Tübingen, Germany: Gunter Narr Verlag.
14. Tench, P. (2011). Transcribing the sound of English: A phonetics workbook for words and discourse. Cambridge: The Author.
15. Ulrike, G. (2009). Introduction to English phonetics and phonology. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.