

**МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ
ТАВРІЙСЬКИЙ НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ
ІМЕНІ В. І. ВЕРНАДСЬКОГО**

Журнал заснований у 1918 році

**ВЧЕНІ ЗАПИСКИ
ТАВРІЙСЬКОГО НАЦІОНАЛЬНОГО УНІВЕРСИТЕТУ
ІМЕНІ В. І. ВЕРНАДСЬКОГО**

Серія: Філологія. Журналістика

Том 34 (73) № 1 2023

Частина 1



Видавничий дім
«Гельветика»
2023

Головний редактор:

Казарін Володимир Павлович – доктор філологічних наук, професор.

Члени редакційної колегії:

Гадомський Олександр Казимирович – доктор філологічних наук, доктор габілітований гуманітарних наук в області мовознавства (Варшавський університет), професор, завідувач кафедри білоруських та українських досліджень Інституту славістики Опольського університету (Ополе, Польща);

Досенко Анжеліка Костянтинівна – кандидат наук із соціальних комунікацій, доцент кафедри слов'янської філології та журналістики Таврійського національного університету імені В. І. Вернадського;

Маркова Мар'яна Василівна – кандидат філологічних наук, доцент, завідувач кафедри романської філології та компаративістики Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка;

Свенцицька Еліна Михайлівна – доктор філологічних наук, професор, професор кафедри слов'янської філології та журналістики Таврійського національного університету імені В. І. Вернадського;

Семенець Ольга Сергіївна (відповідальний секретар) – кандидат філологічних наук, в.о. завідувача кафедри іноземної філології та перекладу, Східноукраїнський національний університет імені Володимира Даля;

Статкевич Лариса Павлівна – кандидат філологічних наук, доцент, доцент кафедри зарубіжної філології Таврійського національного університету імені В. І. Вернадського;

Ткаченко Тетяна Іванівна – доктор філологічних наук, доцент.

Статті у виданні перевірені на наявність плагіату за допомогою програмного забезпечення StrikePlagiarism.com від польської компанії Plagiat.pl.

**Рекомендовано до друку та поширення через мережу Internet
Вченою радою Таврійського національного університету імені В. І. Вернадського
(протокол № 14 від 19 травня 2023 року)**

Науковий журнал «Вчені записки ТНУ імені В. І. Вернадського.
Серія: Філологія. Журналістика» зареєстровано Міністерством юстиції України
(Свідоцтво про державну реєстрацію друкованого засобу масової інформації
серія КВ № 24632-14572ПР від 04.11.2020 року)

***Журнал включено до Переліку наукових фахових видань України (категорія «Б»)
зі спеціальностей 035 – Філологія, 061 – Журналістика відповідно до Наказу МОН України
від 17.03.2020 № 409 (додаток 1)***

***Журнал включено до міжнародної наукометричної бази Index Copernicus International
(Республіка Польща)***

Сторінка журналу: www.philol.vernadskyjournals.in.ua

ISSN 2710-4656 (Print)

ISSN 2710-4664 (Online)

© Таврійський національний університет ім. В. І. Вернадського, 2023

Halahan Ya. V.

Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics

Bezuhla I. V.

Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics

Leshchinska A. V.

Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics

STUDY OF PHONOLOGICAL FOSSILIZATION IN THE PROCESS OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

Nowadays the process of globalization requires excellent knowledge of English in all spheres of our life. According to recent studies, in Ukraine English language proficiency ranks quite low, specifically 28th out of 32 in Europe. The differences between the phonological systems of Ukrainian and English can pose significant challenges for Ukrainian students when learning to speak English. We can see that they differ significantly in the field of vocalism and consonantism. In this article, we provided an overview of the differences in consonant and vowel systems between English and Ukrainian. This article highlights the importance of addressing Ukrainian students' pronunciation difficulties in learning English. Research has indicated that teaching English to Ukrainian students can be challenging due to a lack of awareness regarding the pronunciation of some sounds, rhythm, intonation, and fluency in a natural language environment. This deficiency can result in a high frequency of errors and misunderstandings, which, in turn, can lead to a psychological barrier that hinders the learning process. It suggests that teachers can provide targeted training on English phonemes and address common errors made by Ukrainian students to overcome them. Ukrainian students most often make mistakes by involuntarily drawing a parallel to their mother tongue. We underline the importance of paying special attention to the main differences in the phonological systems of the Ukrainian and English languages. Phonological fossilization is related to the difficulty in distinguishing all the sounds of the English language by ear, maintaining the length and shortness of vowels, following the Ukrainian intonation, incorrect division of speech into meaningful groups, the absence of diphthongs, triphthongs, and reduction in the Ukrainian language and so on. The authors emphasize that teachers should use a balanced approach to error correction that caters to the unique needs of each learner in order to optimize the English language teaching process. It was concluded that through appropriate preventive measures, Ukrainian students can overcome phonological fossilization and achieve a native-like level of proficiency in a target language.

Key words: *phonological fossilization, consonant and vowel sounds, mother language, target language.*

Stating the problem. In teaching English to Ukrainian students, it has been found that limited awareness of pronunciation, rhythm, intonation and fluency in a natural language environment not only leads to a large number of errors but also to a misunderstanding of the sounding language, resulting in creating a psychological barrier. Students have fear of speaking a foreign language, self-doubt, and sometimes even a desire to avoid communication, and remain passive observers and listeners. A complex of interacting factors influences the occurrence and fossilisation of phonetic errors. These include: the interference of phonetic systems; the degree of phonetic accent of non-native teachers who have mastered English phonetics outside

the natural language environment (differences in the professional level of foreign language teachers; the use of different ways of correction of foreign language teaching in phonetics with varying degrees of attention to the sounding side of the language; the nature of the teacher's relationship with the members of the learning group, manifested in the presence or absence of the teacher's linguistic authority among the students, which is reflected in the reproduction of the features of the teacher's pronunciation in the students' pronunciation; features of language behaviour and language preferences developed in each of the learning groups during the joint teaching of a foreign language, manifested, among other things, in the features of pronunci-

ation, also by the features of pronunciation characteristic only of members of a particular study group as a small social group of a closed type. The nature of the expression and weight of each of the factors considered in this complex is in turn determined by the specific social but communicative conditions prevailing in the individual language groups.

The objective necessity of modern language teaching, especially at its initial stage, is to find the best ways of organising the educational process, and rational options for the content of teaching and its structure. The practice of teaching English in higher educational institutions shows that most students have quite a lot of difficulties at the initial stage of their studies at a university. The purpose of the initial stage is to activate and correct the phonetic, grammatical and lexical material that students have learned at school. In practise, however, we clearly see that a lot of students who come to us need to be retrained, which in itself is much more difficult. The speech organs of beginning students do not have the necessary flexibility, and the articulation base for speaking in a foreign language is not yet developed. Therefore, undelivered pronunciation, incorrectly learned sounds, and the complete absence of English rhythm hinder the learning of any other type of activity.

Incorrect pronunciation not only distorts the sound of the students' speech itself but also does not allow the students to understand the sound of the foreign language, which is why such a large percentage of students have difficulty with phonetics in the early stages of education. Without mastery of pronunciation, there can be no active fluency, which is what we seek from students by the end of the first year of school, that is, straightforward, free speech in a foreign language. Overcoming phonetic difficulties is a prerequisite for the transition to automation of students' speaking skills in all stages of foreign language acquisition and also contributes to improve the communicative competence of students.

Helping the student overcome difficulties in linguistic and psychological terms is undoubtedly the task of the teacher, who in turn focuses on the training and automation of correct pronunciation and rhythmic-intonational skills, while developing the ability of self-control and self-correction.

Research methods: The study was done over one term and was delivered to first-year university students. The candidates were 40 native speakers of Ukrainian (age range 18 to 20). All students study at the Kharkiv National University of Economics. Each of the participants indicated that they had regular hearing abilities and no difficulties with English. Dur-

ing the study, their proficiency level was determined to be at B1 as per CEFR. The data for the study was gathered using Ukrainian students' questionnaires and by analyzing their oral speech for errors.

Analysis of the research and publications on the issue under consideration. The field of second language acquisition has extensively researched interlanguage, a phenomenon that refers to the language system developed by language learners as they acquire a new language. Foreign language studies have undergone significant changes since the 1960s, characterized by two distinct historical stages: the comparative analysis hypothesis and the interlanguage hypothesis. Larry Selinker is credited with introducing the concepts of interlanguage in his work from 1972 [1]. These theoretical models have evolved over time, leading to renewed interest in foreign language studies in the late 1980s after a period of slower progress in the 1970s. This shift was accompanied by a transition from a one-sided approach to a more complex understanding of foreign language learning. During the 1970s, the analysis of interlanguage gained greater attention and interest not only in American and European linguistics but also in Chinese linguistics. Best, McRoberts, Goodell [2], Bradlow, Bent [3], Bradlow, Pisoni, Akahane-Yamada, Tohkura [4], Chaira [5], Cooke, Scharenborg [6], Flege [7] and others have contributed to predicaments that learners face distinguishing and pronouncing vowels and consonants in the language that they are acquiring. In addition, many other researchers have explored different aspects of interlanguage, including its relationship with language transfer, fossilization, and language development in multilingual contexts. During the period under review, the study of the phenomenon of language transfer focuses on the difference between the target and mother languages of students. Researchers rightly point out that the difficulties of language learning arise due to differences between the target language and the native language of students. The process of learning a foreign language is naturally considered, among other things, as overcoming fossilized errors. Different aspects of Ukrainian-English interlanguage, the acquisition of English as a foreign language by Ukrainian learners, interlanguage development and language transfer in Ukrainian-English language learners are indicated by a wide range of studies [8, 9, 10].

Stating the task. It should be noted that the differences in the phonological systems of English and Ukrainian are very great. Phonetic errors, even if a person has a good command of the language, can disrupt communication and even lead to misunderstand-

ings of statements. At the phonetic level, students most often make mistakes by involuntarily drawing a parallel to their mother tongue. This paper will discuss the phonological features of the English and Ukrainian languages. We believe that a comparative analysis of two languages will allow us to predict the impact of the native language on the learning of the target language, which will allow us to take appropriate preventive measures.

The main body. Most people associate pronunciation with the sounds we make when we speak. The way we speak says a lot about who we are and what kind of person we are, depending on how we pronounce words, phrases and sentences. Among a number of factors, a key component of the English language is its diversity. As language teachers, we need to be aware of this. We feel it necessary to briefly describe the three periods of pronunciation teaching orientation. in our paper.

In the 1940s–1950s, “Listen and Repeat” teaching forced its students to imitate, memorise and practise speech examples until they became natural. Behaviourism formed the basis for this teaching. Language teaching consists of teacher-led presentations of language examples, substitution exercises, rigorous practise of sentence patterns and other activities that focus on memorised scripts and dialogues. Grammar and vocabulary are taught during these teaching phases mainly through pronunciation exercises based on speech patterns. The idea that students learn to successfully repeat and approximate their teacher’s speech patterns is an implicit feature of such sessions. This original orientation is reflected in a teaching practise that allows students to practise ‘by ear’ to find out how to pronounce English according to reliable patterns under guidance. One problem is that different learners have different levels of success in understanding the sound system of a new language.

The second orientation, “We should study these sounds carefully to find out how to pronounce them more clearly”, took place in the 1960s–1970s. The second tendency is based on students’ mental abilities to understand complex sound descriptions and involves clear imagination, rigorous practise with specific sounds and this. Teachers spend a lot of time introducing and practising English sounds, especially single vowels and consonants. Lessons use students’ analytical skills so that they can learn more about speech sounds, compare the sound systems of English with parts of their mother tongue and practise new sounds thoroughly. The teacher can show students diagrams, pictures and videos that visually illustrate where the different sounds are formed in the mouth.

A teacher can introduce students to a set of symbols representing specific vowels and consonants to introduce and practise a list of sounds in class, such as the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA). It is important to note that the second trend covers more than just vowels and consonants. Likewise, special attention is given to more general aspects of spoken language, such as the blending of word boundaries, word stress, rhythm patterns and intonation. We believe that attempts to immediately teach flawless pronunciation are directly related to detailed explanations of articulation, leading to the excessive theorisation of the educational process. Teaching practice shows that the effort required to build foreign language pronunciation is not justified.

At present, teachers believe that work on improving pronunciation should be carried out throughout the study period, although the role of this work and its nature change at different stages. In the third direction (1980s and beyond), the teacher emphasises the value of open communication in the classroom with the aim of involving students quickly and interactively in the use of particular sounds and sound patterns. As with the second orientation, the teacher may explain how a particular sound is produced. In class a brief technical explanation is given and the student is instructed to use the desired sound. They have many opportunities to talk to each other. The structure of the lesson activities encourages the students to focus on expressing meaning while the teacher observes, evaluates and supports them. So, a typical part of the learning process is to encourage students to speak spontaneously. First, identify sounds or sound patterns that need improvement. Then look for situations where the identified sounds or sound patterns are used in different natural contexts. Next, create communicative teaching activities that involve the use of correct language and identifiable sounds. Finally, create at least three or four activities that can be used to focus teaching and provide new situations for practising the targeted sound patterns.

The Ukrainian language is synthetic, English is analytical. At the phonological level, the difference in the synthetic analytical structure is manifested by the alternation of sounds in different phonetic positions. In the Ukrainian language there is a large variability associated with the qualitative and quantitative reduction of vowels and the neutralization of consonants and a relatively uniform qualitative reduction in the English language.

In comparison with Ukrainian, the English phonetic system has a number of peculiarities in addition to some similarities. We can see that they differ significantly in the field of vocalism and consonantism.

The vocalism of English is much richer and more varied than that of Ukrainian. English has 12 monophthongs, 8 diphthongs, and 5 triphthongs. Triphthongs are not separate phonemes, but a combination of diphthongs with a neutral vowel. In Ukrainian, the number of phonemes is twice less than the number of English monophthongs, which, together with other differences in the vowel systems of the two languages, makes the assimilation of English vowels by Ukrainian learners much more difficult.

The composition of English phonemes quantitatively exceeds the composition of Ukrainian phonemes. The English diphthongs are descending diphthongs. The initial element in such diphthongs is more pronounced, sounds more intense, distinct, and louder than the second element, and occupies almost 3/4 of the duration of the entire vowel. Vowel combinations are not considered diphthongs in Ukrainian. Ukrainian, unlike English, does not have diphthongs.

The above reasons explain the presence of a large number of incorrect realizations of English vowel phonemes in the speech of the tested students. Moreover, in these groups, work on English pronunciation used the imitation way, which presupposes only an approximation to the pronunciation norm of the language being learned and does not allow good pronunciation to be achieved in average students with an average level of linguistic ability, including the ability to imitate. It should be noted that students in these groups usually pronounce Ukrainian phonemes with similar sounds instead of English vowels, e.g. [ɪ] ↔ [i:], [ʊ] ↔ [u:]. However, the substitutions of English vowels by similar Ukrainian vowels are not statistically significant.

The articulation of vowels, unlike consonants, is not as varied. This is because the flow of air can escape unhindered from the oral cavity when they are pronounced. Vowels differ from each other in their quality, which is determined by the volume and shape of the resonance cavities. The timbre of the vowels is "set" by different movements of the tongue. Both languages use the same differentiated features of the vowels: in rise (vertical movement of the tongue), in a row (horizontal movement of the tongue) and labialization (involvement of the lips). Moreover, in the phonetic system of English, there is a correlation between length and shortness that is not present in the Ukrainian system. Thus, frequent violations of the degrees of the length of vowels in positions before a voiceless and voiced consonant in the pronunciation of students were found in 37 to 64% of possible cases.

It is assumed that the most favourable situation for mastering a foreign language arises when the number

of phonemes of the mother tongue is greater than the number of phonemes of the target language and the different phonemes of the mother tongue correspond to a certain extent to the variants of the phonemes of the foreign language; then phonemic errors are excluded and only inaccuracies in phonetic realisation are possible. It cannot be denied that in all languages there is a difference between the spelling of words and their pronunciation. In the Ukrainian language, there is no reduction. Sounds should be pronounced clearly and sonorously and not swallowed. In Ukrainian, for example, [o] is not approximated to [a]. We always pronounce the sound [o] cleanly and clearly, whether it is stressed or not, we pronounce the iotated [i], [u], [e] clearly, and when they denote two sounds, we do not deafen the voiced ones, the sound [h] is hard. In English, the same sound, the same combination in conjunction with certain letters (-ough-, -ow-, -ea-) can be pronounced completely differently.

In English, next to the characters "row" (vowels of the front, back and mixed row), "rise" (vowels of the lower, upper and middle row), "roundness", not only the length of the vowel is important, but also the stability of articulation. Vowels with stable articulation (monophthongs) are contrasted with diphthongs. It should be emphasized that the distinguishing feature of the Ukrainian language is that the phonological category of length, the shortness of vowels is absent in it. The longer or shorter duration of vowels is not a semantic feature in Ukrainian, while in English it creates semantic differences. Violations of the degree of vowel length in positions before voiceless and voiced consonants are high-frequency errors in students' speech (from 89 to 100%).

Students should be aware, that Ukrainian has no syllables without vowel phonemes. However, English syllable structure differs in that in addition to vowels, the sonants l, m, n can also be syllabic, more rarely m in combination with the preceding consonant, for example: beetle [bi: - tɫ], garden [gɑ: - dn], curtain [kɜ: - tn], etc.

According to their structure, syllables are divided into open (ending with a syllable sound) and closed (ending with a non-syllable sound). Closed syllables are very typical of the English language. 63% of syllables are closed and 37% are open. In Ukrainian, the ratio is reversed: 73% open syllables and 27% closed syllables.

The peculiarity of English stress is most evident in polysyllabic words where the main stress is on the third to fifth syllable from the beginning of the word, e.g., has disappeared, while the first or second syllable from the beginning of the word is accentuated,

i.e., receives a secondary stress, a phenomenon that is completely atypical for the Ukrainian language.

It is equally important to recognise the differences in the pronunciation of English and Ukrainian consonants. The Ukrainian consonant system is more complex than English because it has more oppositions. It also contains a large number of consonants that are within the same morpheme. In English, the number of consonants (24) and vowels (20) is approximately equal, and the clustering of more than two consonants is not typical of English. Consonants, unlike vowels, have a clear, fairly fixed, easily grasped and easily controlled place of barrier formation. In the pronunciation of English consonants, experience has shown that the difficulty for students is precisely in locating the place of barrier formation correctly. Therefore, special attention is given to this aspect. In special tasks, English consonants are trained in comparison with similar-sounding Ukrainian consonants, e.g., [t] – [ɾ], paying attention to differences both in the place of barrier formation and in pronunciation.

In English, consonant phonemes are distinguished on the basis of deafness – sonority, by the manner of formation, by the place of formation, by the organ of articulation, by the predominance of noise or sound. Palatalization in Ukrainian has a semantic meaning, as words acquire one or another meaning depending on whether they contain, for example, a hard or soft consonant: син – синь, рис – рись, лан – лань. When lining up consonant sounds, students should focus their attention on the lack of correlation between hardness and softness in English and their presence in Ukrainian. Thus, there are speech errors in the pronunciation of English consonants, which are a clear indication of the accent in English. The absence of palatalization of English consonants is found in the speech of students in up to 43.9% of cases.

The most common errors that the teacher should watch out for and properly control in the students are related to the presence of certain phonemes. Let us consider some of them. There are often errors in the pronunciation of some sounds in the students' pronunciation, such as the interdental [θ] or simplification of combinations of fricatives in sentences such as the fifth finger (from 13 to 44% of cases), replacing [w] with [v] (from 18 to 25% of cases). In students' pronunciation, there are substitutions fricative [r] → quavering [r] (from 6.8 to 44%); [h] is mispronounced as [x] (from 25 to 67% of cases). Frequent deviations in the transposition of the consonants [w], [r] are attributed on the one hand to interference, and on the other hand to insufficient control on the part of the teacher. The pupils often make phonetic errors when replacing the

back speech [ŋ] with the dorsal front speech [n], when replacing the back speech [ŋ] with combinations [ng] and [nk]. Furthermore, English fricative consonants are among the most difficult phonemes to learn and also cause difficulties for native English speakers.

Another distinguishing feature of English consonants is the apical-alveolar pronunciation of t, d, n, l compared to the dorsal-tooth articulation of the corresponding Ukrainian phonemes.

Due to the fact that English final voiced consonants do not lose their voicedness, thus revealing similarities with the Ukrainian language, there is a small percentage of errors associated with stunning the final voiced consonant (9% of cases), which is associated with the coincidence of the pronunciation norms of voiced consonants in both language systems.

In general, there is a certain dependence of the number of analysed types of errors in the pronunciation of students on the level of their prevalence in the speech of the teacher. In general, there is a certain dependence of the number of analysed types of errors in the pronunciation of students on the level of their prevalence in the speech of the teacher.

It must be stressed that the teacher will only be able to make error corrections as efficiently as possible if he has a clear understanding of the types of errors, how to work with them and the target group. It is assumed that the teacher can choose for himself the most productive way to work with error correction by answering the main question: For what purpose is it necessary to teach a foreign language? In answering this question, it is worthwhile to pay attention to the goals of teaching. Working on error correction is different in the following situations: to pass an exam / pass an interview; to improve the level of language skills (personal goals, to speak and understand better); to improve the level of language skills (personal goals, to get a promotion at work); to learn a foreign language as a compulsory subject (at school, university, etc.). The answer to the above question helps the teacher to define the goals of the lesson, the objectives of the course and to develop an integrated approach to teaching a particular target group. In addition, educators often raise the question of time for error correction. It is common knowledge that mistakes made in oral communication can be corrected immediately and delayed (i.e., later). Both ways have their advantages and disadvantages. Delayed correction allows the student to build up his statement freely without being distracted by correcting errors, and thus to concentrate only on the meaning and the lexical means necessary for its expression. The disadvantage of this procedure is that the student cannot see

the error report prepared by the teacher and given to him after class. In any case, even if the student has familiarised himself with his mistakes afterwards, it will be psychologically difficult for him to apply the acquired knowledge in practise because of the time lag. Some of the statements will have been forgotten, the student will not have participated in the correction, will not have made an effort. Many mistakes may have been made. Remembering all the correct options at the same time can be quite a challenge. By the end of the communication, the motivation to speak correctly is significantly reduced (if not gone). As for non-deferred error correction, firstly, it provides information about only one error per time unit (two or three at most). Secondly, it allows the student to participate in the correction of this error (or these errors) by repeating what he has just said, but correctly. The disadvantage of undelayed control is that the utterance is interrupted, the student goes astray and sometimes gets upset. Such error correction can have a negative impact on the student's desire to continue speaking the language they have learned. According to Kasper's [11, 52] findings, correction in the classroom is deemed essential by both teachers and students. However, there exists a range of opinions regarding the frequency and manner in which correction should be carried out. Some teachers may be reluctant to interrupt students, while some learners may feel that they are not corrected enough. Conversely, some students may find a correction to be disruptive and uncomfortable, particularly those who struggle with fluency and are anxious about making mistakes. This is particularly relevant as excessive correction can hinder rather than facilitate learning for certain individuals. Despite this, Zheng and Park [12] contend that immediate error correction is necessary to prevent fossilization in language learning, and modelling the correct form can be an effective strategy for teachers. Therefore, it is crucial to adopt a balanced approach to a correction that caters to the unique needs of each learner. Through comparative analysis of two languages, we can anticipate the influence of a learner's native language on their acquisition of a target language. This, in turn, will enable us to implement proactive measures to address potential issues.

Conclusion. Phonological fossilization is related to the difficulty in distinguishing all the sounds of the English language by ear, maintaining the length and shortness of vowels, the dorsal-tooth articulation of [t], [d], [n], [l] compared to the apical-alveolar pronunciation of the corresponding English phoneme, following the Ukrainian intonation, incorrect division of speech into meaningful groups, and so on.

In the article, we paid attention to the main differences in the phonological systems of the Ukrainian and English languages. We are convinced that based on the comparison described above, it is possible to predict the phonological peculiarities of the Anglo-Ukrainian interlingua. The distinct differences between Ukrainian and English vowels can create challenges for both Ukrainian and English speakers. The absence of diphthongs, triphthongs, and reduction in the Ukrainian language can make it difficult for speakers of either language to communicate clearly. Furthermore, the contrasting phonetic systems of the two languages, such as the correlation between length and shortness in English that is not present in Ukrainian, require careful attention to pronunciation skills.

When comparing the consonant pronunciation in these two languages, we can observe several distinct differences. First, the Ukrainian consonant system is more complex than English and has a more diverse range of consonant oppositions. It also includes clusters such as [ts], [tʃ], and [dʒ], which are not present in English. Second, in the Ukrainian language, palatalization plays a principal semantic role but in English it is absent. Third, the Ukrainian language features several "hard" consonants, such as "г" (h), "ж" (zh), and "ш" (shch), that do not exist in English. They are pronounced with greater force than the typical English consonant. Furthermore, English consonants are distinguished based on deafness-sonority, manner, place, organ of articulation, and predominance of noise or sound. Students often make errors in the pronunciation of certain sounds, such as interdental th, fricative combinations, and replacing [w] with [v]. Moreover, the apical-alveolar pronunciation of [t], [d], [n], and [l] in English compared to the dorsal-tooth articulation of the corresponding Ukrainian phonemes is another distinguishing feature. As experience shows, when pronouncing English consonants, the difficulty for students is precisely the correct placement of the point of articulation.

The differences between the phonological systems of Ukrainian and English can pose significant challenges for Ukrainian students when learning to speak English. In this article, we provided an overview of the differences in consonant and vowel systems between English and Ukrainian. The authors stress the significance of adopting a personalized approach to error correction for English language teaching that considers the individual requirements of each student for optimal results. Their study suggests that Ukrainian students can overcome phonological fossilization and attain native-level proficiency in the target language by taking necessary preventive measures.

Bibliography:

1. Selinker L. Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*. Vol. 10. Issue 1–4. 1972. p. 219–231.
2. Best C.T., McRoberts G.W., Goodell E. Discrimination of non-native consonant contrasts varying in perceptual assimilation to the listener's native phonological system. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 2001.
3. Bradlow A.R., Bent T. The clear speech effect for non-native listeners. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 2002.
4. Bradlow A.R., Pisoni D.B., Akahane-Yamada R., Tohkura Y. Training Japanese listeners to identify English /r/ and /l/: IV. Some effects of perceptual learning on speech production. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 1997.
5. Chaira S. Interference of First Language in Pronunciation of English Segmental Sounds. *English Education Journal (EEJ)*. 2015. 6(4), p. 469–483.
6. Cooke M., O. Scharenborg. The interspeech 2008 consonant challenge. *Proceedings of Interspeech, Brisbane, Australia*, p. 1765–1768.
7. Flege J.E. 1995. Second language speech learning: Theory, findings, and problems. In W. Strange (ed.), *Speech perception and linguistic experience: Issues in cross-language research*. Baltimore: York Press, 2008. p. 233–277.
8. Kotsyuk L. M. *English Language Error Analysis of the Written Texts Produced by Ukrainian Learners: Data Collection*. 2015.
9. *Contrastive Grammar: Theory and Practice* Порівняльна грамати́ка: теорія і практика: навч. посіб. / авт.-сост.: Н. Ф. Гладуш, Н. В. Павлюк; Київ. ун-т. ім. Б. Грінченка; Нац. ун-т «Києво-Могилянська акад.». К., 2019. 296 с.
10. Порівняльна типологія англійської та української мов: тези лекцій, завдання для семінарських занять, завдання для самостійної роботи, тестові завдання: Навчально-методичний посібник. Укл. Фраси́нюк Н.І. Кам'янець-Подільський: ТОВ «Друкарня «Рута», 2020. 158 с.
11. Kasper G. *Learning, Teaching and Communication in the Foreign Language Classroom*. Aarhus: University Press, 1996. 15.
12. Zheng, C., Park Tae-Ja. An analysis of errors in English writing made by Chinese and Korean university students. *Theory and Practise in Language Studies*, 3(2), 2013. p. 1342–1360. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.3.8.1342-1351>

Галаган Я. В., Безугла І. В., Лещінська А. В. ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ ФОНОЛОГІЧНОЇ ФОСІЛІЗАЦІЇ У ПРОЦЕСІ ОВОЛОДІННЯ АНГЛІЙСЬКОЮ МОВОЮ

У наш час процес глобалізації вимагає відмінного знання англійської мови у всіх сферах нашого життя. Згідно з останніми дослідженнями, рівень володіння англійською мовою в Україні посідає досить низьке місце, а саме 28 місце з 32 у Європі. Відмінності між фонологічними системами української та англійської мов можуть створити значні проблеми для українських студентів під час навчання англійської мови. Ми бачимо, що вони суттєво відрізняються в області вокалізму та консонантизму. У цій статті ми надали огляд загальних та специфічних відмінностей у системах приголосних і голосних англійської та української мов. Ця стаття підкреслює важливість розв'язання проблем вимови українських студентів під час вивчення англійської мови. Дослідження показали, що навчання англійської мови для українських студентів може бути складним через недостатню обізнаність щодо вимови деяких звуків, ритму, інтонації та вільного володіння мовою в природному середовищі. Цей недолік може призвести до високої частоти помилок і непорозуміння, що, у свою чергу, може призвести до психологічного бар'єру, який перешкоджає процесу навчання. Метою нашої роботи є виявлення найбільш типових помилок українських студентів на фонологічному рівні. Українські студенти найчастіше помиляються, мимоволі проводячи паралель із рідною мовою. Фонологічна фосилізація пов'язана з труднощами розрізнення на слух усіх звуків англійської мови, збереженням довготи й короткості голосних, дотриманням української інтонації, неправильним поділом мовлення на смислові групи, відсутність в українській мові дифтонгів, трифтонгів, редуції тощо. Важливо звернути особливу увагу на основні відмінності у фонологічних системах української та англійської мов. Авторами підкреслюється, що викладач повинен використовувати збалансований підхід до корекції помилок, який відповідає унікальним потребам кожного учня, щоб оптимізувати процес навчання англійської мови. Було зроблено висновок, що завдяки відповідним профілактичним заходам українські студенти можуть подолати фонологічну фосилізацію та досягти рівня володіння цільною мовою на рівні рідної.

Ключові слова: фонологічна фосилізація, голосні та приголосні звуки, рідна мова, цільна мова.

ЗМІСТ

УКРАЇНСЬКА МОВА

Бортун К. О.

ЗАСОБИ ВИРАЖЕННЯ КОНОТАТИВНОГО ЗНАЧЕННЯ У РЕЧЕННІ У РОМАНІ
НАТАЛКИ ДОЛЯК «ШИКАРНЕ ЖИТТЯ У ВУППЕРТАЛІ»..... 1

Гладченко А. М., Комарова О. С.

НЕОЛОГІЗАЦІЯ ЛЕКСИКИ У ПЕРІОД РОСІЙСЬКО-УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ ВІЙНИ..... 7

Громко Т. V.

ASPECT DICTIONARIES AS A REFLECTION OF MODERN LEXICOGRAPHIC
TECHNOLOGIES OF THE DESCRIPTION OF THE LINGUAL OF THE IDIOM..... 14

Гльченко О. А.

МЕТАФОРИЧНА МОДЕЛЬ ВІЙНИ В ПОЛІТИЧНОМУ ДИСКУРСІ УКРАЇНСЬКОГО
МЕДІАПРОСТОРУ 2014–2023 РР..... 21

Короткова Ю. М., Сабельникова Т. М.

ПОСИЛЕННЯ РОЛІ МОВИ Й МОВНОЇ ОСВІТИ В УМОВАХ ВОЄННОГО СТАНУ..... 26

Костусяк Н. М., Заваринська І. Ф., Римар Н. Ю.

СУЧАСНІ ТЕНДЕНЦІЇ ФУНКЦІОНУВАННЯ ВАРІАНТНИХ ФОРМ
ІМЕННИКІВ ЖІНОЧОГО РОДУ..... 31

Кулик О. Д.

КРЕАЛІЗОВАНИЙ ТЕКСТ ЯК ЗАСІБ РЕПРЕЗЕНТАЦІЇ КУЛЬТУРНИХ КОДІВ
(НА МАТЕРІАЛІ РЕКЛАМНИХ РОЛІКІВ КОМУНІКАЦІЙНОЇ КАМПАНІЇ
«СМІЛИВІСТЬ» / «БУДЬ СМІЛИВИМ, ЯК УКРАЇНА»)..... 37

Кучмак К. І.

ЕЛЕМЕНТАРНІ ПАРАДИГМАТИЧНІ КЛАСИ УКРАЇНСЬКИХ ВЛАСНИХ НАЗВ
ВОДНИХ ОБ'ЄКТІВ ЧОЛОВІЧОГО РОДУ ДРУГОЇ ВІДМІНИ М'ЯКОЇ ГРУПИ
В СУЧАСНІЙ УКРАЇНСЬКІЙ МОВІ..... 44

Лахно Н. В.

ПРОБЛЕМИ ЛЕКСИКОГРАФІЧНОГО ОПИСУ ЗВОРОТНИХ ДІСЛІВ..... 51

Межов О. Г.

ЕКСПРЕСИВНИЙ СИНТАКСИС ПОЕТИЧНОГО МОВЛЕННЯ ПРЕДСТАВНИКІВ
«ПРАЗЬКОЇ ШКОЛИ»..... 56

Пахненко І. І., Телетова С. Г.

ОСОБЛИВОСТІ ФУНКЦІОНУВАННЯ ОНІМІВ В АНЕКДОТАХ 63

Польовик Д. В.

СПОРТИВНІ СЛЕНГІЗМИ В СУЧАСНОМУ УКРАЇНСЬКОМУ
ГАЗЕТНОМУ ДИСКУРСІ..... 69

Романчук С. М.

КУЛЬТУРА МОВЛЕННЯ СТУДЕНТІВ ЯК ЛІНГВОКОГНІТИВНА Й МОРАЛЬНА
ПРОБЛЕМА: ЗМІНА АКЦЕНТІВ ПІСЛЯ ПОВНОМАСШТАБНОГО
ВТОРГНЕННЯ РОСІЇ В УКРАЇНУ..... 76

Степанова С. Є.

ЗАСОБИ ВИРАЖЕННЯ СОЦІАЛЬНОГО СТАТУСУ ХУДОЖНІХ ПЕРСОНАЖІВ
ОПОВІДАННЯ В. ВИННИЧЕНКА «КОНТРАСТИ»..... 81

Фецко І. М. МЕТАФОРИЧНЕ ПЕРЕНЕСЕННЯ ЯК СПОСІБ ТЕРМІНОТВОРЕННЯ В ПРИРОДНИЧОМУЗЕЙНІЙ ГАЛУЗІ ПІД ЧАС ВТОРИННОЇ НОМІНАЦІЇ.....	86
Шатілова Н. О. ПОРІВНЯННЯ В МОВНО-ОБРАЗНІЙ СИСТЕМІ ХУДОЖНЬОГО ТЕКСТУ (НА МАТЕРІАЛІ ТВОРІВ СИДОРА ВОРОБКЕВИЧА).....	92
Юносова В. О. ЕМОЦІЙНО-ЕКСПРЕСИВНА ЛЕКСИКА НА ПОЗНАЧЕННЯ НАЗВ ОСІБ У РОМАНІ ЛЮКО ДАШВАР «РАЙ.ЦЕНТР».....	98
СЛОВ'ЯНСЬКІ МОВИ	
Голі-Оглу Т. В., Жижома О. О. СИСТЕМА ДІЄСЛІВНИХ ФОРМ ДАВНЬОРУСЬКОЇ МОВИ В «СЛОВІ ПРО КНЯЗІВ».....	106
РОМАНСЬКІ ТА ГЕРМАНСЬКІ МОВИ	
Aksiutina T. V. SPEECH ETIQUETTE PATTERNS AS REGULATORS OF COMMUNICATIVE BEHAVIOR IN ENGLISH AND UKRAINIAN LANGUAGES.....	111
Архіпова І. М. КОМУНІКАТИВНО-ПРАГМАТИЧНИЙ ПІДХІД ДО ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ АВТОРСЬКОГО ВІДСТУПУ.....	117
Ahmadova V. H. DEVELOPMENT OF LEXICAL COHESION OF GERMAN IN WRITING.....	124
Василенко І. О., Малінко О. Г. ДЕСПЕЦІАЛІЗАЦІЯ ЕКОНОМІЧНИХ ТЕРМІНІВ У ХУДОЖНЬОМУ ТА ПУБЛІЦИСТИЧНОМУ ДИСКУРСАХ.....	128
Halahan Ya. V., Bezuhla I. V., Leshchinska A. V. STUDY OF PHONOLOGICAL FOSSILIZATION IN THE PROCESS OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION.....	134
Gryshkova R. O. TENDENCIES OF CREATING ANGLOPHONE ERGONYMS IN MODERN ENGLISH-SPEAKING WORLD.....	141
Humeniuk N. H. PRAGMA-COMMUNICATIVE ASPECT OF THE PRESIDENT ZELENSKY SPEECH BEFORE THE US CONGRESS, 12.21.2022	147
Казимір І. С. ГІПЕРО-ГІПОНІМІЧНІ ВІДНОШЕННЯ КОНТЕКСТУАЛЬНИХ СИНОНІМІВ В СУЧАСНОМУ БРИТАНСЬКОМУ ГАЗЕТНОМУ ДИСКУРСІ.....	157
Карпушина М. Г., Комарницька О. І. ОСОБЛИВОСТІ ЦИРКУЛЮВАННЯ ФРАЗОВИХ ДІЄСЛІВ У ПРИКОРДОННОМУ ДИСКУРСІ.....	163
Катеринич П. В., Дубровський Р. О., Кіндрась І. В. МОВА ВОРОЖОСТІ В ПУБЛІЦИСТИЧНОМУ ДИСКУРСІ (НА МАТЕРІАЛІ ТЕКСТІВ TELEGRAM).....	170

Косович О. В. СУЧАСНА ФУТБОЛЬНА ТЕРМІНОЛОГІЯ ФРАНЦУЗЬКОЇ ТА АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ МОВ: АНАЛІЗ ОСНОВНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ ФОРМУВАННЯ.....	178
Львова Н. Л., Петренко О. Д. СТРУКТУРНІ ОСОБЛИВОСТІ ТА СПОСОБИ ПЕРЕКЛАДУ АНГЛОМОВНИХ БЛЕНДІВ.....	185
П'єсцук О. І. КОНЦЕПТ <i>СОЦІАЛЬНА СФЕРА СПОЛУЧЕНОГО КОРОЛІВСТВА</i> : ПРОДУКТИВНІ МЕТАФОРИЧНІ МОДЕЛІ.....	190
Черненко О. В. ІНТРАПЕРСОНАЛЬНИЙ КОНФЛІКТ У СУЧАСНОМУ ХУДОЖНЬОМУ ТА КІНОДИСКУРСІ: СЕМІОТИЧНИЙ АСПЕКТ.....	198
Ярова Л. О. КУЛЬТУРНО-МАРКОВАНІ ЕЛЕМЕНТИ У ЗАГОЛОВКАХ МЕРЕЖИВИХ НОВИНИХ ТЕКСТІВ.....	208
ТЮРСЬКІ МОВИ	
Allahverdieva G. Z. LEXICO-SEMANTIC FIELD “WEDDING” IN AZERBAIJANIAN LANGUAGE.....	213
Хаяла Мугамат ВЛИЯНИЕ ЛЕКСИЧЕСКОГО ОФОРМЛЕНИЯ ОРХОНО-ЕНИСЕЙСКИХ ПАМЯТНИКОВ НА РУССКИЙ ЯЗЫК.....	218
СЕМІТСЬКА МОВА	
Melikov T. P. METHODS OF THE FORMATION OF NEOLOGISMS IN ARABIC.....	225
КЛАСИЧНІ МОВИ. ОКРЕМІ ІНДОЄВРОПЕЙСЬКІ МОВИ	
Чакал І. С. АВТОРСЬКІ ДІЄСЛІВНІ НОВОТВОРИ В РОМАНІ АХІЛЛА ТАТІЯ (ФУНКЦІЙНО-СЕМАНТИЧНИЙ АСПЕКТ).....	231
ЗАГАЛЬНЕ МОВОЗНАВСТВО	
Karachova D. V., Ahibalova T. M., Kalashnyk O. V. IMPACT OF GLOBALIZING TRANSFORMATIONS OF GENDER LINGUISTICS IN THE FIELD OF TRANSLATION AND GENERAL LINGUISTICS.....	238
Круть О. В. РОЛЬ БАЗИСІВ В ОНОМАСІОЛОГІЧНІЙ СТРУКТУРІ НАЙМЕНУВАННЯ НА ПОЗНАЧЕННЯ АГРЕСІЇ.....	243
Sobor A. B. TYPES OF BILINGUALISM AND THE POSSIBILITIES OF THEIR PRACTICAL APPLYING	248
Сушко О. І., Ковальова Г. М. КОДУВАННЯ ДЕРЖАВОТВОРЧОЇ ФУНКЦІЇ МОВИ В СЕМАНТИЦІ ФРАЗЕОЛОГІЗМІВ ТЕКСТІВ ДОКУМЕНТІВ ПЕРШОЇ ПОЛОВИНИ ХХ СТОЛІТТЯ.....	253

ПЕРЕКЛАДОЗНАВСТВО

Ababilova N. M. CHALLENGES OF LITERARY TRANSLATION AND ITS EDITING.....	258
Верезубенко М. М. ЗАСТОСУВАННЯ ПЕРЕКЛАДАЦЬКИХ ТРАНСФОРМАЦІЙ У ПЕРЕКЛАДІ ТЕКСТІВ НАУКОВО-ТЕХНІЧНОГО СТИЛЮ В МОВНІЙ ПАРІ НІМЕЦЬКА – УКРАЇНСЬКА.....	264
Галайбіда О. В., Марчишина А. А. СТРАТЕГІЇ ПЕРЕКЛАДУ УКРАЇНСЬКОЮ МОВОЮ ПОЕМИ Г. ЛОНГФЕЛЛО «ПІСНЯ ПРО ГАЙВАТУ»	269
Derik I. M. ON THE ISSUE OF THE PECULIARITIES OF CHINESE DIPLOMATIC DISCOURSE TRANSLATION INTO ENGLISH.....	274
Єлісеєва С. В. ОСОБЛИВОСТІ ЗАЛУЧЕННЯ ПЕРЕКЛАДАЧА ТА ДЕЯКІ АСПЕКТИ ПЕРЕКЛАДУ ПІД ЧАС ПРОВЕДЕННЯ СУДОВОЇ КРИМІНАЛЬНОЇ ЕКСПЕРТИЗИ	281
Линтвар О. М., Плетенецька Ю. М. СПЕЦИФІКА ПЕРЕКЛАДУ МОРСЬКОГО ЖАРГОНУ (НА МАТЕРІАЛІ ПОВІСТІ Р. КІПЛІНГА «ЗУХВАЛІ КАПІТАНИ»).....	288
Максимова А. Я. ТЕМАТИЧНА КЛАСИФІКАЦІЯ НЕОЛОГІЗМІВ У БРИТАНСЬКІЙ ПРЕСІ.....	294
Пашко С. В. АФРИКАНСЬКО-АМЕРИКАНСЬКИЙ ДІАЛЕКТ АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ МОВИ.....	299
Прищеп О. П. ЗАСОБИ ВІДТВОРЕННЯ КОМІЧНОГО В УКРАЇНСЬКОМУ ПЕРЕКЛАДІ Н. ГОРДІЄНКО-АНДРІАНОВОЇ РОМАНУ Б. БРЕХТА «ДІЛА ПАНА ЮЛІЯ ЦЕЗАРЯ»....	304
ВІДОМОСТІ ПРО АВТОРІВ.....	310