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ABSTRACT

Being able to speak English with comprehensible pronunciation is key to communicative competency, yet pronunciation is one of the most difficult parts of learning English as a second language. English Language Learners (ELLs) are not receiving enough effective pronunciation instruction to correct their fossilized pronunciation errors. Currently, ESL teachers often lack effective tools and training in how to teach pronunciation. The purpose of this project is to give ESL teachers specific tools to help de-fossilize their ELLs persistent pronunciation errors. This literature review discusses five different linguistic theories that explore the journey and the obstacles (fossilization) in second language phonological acquisition: the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis, the Noticing Hypothesis, the interlanguage system, the Selective Fossilization Hypothesis and the Markedness Differential Hypothesis. This paper includes a detailed teachers handbook that incorporates many key elements from the linguistic theories mentioned. In addition, this handbook illustrates how to use contextualized authentic material to de-fossilize common ELL pronunciation errors. Teaching students how to defossilize their English pronunciation errors requires the right tools, proper teacher training, and consistent practice in and outside of the classroom. At the end of this paper a number of recommendations are suggested on how to reinforce the ELL’s pronunciation progress made in the classroom.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The number one goal for most English Language Learners (ELLs) is to communicate successfully with other English speakers. For ELLs, being in a conversation with other speakers who clearly have perplexed facial expressions and repeatedly say “pardon?”, “what?” or “say again” can be very demoralizing to the speaker and frustrating to the listener. However, one of the biggest obstacles for ELLs is being misunderstood due to incorrect pronunciation. While it is paramount in communicative competency (Nair, 2017), pronunciation is one of the most difficult parts of learning English. Most researchers stress the importance of intelligibility and comprehensibility over degree of second language accent (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010; Scarcella & Oxford, 1992). Still, the goal of pronunciation should not be for the ELL to sound like a native speaker but instead to master the pronunciation that facilitates communication (Scarcella & Oxford, 1992).

Speaking to someone and obviously not being understood can be frustrating, humiliating, and even sabotaging. This can cause the learner to shut down all communication. Even though mastering pronunciation is an essential component of an ELL’s competency journey, the feelings of embarrassment and frustration can result in an ELL being reluctant to work on furthering their speaking and pronunciation skills, which leads to fossilization, or even abandoning their second language acquisition journey. (Bernal Castañeda, 2017; Scarcella & Oxford, 1992).
The Unabridged Random House dictionary defines fossilization as:

Ling. (0f a linguistic form, feature, rule, etc.) to become permanently established in the interlanguage of a second language learner in a form that is deviant from the target-language norm and that continues to appear in performance regardless of further exposure to the target language (p. 755).

According to Han (2004:23), most researchers believe that second language fossilization involves a roadblock or impediment to optimal learning or progress to second language acquisition. In fact, many researchers believe that the learners’ interlanguage is key to where fossilization occurs (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010). Selinker’s (1972) seminal study of fossilization illustrates that interlanguage (the evolving language between learners native language and the target language) plateaus may occur regardless of the amount of exposure to the target language. Specifically, linguistic items, rules, and or subsystems of their native language can fossilize in their interlanguage even when it does not correctly apply in the target language.

Temporary fossilization has been described as language errors/plateaus that are fixed in the interlanguage at a certain stage and only 5% of ESL learners will gain complete access to the target language leaving 95% to fall short (Qain & Xiao, 2010). In addition, many second language acquisition researchers believe fossilization is both an integral part of the interlanguage system and heavily influenced by the learner’s native language (Han, 2004). Brown (2007) states that fossilization is a normal stage in a second language learners acquisition journey and should not be looked upon as terminal or unchangeable, but it still can create personal and professional challenges.

When ELLs have fossilized pronunciation errors, they may struggle in the workplace due to the fear of possibly not being understood. A second language learners’ fossilized
pronunciation errors may impede social interactions, slow down academic success, and negatively affect job attainment and/or job promotion (Hinofotois & Baily, 1980; Varasararin, 2007). Pronunciation errors may also contribute to embarrassing social and transactional miscommunications and may slow down an ELL’s acculturation process. When ELLs have fossilized pronunciation errors, they often are reluctant to speak in the workplace for fear of not being easily understood. Fossilized pronunciation may also hinder an immigrant’s acculturation process (Han, 2004; Schumann, 1978). This acculturation process is especially important for adult learners.

Many psycholinguists believe that certain language tools are more effective for younger ELL students which could explain the increased rate of fossilization in adult ELL learners (Al-Shormani, 2013). Sociolinguists have argued that adult learners do not have as many social opportunities to practice their language, which results in a higher rate of incorrectly remembered language structures and pronunciations (Al-Shormani, 2013). Making the matter of fossilization more complicated, research shows that fossilization varies from learner to learner based on the learners’ cognitive abilities, first language, and maturational constraints (Han, 2013).

Most learners want better and more frequent English pronunciation instruction (Pardo, 2004); however, few teachers know how to help these learners push past this stage of fossilized pronunciation. Although many ESL teachers try to incorporate some pronunciation teaching in their classrooms, most teachers are not properly trained in teaching English pronunciation (Couper, 2006). Moreover, teaching materials and texts in the field of SLA speech production and pronunciation are extremely lacking. The most widely used second language textbooks are often void in effective pronunciation teaching (Derwing & Munro, 2005). Many second
language acquisition textbooks encourage teachers to look at their students’ native languages when mapping out how to teach and/or de-fossilize current pronunciation errors (Avery & Ehrlich, 2012; Celce-Murcia et al., 2010). Pronunciation teaching is often neglected because many teachers do not feel as confident teaching pronunciation as they do grammar and vocabulary and they do not know how to incorporate proper pronunciation teaching into their second language curriculum (Derwing & Munro, 2005). In other words, these teachers lack the skills to determine the appropriate and most effective ways to improve their specific student’s pronunciation (Gilbert, 2008).

The goal of pronunciation instruction should be teaching learners how to speak English so they are easily understood, not to gain a native-like accent (Gilbert, 2008). However, the problem is that ELLs are not receiving enough effective pronunciation instruction to correct their fossilized pronunciation errors. This is because ESL teachers often lack the training and tools to retrain fossilization or pronunciation errors in their students.

**Purpose of the Project**

The purpose of this project is to give ESL teachers the tools needed to help de-fossilize second language students’ persistent pronunciation errors and help the students improve their pronunciation skills for successful communication. The focus of this handbook is for students to produce accurate English pronunciation in a spontaneous setting, not just from reading a dialogue or doing focused pronunciation exercises. The tools in this comprehensive handbook are designed specifically for ESL teachers in community colleges or adult non-credit classes who are teaching intermediate and higher level students from all nationalities. This handbook includes
detailed lesson plans illustrating how teachers can successfully utilize the most current
Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) pronunciation teaching techniques (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010) and integrate prosody into their lesson plans (Gilbert, 2008).

To reiterate, the ability for ESL students to pronounce English words correctly is key to their success in achieving communicative competency. Many researchers describe three key factors to successful ESL communication (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010; Derwing & Munro, 2005; Field, 2005).

1. Intelligibility – the extent to which the listener understands what is spoken.
2. Comprehensibility – the listener’s perception of how difficult it is to comprehend what is spoken.
3. Accentedness – the listener’s perception of how much of what is spoken is different from the speaker’s L1.

In terms of successful communication, most researchers stress the importance of intelligibility and comprehensibility over accentedness (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010). According to Derwing & Munro (2005), it would be disheartening to English language learners to strive for a native accent; rather it is better for ESL teachers to help their students set realistic pronunciation goals.

As such, the lessons in this handbook focus mainly on intelligibility and comprehensibility in pronunciation rather than attempting to have students strive for a native accent.

This handbook also gives ESL teachers, those experienced and inexperienced in teaching pronunciation, the tools they need to successfully help ELLs de-fossilize their pronunciation errors. Each lesson plan in the handbook focuses on some of the most common ELL pronunciation errors; /t/ vs. /th/ as in ‘tank’ and ‘thank’, /v/ vs. /w/ as in ‘vine’ and ‘wine’, and
/iy/ vs. /I/ as in ‘beans’ and ‘bins’. These three minimal pairs, two consonant pairs, and one vowel pair, were chosen because they represent common pronunciation errors for learners from many different countries. Furthermore, the lesson plans incorporate the following teaching methods:

- Contrastive examples
- Inductive generalization
- Recognition exercises
- Production exercises

In addition, the handbook includes “listen and imitate” exercises, phonetic instructional videos, contextualized minimal-pair drills using authentic materials and developmental approximation drills. The handbook demonstrates innovative ways to encourage learners’ accurate perception and production of English language sounds.

**Theoretical Framework**

This field project is supported by the framework of Communicative Language Teaching. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) is an approach to second language teaching that focuses on learners using the target language with the number one goal of communicative competency (Celce-Murcia et al., 2014; Savignon, 2017). CLT embraces the interactive nature of using the target language in all forms of communication, whether it is reading, writing, speaking or listening (Savignon, 1987).

Before CLT became the new and innovative way to teach a second language, the grammar translation and audio lingual methods were the way most people learned English as a
second language. The biggest problems with these methods was that although students could use English appropriately in class, once they were outside of class, they were not able to use English effectively or confidently (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2013). In response to the shortcomings of the audiolingual and grammar translation methods, the CLT became increasingly popular in Europe and the United States during the 1970s and to this day. Unlike the grammar translation and audio lingual methods, CLT puts grammar rules in the background and active second language communication learning in the foreground (Savignon, 1987).

Some of the key components to CLT are grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence and strategic competence (Canale & Swain, 1980). According to Brown (2007) the following four characteristics best describe CLT:

1. The main goal of the classroom is communicative fluency, not grammatical or linguistic competence.
2. Authentic contextualized materials are used for real life needs of the students, often in pairs or small groups.
3. Fluency and accuracy take a backseat to communicative competency.
4. ELLs use the target language productively and receptively without prior rehearsal.

Learners may benefit greatly and improve their speaking comprehensibility if they are taught pronunciation using the CLT method, especially if the errors are framed as unintelligible rather than not having a native accent (Ivanović, 2019). In addition, using CLT to teach pronunciation (and correct fossilized errors) can be very effective especially if it is combined
with other repetitive, pronunciation drills (Isaacs, 2009). CLT encourages ELLs to be an active and communicative part of their second language acquisition journey.

**Significance of the Project**

Being understood by native speakers is essential to English language learners (ELLs). For most ELLs, proper and intelligible pronunciation is one of the most difficult parts of second language acquisition (Ivanović, 2019). While comprehensible pronunciation is key to communicative fluency, it is often the most overlooked area of teaching a second language (Derwing & Munro, 2005). Moreover, most English as a Second Language classes do not provide enough effective pronunciation teaching. Consequently, many ELLs have an ongoing struggle with fossilizing pronunciation errors.

The significance of this project is that ESL teachers will be provided an innovative handbook which includes contextualized authentic material on how to de-fossilize common ELL pronunciation errors. This handbook gives ESL teachers the tools they need to teach their students how to relearn words that were previously fossilized. Having a state-of-the-art handbook may give ESL teachers the confidence to teach pronunciation on a more frequent and regular basis.

This is significant to the TESOL community since teaching pronunciation has often been the neglected step-child of ESL teaching. Most second language learners have difficulty with English pronunciation, and this improper pronunciation often impairs the communication process. Effective teacher handbooks are significant because nothing is more important to the English learner than being understood in a conversation.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Many English language learners (ELLs), research shows, find speaking English with comprehensible pronunciation challenging and often frustrating (Bernal Castañeda, 2017; Scarcella & Oxford, 1992). If the necessary teaching interventions are not made, pronunciation errors can escalate from being challenging to fossilized. This ultimately undermines effective communication. Even though fossilization is a common occurrence in second language acquisition, the problem is that ELLs are not receiving enough effective pronunciation instruction to correct these fossilized pronunciation errors. To facilitate defossilizing pronunciation errors (Derwing & Munro, 2005; Gilbert, 2008) and to help ELLs become more confident English speakers, English as a second language teachers need more training and better tools.

To elucidate the kind of training needed, this literature review discusses five different linguistic theories that explore the journey and the obstacles (fossilization) in second language phonological acquisition: the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis, the Noticing Hypothesis, the interlanguage system, the Selective Fossilization Hypothesis and the Markedness Differential Hypothesis. These theories support the choice and creation of the teaching tools and instructions outlined in this field project handbook.
The first theory, Contrastive Analysis, asserts that a learner’s native language is the biggest obstacle and creates the most interference to second language acquisition (Brown, 2007; Celce-Murcia et al., 2010; Khalifa, 2018). Contrastive Analysis compares the learner’s native language and the learner’s target language with the purpose of isolating and discovering potential errors during second language acquisition (Gass, 2013).

The second theory reviewed concerning second language acquisition is Schmidt’s (1990) Noticing Hypothesis. Schmidt claims that lack of attention to erroneous grammatical, lexical and/or phonological forms can lead to stabilization in the learner’s interlanguage (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010; Tajeddin & Tabatabaeian, 2017).

The third important theory discussed is interlanguage. In 1972, Selinker defined and expanded the concept of the interlanguage system as a language that is neither an ELL’s native language nor the target language but a unique language system somewhere in between the L1 and the target language. Most second language acquisition researchers agree that fossilized errors occur in an ELL’s interlanguage system (Han, 2004).

The fourth theory, the Selective Fossilization Hypothesis, builds on the concept of interlanguage and claims that fossilization is highly selective and there is an interrelationship between an ELL’s native language, the target language input and the target language production (Han, 2009).

The last theory discussed is Eckman’s (1977) Markedness Differential Hypothesis (MCH), which is arguably the premier theory on markedness (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010;
Colantoni & Steele, 2008). MCH takes key concepts of the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis and integrates the theory of typological markedness (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010; Khalifa, 2018). The MCH will be the foundation for much of the field project handbook.

The Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis

One of the most enduring theories of second language pronunciation acquisition is the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010). In Robert Lado’s (1957) seminal work on Contrastive Analysis (CA), he claimed that the biggest obstacle to second language acquisition is the interference of the learner’s native language systems (sound, morphological, syntactic and cultural) on the target language systems (Brown 2007, Celce-Murcia et al., 2010; Gass 2013, Khalifa 2018). In addition, proponents of CA assert that linguists can predict and describe what difficulties an ELL will have, like the cause of producing erroneous utterances, based on comparing their native language to their target language (Brown, 2007; Celce-Murcia et al., 2010).

Three key concepts of CA (Gass 2013, Khalifa 2018) are:

1. An ELL’s errors in production and reception of the target language (TL) are mostly due to interference from their native language (NL).
2. The greater the differences in an ELL’s NL compared to the TL, the more errors the ELL will commit in the TL.
3. How much difficulty or ease an ELL will have in acquiring a second language is determined by the similarities and differences between the NL and the TL.
Although linguists initially embraced the concepts of CA, many researchers later criticized the theory for being:

1. Oversimplified and blaming most ELL’s L2 errors on the learner’s NL.
2. Concluded the learner’s differences equals learner’s difficulties.
3. Lacked empirical evidence that the learner’s NL is the greatest influencer/inhibitor of second language acquisition (Brown, 2007; Gass, 2013; Han, 2004).

Ronald Wardhaugh (1972) was one of the most prominent opponents of the original theory of CA (referred to as the strong version). Wardhaugh asserted that using CA to accurately predict what second language learners’ errors would be was neither practical nor achievable (Al-Sobhi, 2019). Instead, Wardhaugh (1972) claimed that contrastive analysis of a learner’s L1 (the target language and the possible interference of the L1), was best used to observe errors already made rather than to predict future errors (Brown, 2007). Wardhaugh coined this modified interpretation of contrastive analysis as the ‘weak version’ of contrastive analysis.

Although today many linguistic researchers de-emphasize the impact that NL interference plays in second language acquisition, most agree analyzing the interference from a learner’s NL is justifiable and may be helpful in second language pronunciation acquisition (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010; Celce-Murcia et al., 2014).
The Noticing Hypothesis

An important factor to fossilization is whether the learner’s process of acquiring these fossilized errors takes place on a conscious level with the ELL or on an unconscious level without the learner realizing. This leads us to the highly debated Noticing Hypothesis.

After the Contrastive Analysis period in the mid-century, many second language acquisition (SLA) researchers started focusing on learner’s awareness and consciousness of acquiring a second language. Schmidt’s (1990) seminal psychological research and theory on how consciousness and input processing relates to second language acquisition is known as the Noticing Hypothesis (1990). Schmidt’s Noticing Hypothesis addresses three second language acquisition (SLA) questions (Schmidt 1990):

1. Is conscious awareness at the noticing level necessary for SLA?
2. Is it required to pay attention in order to learn a second language?
3. Is the learner hypothesis based on conscious input or an unconscious process?

The Noticing Hypothesis claims awareness through attention is required for noticing and is essential for learning a second language (Gass, 2013). Furthermore, the Noticing Hypothesis stresses the importance of the subjective experience of a second language learner taking target language input and converting it into meaningful target language intake (Han, 2004). Schmidt theorized in his Noticing Hypothesis that lack of attention to erroneous grammatical, lexical and/or phonological forms can lead to stabilization in the learner’s interlanguage (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010; Tajeddin & Tabatabaieian, 2017).
ELLs often have trouble hearing the English sounds correctly because they are hearing it through their L1 sound system (Avery & Ehrlich, 2012). Noticing in second language acquisition refers to when a second language learner is aware of the difference between the learner’s interlanguage and the target language (Gass, 2013). An ELL’s ability to notice the difference between their own L2 pronunciation versus those proficient English speakers will allow greater success in English pronunciation acquisition (Derwing & Munro, 2005). In other words, correct perception of the sound is essential before correct production can occur. The production of a learner’s output is in direct response to the input and when learners notice the difference of their output (after receiving feedback) and reformulate their initial utterances. This promotes language development and is in the forefront of the learner’s interlanguage (Swain & Lapkin, 1995).

The concept of learners being able to notice the gap between their interlanguage and the target language is key to defossilization (Tajeddin & Tabatabaeian, 2017). In one study done by Tajeddin & Tabatabaeian (2017), they had advanced second language learners’ focus on the fossilized forms they tended to produce. When the written and spoken productions of the learners were analyzed, 3,796 erroneous forms were observed. When making a conscious effort, ELLs could notice 37.4% of the 3,796 fossilized forms they had produced. The results showed that noticing affected the number of fossilized forms the learners produce. The more errors they noticed, the fewer errors they tended to produce. Tajeddin & Tabatabaeian (2017) asserted that having students notice their errors can result in fewer fossilized forms. Moreover, the better a learner notices forms, the fewer fossilized forms they will produce. They concluded that if
fossilized features go unnoticed, learners could possibly not recognize the teachers recasts and this would inhibit the defossilization process. This study emphasized how critical noticing and paying attention to errors is in the second language acquisition process and the process of defossilizing errors.

Research shows that assisting the learner to notice the incorrect utterance is key to repairing and defossilizing the error (Brown & Lee, 2015). It is through interactions with the instructor (e.g. recasts, negotiations, and prompts) that a learner is able to focus on the error and initiate repair (Brown & Lee, 2015; Gass, 2013).

**Interlanguage and the Fossilization Hypothesis**

As stated in Chapter I, currently ELLs are not receiving enough effective pronunciation instruction to correct their fossilized pronunciation errors. An important question to ask is this: “Where do these fossilized pronunciation errors start in an ELL’s journey to English fluency?” Most second language acquisition researchers agree that fossilized errors occur in an ELL’s interlanguage system (Han, 2004). In 1972, Selinker brought to the forefront of the linguistic world the concept of learners’ interlanguage system, which is a language that is neither an ELL’s native language nor the target language. Selinker asserted that the ELL’s interlanguage is a unique, active language system that lies in between the ELL’s first language and the target language (Selinker, 1972).

According to Selinker, the interlanguage system contains an internal construction of grammar rules, structures and pronunciation rules that may or may not be the correct rules of the
target language. Selinker’s description of interlanguage maintains that it includes the following characteristics:

1. **Systematic** – at every stage in the ELL’s language development the learner continually processes input by using their own interlanguage governed rules.

2. **Dynamic** - the unique and mercurial nature of the interim phonology and grammar rules.

3. **Variable** – the rules in the learners’ IL are not fixed at any stage, rather they are open to change.

4. **Reduced system** – the grammatical structures are less complex than either the L1 or the TL.

A key claim to Selinker’s Interlanguage Hypothesis is that when ELLs attempt meaningful communication (spontaneously), this interlanguage communication is systematic in all aspects of language; phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics.

The Fossilization Hypothesis addresses the cognitive and the behavioral reasons why so many ELLs never reach native-like fluency. Selinker’s seminal Fossilization Hypothesis claims that regardless of the amount of ESL instruction and exposure to the target language, the majority of ELLs will fall short of native-like fluency. He maintains that 95% of ELLs, regardless of their age or motivation, will not attain native fluency. He asserts that the 5% of ELLs who do achieve native fluency have reactivated their cognitive latent language structure. The latent language structure is a biological, already formulated arrangement in the brain (Lenneberg, 1967). According to Selinker (1972), the fossilization mechanism exists in the brain.
in a latent psychological structure (as cited in Han, 2013). Selinker asserts that most second language learners—the 95%—use a more general cognitive process called the latent psychological structure (LPS). He defines LPS as an ‘already formulating arrangement in the brain’. The LPS contains five central processes which are key to understanding fossilization and second language learning (Selinker, 1972). These processes are the following:

1. **Native Language transfer** – is the propensity to transfer the language rules and phonology from the native language to the TL.

2. **Transfer-of-training** – occurs when an ELL is taught by teachers and or textbooks to use only one form of an aspect of English even though the learner was exposed to multiple forms. For example, an ELL who learns the he/she distinction but in all the textbooks and teaching materials only the “he” pronoun was used. The learner concludes in his or her interlanguage that using “he” (instead of the appropriate he or she) all of the time is acceptable.

3. **Strategies of second-language learning** - a conscious attempt for an ELL to learn the TL. This can be memorizing verb conjugations, textbook dialogues or other second language acquisition tools. Although often successful, ELLs can use these strategies incorrectly repeatedly.

4. **Strategies of second-language communication** – in an attempt to speak the TL without hesitation and keep a conversation flowing, a learner will avoid articles, plural forms and past forms in the TL.

5. **Overgeneralization of TL rules** – is a common phenomenon where an ELL takes the application of a TL rule to items that are excluded from the rule. For example,
overgeneralizing the past tense -ed “What did he wanted to say?”

Moreover, in Selinker’s (1972) groundbreaking work, he suggests second language acquisition researchers should focus on ELLs attempts to produce the target language. He points out that there are three types of ELL utterances that will fall into one of the five central processes mentioned above. The ELL will produce an utterance in:

1) the ELL’s native language

2) the ELL’s interlanguage, or

3) correctly in the target language.

From these utterances Selinker suggests that ELLs’ interlanguages and fossilizations are directly connected to the ELLs’ latent psychological structure (LPS). The LPS is an important element in the fossilization process because Selinker claimed most ELLs use these general cognitive processes in the LPS to: transfer native language to target language, transfer-of-training, strategies of second language learning, strategies of second language communication and over generalization of target language rules when acquiring a second language. Thus, the interlanguage system that ELLs develop may lead to the fossilization of pronunciation errors.

The Selective Fossilization Hypothesis

In the last 40 years, many researchers have looked for more answers to how SLA fossilization works and the linguistic characteristics of fossilization. Since fossilization can be extremely selective and vary greatly from one learner to another, most recent research has
focused on the selectivity of fossilization and how fossilization in meaning and usage is a greater challenge for ELLs than a simple fossilized unit or decontextualized utterance (Han, 2004; Han & Lew, 2012). Han’s Selective Fossilization Hypothesis (2009) is widely regarded as the most current and comprehensive analysis of second language acquisition fossilization.

The Selective Fossilization Hypothesis asserts that there is an interconnection and interactivity between the target language construction, the target language input, and the native language influence (Han, 2009). According to Han, the Selective Fossilization Hypothesis (SPH) recognizes the mixtures of the L1 markedness and the target language robustness as catalysts to second language acquisition and fossilization.

The key characteristics of the SPH are:

1. Fossilization is selective.
2. Fossilization affects the learning systems, meanings and functions in the interlanguage.
3. Fossilization is stimulated by the L1 and created or fortified by target language input traits.
4. Fossilization is most prolific when an ELL attempts his own meaning during spontaneous production.
The Selective Fossilization Hypothesis allows beneficial insight into how fossilization affects second language acquisition and how fossilization is influenced by a learner’s native language and created or strengthened by the target language input.

**The Markedness Differential Hypothesis**

The modern idea of markedness started in the Prague School by Trubetzkoy (1939), Jakobson (1941) and other linguists as a way of identifying binary oppositions (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010). The concept of markedness suggests a ranking for phonological oppositions between certain phonological sounds such as; voiced and voiceless, nasalized and oral vowels, and open and closed syllables (Khalifa, 2018). Arguably, the premier theory on markedness in terms of second language phonological acquisition is Eckman’s (1987) markedness differential hypothesis (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010; Colantoni & Steele, 2008).

The Markedness Differential Hypothesis is a direct response to the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis and builds on the concepts of Contrastive Analysis (CA) by integrating the theory of typological markedness (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010; Khalifa, 2018). Eckman’s Markedness Differential Hypothesis (MDH) proposes that the more marked a structure, the more difficult it is to learn and conversely the more unmarked a structure the easier it is to learn. Eckman (1977, p.321) asserts these following key MDH properties will predict second language acquisition difficulties.

1. Those parts of the target language that vary from the learners L1 and are more marked than the L1 will be difficult.
2. The areas and degree of difficulty in the target language that are more marked than the L1 will directly relate to the degree of markedness.
3. Those areas of the target language that are different than the L, yet are not more marked than the L1, will not be difficult.

In addition, according to Eckman MDH asserts that the degree of difficulty directly corresponds to the concept of typological markedness. Edkman (1985, p. 290) defines typological markedness this way:

A phenomenon or structure X in some language is relatively more marked than some other phenomenon or structure Y if cross-linguistically the presence of X in a language implies the presence of Y, but the presence of Y does not imply the presence of X.

Eckman (1985) cites several studies that show the markedness relations and typologies which include Dinnsen & Eckman (1978), Greenberg (1978) and Keenan & Comrie (1977) to name a few. These studies exemplified phonological structures that are “more marked” and “less marked,” which according to the MDH, translates into which phonological sounds will be easier or more difficult for an ELL to produce. For instance, the study by Dow (1972), used the MDH to predict that native speakers of Mandarin (who have no voice contrast in any position) will have the most trouble learning this contrast in the final position (the more marked) and less difficulty with the medial voice and even less difficulty with the initial voice position (the less marked) (Eckman, 1985).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More Marked</th>
<th>Less Marked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final voice contrast</td>
<td>medial voice contrast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Dow study is an excellent example of where the markedness theory builds upon the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis. The MDH proposes not only will voice contrasts in English be difficult for native Mandarin speakers but the markedness shows the degree of difficulty a Mandarin speaker will have. This is important for second language phonological teaching because the MDH distinguishes between beginner, intermediate and advanced levels of phonological difficulties (Eckman, 1985).

Eckman’s MDH gives valuable insight into discovering what sounds will be more difficult for the ELL and the degree of difficulty the ELL will face (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010). This is important because this knowledge allows second language acquisition teachers the ability to plan and teach pronunciation (and defossilize students errors) where it is most needed.

**Summary**

All these theories - the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis, the Noticing Hypothesis, the interlanguage system, the Selective Fossilization Hypothesis and the Markedness Differential Hypothesis—offer insight on how fossilized errors occur and how best to teach the defossilizing process of these errors in the ESL classroom. The Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis shows how a learner’s L1 can cause interference in learning the target language. The Noticing Hypothesis illustrates how accurate perception (consciously noticing) is a prerequisite to correct production and defossilization of learner’s errors. The interlanguage theory asserts every second language learner has a unique, developing, target language system where errors can stabilize and/or
fossilize. In addition, the Selective Fossilization Hypothesis gives valuable insight to the selectivity and the interconnectedness of a learner’s native language and the target language input.

The last, and arguably the most important theory in second language phonological acquisition, is the Markedness Differential Hypothesis. MDH claims that not only does a learner’s L1 cause interference in learning a second language but also that the L1 can predict the relative degree of difficulty a learner will face when learning the new target language structures (Colantoni & Steele, 2008). All of these theories together built the foundation for the handbook by recognizing L1 interference, using creative tools for learners to hone their noticing skills, and finally utilizing proven minimal pairs, contrastive examples, inductive generalizations and recognition/production exercises to defossilize the errors in the learner’s interlanguage system.
CHAPTER III
THE PROJECT AND ITS DEVELOPMENT

Brief Description of the Project

This field project is based on students I have taught, pronunciation teachers I have watched in action and extensive research I have done in the field of second language fossilization, particularly in terms of English pronunciation. The three lessons are designed to provide ESL teachers a template with concrete drills, activities and pointers on how to facilitate defossilization of ELL’s pronunciation errors.

This field project is in the form of a handbook which consists of three units on how to defossilize common ELL pronunciation errors. These units are based on the following minimal pairs: (1) /θ/ vs. /t/ as in math and mat, (2) /w/ vs. /v/ as in wine and vine, and (3) /i/ vs. /I/ as in beans and bins. I selected these errors because they represent a variety of habitual pronunciation errors made by ELLs from all parts of the globe; native speakers from Asia, South America, Africa and Europe. In addition, I designated one unit for each of the three pronunciation positions: in the initial position, consonant sounds (/w/ vs. /v/), in the medial position, vowel sounds (/i/ vs. /I/), and in the final position, consonant sounds (/θ/ vs. /t/).

Each of the three units is designed to be taught to intermediate/advanced intermediate ESL students for approximately a 60-minute class. Each lesson narrowly focuses on English sounds that have been proven to be very challenging for many ELL students (Celce-Murcia et
A key component to each unit is teaching the ELL to become more aware of the sound, how it is made, and notice the differences between the two similar English sounds.

Each lesson gives a song suggestion to start a few minutes before class starts and plays while students are settling into their desks. For instance, ‘Thank You for Being a Friend” would be played for the unit on /th/ vs. /t/, ‘Red, Red, Wine’ for the unit on /w/ vs. /v/ and ‘Pork and Beans’ for the unit on (/iy/ vs. /I/). I have observed in other ESL classes how music subtly exposes the students to the sounds they will study and lowers their affective filter which is always good when teaching English as a second language.

The main focal point of each lesson is two vivid pictures showing contrastive examples of two similar sounds. After introducing these two strong visuals, the teacher follows with repeat after me choral work. Since these lessons are for intermediate students, most should be familiar with these words. Starting with focused listening is important since you need to hear the sound before you can correctly produce it (Gass, 2013).

The next step is critical in defossilizing students’ pronunciation errors. Each unit contains two videos (one for each sound) with an ESL teacher showing the students exactly where their tongue should be (using a mouth model) and how their lips should be formed to make the proper sound. This is key for students who never learned how to make the sound correctly the first time. Furthermore, this detailed instruction and practice of the target sound is designed to improve their ‘noticing’ skills which is essential for defossilizing pronunciation errors (Celce-Murcia et al., 2010; Tajeddin & Tabatabaeian 2017).
Each of the lessons have three key parts: (1) inductive generalization exercises, (2) recognition exercises, and (3) production exercises. The lessons start with inductive ‘yes or no’ generalization exercises that will help the students solidify what mouth and tongue positions are needed for the different sounds. After the inductive exercises, each unit contains recognition exercises; same vs. different exercises, identification exercises and structured communication drills. Next comes the production exercises. Each lesson contains repetition of minimal pairs, opposite drills, mixed recognition/production drills and contextualization drills. This last part is especially important since proper production and repetition will help cement the newly retrained pronunciation skills.

The objective of each unit is for the students to be able to pronounce the target sounds correctly at least 80% of the time, in structured practice and then ultimately consistently in spontaneous speech.

Development of the Project

I was inspired to do this field project for several reasons. First, focused pronunciation teaching is often the most neglected area of ESL teaching even though most ELLs desire to have greater command over their English pronunciation (Couper, 2006; Pardo, 2004). Secondly, I wanted to do a field project that was needed in the ESL world and I was intrigued by professor Dr. Popal reporting that not enough field projects addressed the fossilization phenomenon in acquiring a second language. Thirdly, as part of an extra-credit paper in my Teaching Pronunciation class at UC Berkeley Extension, I sat in on a pronunciation class at San Francisco
City College. I was extremely impressed on how much the students wanted to speak intelligible English and how impactful a talented teacher can be to her students. Lastly, I know from personal tutoring experience that ELLs often struggle with habitual pronunciation errors and these errors can greatly inhibit their ability to find better jobs (Hinofotois & Baily, 1980). During the last several years of studying teaching English as a second language and tutoring/teaching ESL, I have come to realize that habitual pronunciation errors can be a huge impediment to being understood by other English speakers and a roadblock to further economic success and acculturation in the United States (Han, 2004).

In December, 2017 I observed an amazing ESL pronunciation class at City College in San Francisco. The teacher was Ms. Tomi Cunningham and the class focused on systematic practice in American English sounds, speech segmentals, suprasegmentals, all for improving reading and oral communication – especially listening and pronunciation. I believe the key to Ms. Cunningham having a packed and attentive class was her ability to have her students ‘notice’ correctly what was being said and then the students were given ample opportunities to make these correct sounds in a variety of activities.

For instance, the students were learning how to correctly say /θ/ in the word thanks. Ms. Cunningham had given them homework to construct four complimentary sentences ‘thanking’ someone. First she had them all say the word ‘thanks’ and then they did choral work. Next, she dramatically showed how she made the /θ/ sound with her mouth and then referred to a diagram on the white board to illustrate where the tongue should be when making the /θ/ sound. Next, she
had the students get up out of their desks and go to four other students and thank them. (This was also good practice on how to respond to a compliment). It was inspiring to watch her slowly, deliberately and patiently demonstrate how to make one of the more difficult English sounds to her students. In addition to the giving compliments (thanks) activity, she used the minimal pairs of thank and tank in opposition drills and correcting sentences practice. Although her class had a broader range of pronunciation objectives, including speech segmentals and suprasegmentals, I noticed a marked improvement in over 80% of the students’ abilities to say the word ‘thanks’ correctly.

In addition to Ms. Cunningham’s class, in March of this year I observed Dr. Popal’s lecture on how to teach ESL pronunciation. Dr. Popal’s class gave me invaluable teaching ideas and exercises that are perfectly suited for retraining/defossilizing pronunciation errors. I was especially inspired by Dr. Popal’s straightforward approach and the many ways he showed how to activate a student’s noticing abilities and pronunciation production abilities. I have adapted many of the units’ exercises from his excellent lecture.

I started to conceptualize this project in late January and fully developed it between February 4th and April 30th, 2020.

**The Project**

The project in its entirety can be found in the appendix.
CHAPTER IV
CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion

When I first started working on this field project, How to Defossilize ELL’s Pronunciation Errors, I found a plethora of articles on how a significant number of ESL teachers do not spend enough time on teaching pronunciation (Derwing & Munro, 2005). Now I understand why teaching pronunciation is not easy. Unlike teaching vocabulary where students see almost immediate benefits to learning new words, teaching and learning pronunciation can be very frustrating. Learning, teaching and re-teaching English sounds takes time, patience and consistent practice. There is definitely a great need and demand for trained pronunciation teachers (Couper, 2006; Gilbert, 2008; Pardo, 2004).

This handbook narrowly focuses on taking common ELL pronunciation errors and methodically retraining the student. Each unit begins with having the students accurately hear the sound, then learn how to recognize the correct sound and distinguish it from similar sounds. The last step is for the ELL to pronounce the new sounds alone and in context correctly. Although in theory this sounds logical and straightforward, the reality is that for many ESL teachers and ELLs this is a big challenge.

This handbook is not a broad and general pronunciation tool. Unlike many pronunciation textbooks that give broad general and technical teaching tools, this handbook pinpoints persistent
and common pronunciation errors in a simple and straight-forward approach inspired by watching experienced and successful ESL teachers.

Through my research I gained a great deal of knowledge about how these incorrect sounds become fossilized in a second language learner’s interlanguage. The mercurial nature of interlanguage is a fascinating part of the learner’s brain where much research is still needed. For instance, when does the pronunciation error become fossilized in a learner’s interlanguage? Furthermore, is there a way for ESL teachers to help students catch these errors and correct them before they become stabilized/fossilized?

**Recommendations**

In addition to defossilizing pronunciation errors, ESL teachers could do the following to increase their learners success:

1. Conduct a needs analysis of the student’s pronunciation errors.
2. Chart the students progress on correcting their pronunciation errors.
3. Implement a student’s self-learning program.

This handbook addresses three of the most common ELL pronunciation errors and is designed to be used in an ESL classroom with students from a variety of countries. Often ESL classrooms can be predominately from one region of the world and doing a student’s needs analysis surveys and informal interviews could be very helpful in deciding which pronunciation errors to address.

Evaluating pronunciation is a complex endeavor but could be very useful to both the teacher and the student. First you would need to document their errors and then if they are having
success with correcting these errors, is it just when they are in a controlled environment? I believe charting a student’s progress would give students encouragement when they look back and see how much their pronunciation has improved. Conversely, this could also be a bit tricky if they are having little to no success.

One way to help reinforce what they have practiced and learned in class is for the students to become independent learners. Having students record their own voices and practice with a friend and/or video-tape conversations for as little as ten minutes a day could be hugely significant to long term pronunciation success.

The need has never been greater for ESL teachers to teach more pronunciation and to learn how to teach it more effectively. Overcoming big obstacles like fossilized pronunciation errors could give ELL learners the confidence to converse with native speakers more and the courage to become more acculturated in American society.
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April 2, 2020

Dear ESL teachers,

This pronunciation handbook is a comprehensive tool for you to use in defossilizing your students’ persistent pronunciation errors.

For the purpose of this project I have focused on 3 common ELL speaking errors: (1) /θ/ vs. /t/ as in math and mat, (2) /w/ vs. /v/ as in wine and vine, and (3) /iy/ vs. /I/ as in beans and bins. I selected these errors because they represent a variety of habitual pronunciation errors made by ELLs from around the world; native speakers from Asia, South America, Africa and Europe. In addition, I designated one unit for each pronunciation position to address these errors: in the initial position, consonants (/w/ vs. /v/), in the medial position, vowel sounds (/iy/ vs. /I/), and in the final position, consonants (/θ/ vs. /t/).

I hope you find this handbook useful and effective in defossilizing your students’ pronunciation errors. Remember, “fossilization” in a student’s English language journey is really just prolonged stabilization – and with effective tools (like this handbook) and patient, dedicated teaching, your students’ pronunciation errors will soon be a thing of the past.

Happy teaching!

Kate Dolan
How to Use this Handbook

Each of the three units in this handbook is a teacher’s guide on how to correct persistent pronunciation errors. The cornerstone to being able to pronounce a sound correctly is first to be able to hear the sound accurately. Many of these exercises and teaching techniques focus on the student’s ability to hear and decipher subtle differences in similar sounds.

All of the teacher’s specific instructions are in green italics. The vowel or consonant focal point in the pictured minimal pairs are highlighted in red. Each of the minimal sounds has a video showing how to say the sound with a mouth model. Just click on the Youtube url to start the video. If you are able to obtain a mouth model it can be very useful in your pronunciation instructions.

In addition, each unit has two student pair exercises to reinforce what they learned as a whole class. Included at the end of each unit are the exercise worksheets without the teacher’s instructions for you use as handouts in your lessons.
Unit 1

/th/ vs. /t/

\(10 + 2 = 12\)

\((x^2y - 3y^2 + 5xy^2)\)

mat
Introduction

/th/

math

T-repeat after me

1. tooth
2. bath
3. path
4. both
5. truth
Making the /th/ sound

The tongue goes between the front and bottom teeth and protrudes slightly.

https://youtu.be/4qaqFMvq4K8
/t/

mat

T-repeat after me

1. toot
2. bat
3. pat
4. hot
5. strut
Making the /t/ sound

The tip of the tongue touches the front part of the roof of the mouth.

https://youtu.be/OIBjvFJwlf0
Inductive Instruction

1. T - Does the tip of your tongue touch your gum ridge when you pronounce /th/ in “math”?  
SS: NO

2. T - Does the tip of your tongue touch the back of your front teeth when you pronounce /th/ in “math”?  
SS: NO

3. T - Does the tip of your tongue touch your gum ridge when you pronounce /t/ in “mat”?  
SS: YES

4. T - Do you put the tip of your tongue between your front teeth when you /th/ in “math”?  
SS: YES

Conclusions:

1. T - When we pronounce /th/, we place the tip of our tongue between our ________________ (front teeth).  
   *Try to elicit the correct answer from SS, if no one has the correct answer – tell them ‘front teeth’.*

2. T – When we pronounce /t/, we touch the tip of our tongue against our ________________ (gum ridge).  
   *Try to elicit the correct answer from SS, if no one has the correct answer – tell them ‘gum ridge’.*
Recognition Practice

T – SS *Tell me if the sounds you hear are the same or different* (say the following pairs of words)

math – mat *(point to the pictures)* SS: different
math – math *(point to the picture)* SS: same
thin – tin *(move around the room)* S1:
theme – theme S2:
booth – boot S3:
thank – tank S4:
bath – bat S5:
faith – faith S6:
mat – mat S7:
thank – thank S8:
both – boat S9:
math – mat S10:
### Sentence Practice  
*Pair work*

**T** – *instruct students to work in pairs and take turns being student 1 and student 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student 1</th>
<th>Student 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I think she’s thin.</td>
<td>(chooses one)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it’s tin.</td>
<td>She’s not thick.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s not glass.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. He needs his math book.</td>
<td>It protects the floor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He needs a mat by the sink.</td>
<td>He has homework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. She said “thanks”.</td>
<td>She is polite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She said tanks are used in the military.</td>
<td>She’s in the military.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. You are tenth.</td>
<td>You are nervous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are tense.</td>
<td>Nine people are before you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. She taught him English.</td>
<td>She thought he was from England.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She thought he was English.</td>
<td>She showed him English verbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. He is the fifth person.</td>
<td>He exercises a lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He is a fit person.</td>
<td>Four people are before him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. What is a sheep?</td>
<td>It is a large boat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is a ship?</td>
<td>It is a wooly animal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Opposite Drills

**T – When I say “math”, you say “mat”, If I say “mat” you say “math”**

1. **math**   SS – (mat)
2. **mat**    SS – (math)
3. **thin**   SS – (tin)
4. **taught** SS – (thought)
5. **theme**  SS – (team)
6. **wit**    SS – (with)
7. **faith**  SS – (fate)
8. **fort**   SS – (fourth)
9. **booth**  SS – (boot)
Repetition drills of sentences and phrases

*T – Repeat after me*

1. I thought I taught you math.
2. Thank you for the theater tickets.
3. I have faith in you.
4. South and north are opposites.
5. I think I will go with him.
6. I thought you were on my team.
7. I think I need a pair of boots.
8. Three plus three equals six.
Correcting Sentences Practice

T - I am going to say some sentences, if you hear a mistake say the correct word or phrase.

1. I taught he loved me.   SS – thought
2. Tank you for helping me. SS – thank
3. Which theme do you play on? SS – (team)
4. She eats very little. She is tin. SS – (thin)
5. I put the math down by the shower SS – (mat)
6. She prays every day. She has fate. SS - (faith)
7. He has lots of mat homework. SS – (math)
Practice in Dialogue Pair work
T – instruct students to work in pairs and take turns being each person.

Thelma: Do you think it’s going to rain?

Tony: I don’t know. The weather app on my phone is always wrong.

Thelma: I have no faith in weather forecasts too.

Tony: Are you ready for the math test?

Thelma: No, I have both math and English tests tomorrow.

Tony: Poor you! Can I help you study?

Kate: Yes, thanks Tony!
# Sentence Practice

**Student 1**

1. I think she’s thin.  
   I think it’s tin.

2. He needs his math book.  
   He needs a mat by the sink.

3. She said “thanks”.  
   She said tanks are used in the military.

4. You are tenth.  
   You are tense.

5. She taught him English.  
   She thought he was English.

6. He is the fifth person.  
   He is a fit person.

7. What is a sheep?  
   What is a ship?

**Student 2**

(chooses one)  
She’s not thick.  
It’s not glass.

It protects the floor.  
He has homework.

She is polite.  
She’s in the military.

You are nervous.  
Nine people are before you.

She thought he was from England.  
She showed him English verbs.

He exercises a lot.  
Four people are before him.

It is a large boat.  
It is a wooly animal.
Practice in Dialogue

Thelma: Do you think it’s going to rain?

Tony: I don’t know. The weather app on my phone is always wrong.

Thelma: I have no faith in weather forecasts too.

Tony: Are you ready for the math test?

Thelma: No, I have both math and English tests tomorrow.

Tony: Poor you! Can I help you study?

Kate: Yes, thanks Tony!
Unit 2

/w/ vs. /v/

wine

vine
/w/

wine

T-repeat after me

1. wow
2. wife
3. wary
4. west
5. worse
Making the /w/ sound

Begin with your lips rounded, then 
un-round them.

https://youtu.be/Dm09WeYJixM
/v/

vine

T-repeat after me

1. vote

2. vacation

3. view

4. visit

5. vital
Making the /v/ sound

Touch your top teeth against the middle of your lower lip.

https://youtu.be/1c5uCQz--yA
Inductive Instruction

1. T – Are your lips rounded when you pronounce the /v/ in “vine”?  
   SS: NO

2. T – Do your front teeth rest on your bottom lip when you pronounce /w/ in “wine”?  
   SS: NO

3. T - Are your lips rounded when you pronounce /w/ in “wine”?  
   SS: YES

4. T - Do your front teeth rest on your bottom lip when you pronounce /v/ in “vine”?  
   SS: YES

Conclusions:

5. T - When you pronounce /w/ in ‘wine’, you round your lips ______________. (together)  
   *Try to elicit the correct answer from SS, if no one has the correct answer – tell them ‘together’.*

6. T – When you pronounce /v/ in ‘vine’, it is with your front teeth resting on your __________ (bottom) lip.  
   *Try to elicit the correct answer from SS, if no one has the correct answer – tell them ‘bottom lip’.*
Recognition Practice

T – SS Tell me if the sounds you hear are the same or different (say the following pairs of words)

wine – vine (point to the pictures) SS: different

vine – vine (point to the picture) SS: same

very – wary (move around the room) S1:

verse - verse S2:

vow – wow S3:

vivid – vivid S4:

vest – west S5:

voice – voice S6:

wary – wary S7:

wine – wine S8:

vase – vase S9:

wow – vow S10:
Sentence Practice *Pair work*

**T** – instruct students to work in pairs and take turns being student 1 and student 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student 1</th>
<th>Student 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. We went to the movies. She’s very pretty.</td>
<td>The movie was long. She is attractive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. His vest matches his suit. He needs a mat by the sink.</td>
<td>It protects the floor. He has homework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. She is weary. She is married to Joe.</td>
<td>She is Joe’s wife. She is tired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. California is on the west coast. Birds have wings.</td>
<td>Wings help birds fly. Where is California?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. He went on vacation. She loved the beautiful view.</td>
<td>He needed a break from work. She was on top of the mountain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. He voted for the first time. The nurse took his vitals.</td>
<td>It was election day. He went to the hospital.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Opposite Drills

**T – When I say “vine”, you say “wine”,
If I say “wine” you say “vine”**

1. **wine**  
   SS – (vine)

2. **vine**  
   SS – (wine)

3. **wow**  
   SS – (vow)

4. **verse**  
   SS – (worse)

5. **west**  
   SS – (vest)

6. **wane**  
   SS – (vane)

7. **vary**  
   SS – (wary)

8. **vow**  
   SS – (wow)

9. **worse**  
   SS – (verse)

10. **vane**  
    SS – (wane)
Repetition drills of sentences and phrases

*T – Repeat after me*

1. Your wife is very vital to our organization.
2. I voted for the first time yesterday.
3. The weather is worse in the west.
4. Wow, I need a vacation.
5. I am wary of big dogs.
6. My cold is much worse.
7. Yosemite has beautiful views.
8. I want to visit my very sick grandmother.
Correcting Sentences Practice

T - I am going to say some sentences, if you hear a mistake say the correct word or phrase.

1. Grapes grow on wines. SS – vines
2. He voted for Obama. SS – voted
3. I am wary hungry. SS – (very)
4. Blood flows in our wanes SS – (veins)
5. I took a vow when I married him. SS – (vow)
6. She prays every day. She has fate. SS - (faith)
7. California is on west coast. SS – (west)
8. He drinks red vine every night. SS – (wine)
Practice in Dialogue *Pair work*

T – instruct students to work in pairs and take turns being each person.

Wally: Are you going to the wine and cheese party tonight?

Vicki: I don’t know. When are you leaving?

Wally: My wife and I are leaving around 6.

Vicki: Oh, that’s too soon. I’m not sure I’m going.

Wally: Why not?

Vicki: My cold is worse. I feel terrible.

Wally: I’m sorry to hear that. My mother says a little wine can help a sore throat.

Vicki: Wow! Thanks for the very good advice.
# Sentence Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student 1</th>
<th>Student 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. We went to the movies.</td>
<td>(chooses one)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She’s very pretty.</td>
<td>The movie was long.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>She is attractive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. His vest matches his suit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He needs a mat by the sink.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. She is weary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She is married to Joe.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. California is on the west coast.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birds have wings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Where is California?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wings help birds fly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. He went on vacation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She loved the beautiful view.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>He needed a break from work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>She was on top of the mountain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. He voted for the first time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The nurse took his vitals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It was election day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>He went to the hospital.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Practice in Dialogue

Wally: Are you going to the wine and cheese party tonight?

Vicki: I don’t know. When are you leaving?

Wally: My wife and I are leaving around 6.

Vicki: Oh, that’s too soon. I’m not sure I’m going.

Wally: Why not?

Vicki: My cold is worse. I feel terrible.

Wally: I’m sorry to hear that. My mother says a little wine can help a sore throat.

Vicki: Wow! Thanks for the very good advice.
Unit 3
/iy/ vs. /l/

beans

bins
Introduction

/iy/

beans

T-repeat after me

1. leave
2. mean
3. green
4. eat
5. team
Making the /iy/ sound

Your lips are wide

https://youtu.be/sTeVQNHYnwE
bins

T−repeat after me

1. wins
2. ship
3. thin
4. minute
5. chin
6. live
7. middle
Making the /l/ sound

Smaller mouth, relaxed lips.

https://youtu.be/EaGgov3_aZI
Inductive Instruction

1. T – Are your lips rounded when you pronounce /iy/ in “beans”?  
   SS: NO

2. T – Do you make your mouth wide when you pronounce /I/ in “bins”?  
   SS: NO

3. T - Are your lips wide when you pronounce /iy/ in “beans”?  
   SS: YES

4. T – Is your mouth small and lips relaxed when you pronounce /I/ in “bins”?  
   SS: YES

Conclusions:

5. T - When you pronounce /iy/ in ‘beans’, your lips are_______________. (wide)  
   Try to elicit the correct answer from SS, if no one has the correct answer – tell them ‘wide’.

6. T – When you pronounce /I/ in ‘bins’ your mouth is small and your lips are __________ (relaxed).  
   Try to elicit the correct answer from SS, if no one has the correct answer – tell them ‘relaxed’.
# Recognition Practice

T – SS Tell me if the sounds you hear are the same or different *(T - says the following pairs of words)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>beans – bins <em>(points to the pictures)</em></td>
<td>SS: different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bin – bin <em>(points to the picture)</em></td>
<td>SS: same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feet – fit <em>(moves around the room)</em></td>
<td>S1:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heel - hill</td>
<td>S2:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grin – green</td>
<td>S3:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leave – live</td>
<td>S4:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ship – sheep</td>
<td>S5:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eat – it</td>
<td>S6:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seen – seen</td>
<td>S7:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heal – heel</td>
<td>S8:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>green – green</td>
<td>S9:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sin – seen</td>
<td>S10:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sentence Practice *Pair work*

T – instruct students to work in pairs and take turns being *student 1 and student 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student 1</th>
<th>Student 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I hurt my heel. Describe a ship.</td>
<td>It’s a big boat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am injured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I put the garbage in the bin. What’s your favorite color?</td>
<td>Where’s the trash?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I love the color green.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lying is a sin. She grins a lot.</td>
<td>She is happy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lying is bad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Where does wool come from? I like to eat it.</td>
<td>Wool comes from sheep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rice and beans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. He didn’t want to be here. Where does she live?</td>
<td>He wanted to leave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>She lives in the green house.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Opposite Drills

T – When I say “beans”, you say “bins”,
If I say “bins” you say “beans”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Opposite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>grin</td>
<td>SS – (green)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bins</td>
<td>SS – (beans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leave</td>
<td>SS – (live)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sin</td>
<td>SS – (seen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eat</td>
<td>SS – (it)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heel</td>
<td>SS – (hill)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sheep</td>
<td>SS – (ship)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fit</td>
<td>SS – (feet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it</td>
<td>SS – (eat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hill</td>
<td>SS – (heal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ship</td>
<td>SS – (sheep)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>live</td>
<td>SS – (leave)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Repetition drills of sentences and phrases

*T – Repeat after me*

1. Green is our team’s color.

2. We have three different garbage bins.

3. She isn’t nice, she is mean.

4. I hurt my heel while I was dancing.

5. He runs every day. He is fit.

6. I eat green vegetables at dinner.

7. She grins when she wins.

8. I live in the green house.
Correcting Sentences Practice

T : I am going to say some sentences, if you hear a mistake say the correct word or phrase.

1. I sailed on a sheep last year. SS – ship
2. He eats very little, he is tin. SS – thin
3. My favorite color is grin? SS – (green)
4. She was last sin at the market SS – (seen)
5. I leave in an apartment. SS – (live)
6. Wool comes from ships. SS - (sheep)
7. He put the garbage in the beans. SS – (bins)
Practice in Dialogue *Pair work*

T – instruct students to work in pairs and take turns being each person.

Kate: Hi Dean! What are you cooking?

Dean: Rice and beans. Do you want eat some with me?

Kate: I don’t know. I see green things in the pot.

Dean: No, you’re being mean. It’s just cilantro.

Kate: Sorry. Sure, I will have some before I leave for my tennis match.

Dean: Great. These rice and beans will give you the strength to win!

Kate: Thanks. I hope I win too.
Sentence Practice

Student 1

1. I hurt my heel.
   Describe a ship.

2. I put the garbage in the bin.
   What’s your favorite color?

3. Lying is a sin.
   She grins a lot.

4. Where does wool come from?
   I like to eat it.

5. He didn’t want to be here.
   Where does she live?

Student 2

(chooses one)

1. It’s a big boat.
   I am injured.

2. Where’s the trash?
   I love the color green.

3. She is happy.
   Lying is bad.

4. Wool comes from sheep.
   Rice and beans.

5. He wanted to leave.
   She lives in the green house.
Practice in Dialogue

Kate: Hi Dean! What are you cooking?

Dean: Rice and beans. Do you want eat some with me?

Kate: I don’t know. I see green things in the pot.

Dean: No, you’re being mean. It’s just cilantro.

Kate: Sorry. Sure, I will have some before I leave for my tennis match.

Dean: Great. These rice and beans will give you the strength to win!

Kate: Thanks. I hope I win too.