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Abstract
The study has been carried out in Alsalam University-Lagaua locality-West Kordofan State in 2017. It is aimed at identifying the problem which encounter students who major English Language in the formation of human consciousness in pronunciation properly. The study adopted the descriptive analytical method. The tool selected is a questionnaire, besides references for data collection. The sample comprises (25) students from Faculty of Arts. The study reached some results such as: The majority of respondents agreed with that: The formation of human consciousness in pronunciation is important for using English Language (100%). The respondents highly disagreed on that: students do not utter speech sound properly (45%). The study recommended that: Students have to practice pronunciation increasingly. Students must learn more about speech sounds to form the human consciousness in the English language. Teachers must have more exercises to improve their students’ accuracy and fluency in English language.

Introduction:
The basic element of the language is the word. A word can be used to refer to objects and to identify properties, actions and relationships. Words organize things into systems. That is to say, words codify our experience. In what follows, we shall deal with such issues as how words come into being, how the semantic structure of a word is constructed, and assign attributes and relations.

Problem of the Study:
English Language learning is difficult to some extent, because of sounds even it has same place of articulation with other languages. So, students who specialized in English language confront problems in phonetics. They suffer more from getting correct pronunciation. Thus, they cannot differentiate between sounds while have same place of articulation. Hence, learning
phonetics depends upon active listening. Therefore, International Phonetic Alphabet should be known by the learners.

**Questions of the Study:**
1. Why the students so confused in the formation of human consciousness?
2. How the students can differentiate some symbols of speech sounds?
3. To what extent do the students able to pronounce speech sounds properly?

**Hypotheses:**
The hypotheses of this study are as following:
1-If the learners are provided with sounds in details intensively, they will use them properly in speech. Then their utterance will become clear and they can master correct pronunciation.
2-If the learners study more verbal practices; they will achieve accuracy and fluency on their speech.

**Research Method:**
The study used descriptive analytical method, because this method is matches the topic.

**Instrument:** The study adopted a questionnaire for data collection. Then percentage used for data analysis.

**Sample:** It is represented by students, who specialized in English Language-in Faculty of Arts-Peace University. Size represented by twenty five (25), students from the second and third year.

**Delimitations:** The study aimed to limit the role of formation of human consciousness in the pronunciation. It has been carryout during the academic year 2016-2017 in Lagaua locality at Peace University-Faculty of Arts.

**Significance of the study:** The study is very significant; because it discovered the problem, which faces the students, in the formation of human consciousness. Therefore, it pinpoints
the problem area and the ways of solving it. Also, it is important, because it identifies the real obstacle in English language learning.
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**Literature Review**

**Definition of Word**

Word: It is a product of social evolution. It enables the humans to go beyond the limits of their direct perception, thus achieving that leap from the sensory to the rational world, which essential for human consciousness.

**Origin of the Words**

One can only speculate about the origins of the word in protolanguage and proto history. Although many theories attempt to explain the origin of words, we still know very little about it what is clear is that words did not originate as a means for expressing affective conditions or states. If they had, the so-called languages of animals would in no way differ from those of humans. We have every reason to believe that the word arose as a result labor, which is a form of material action. As Engle’s reportedly pointed out, the roots of the first word should be sought in the history of labor and social interaction. There is good reason to believe that during the first stages of history, words were intertwined with practice, they did not yet have an independent existence i.e., during the early stages of language development, words had a sympractical character. They acquired their meaning only from a concrete practical situations and activities. According to this line of reasoning, when humans interacted with one another in order to perform elementary acts of labor, the word was intertwined with these acts. If for instance, a group had to lift a heavy object, such as a tree trunk, the word `ah` could mean either `careful!` Or `come on, lift the log!` Or `exert yourself!` Or `be careful with that thing!` However, it was impossible to decipher the meaning of this word out side the context of the labor
situation. It was impossible to do so, because the meaning of the word changed depending on the situation. It became comprehensible only from gestures, from the intonation of the speaker, and from the whole situation. Thus, the primitive word had an unstable diffuse meaning, which acquired concreteness from the sympractical context.

Apparently, the entire history of human language is the history of the emancipation of the word from practical life and the evolution of speech as an independent activity. This activity makes use of language and its elements (i.e., words) in an independent system of codes. The process of emancipating the word from its sympractical context involves the transition of language to a synsemantic system. While we know very little about the proto-history of language, we do know something about the origin of the word in ontogenesis (i.e., the development of a child). In contrast to what was believed at one time, ontogenesis never parallels phylogenies (i.e., the development of speech). The socio historical development of language, like that of all mental process originates in the social process of labor. However, the development of language in ontogenesis dose not occurs in the process of labor. It occurs during the acquisition of human experience and communication with adults.

It may appear that the language of a small child begins with babbling during infancy and that the development of language simply involves the extension of these initial sounds. Many generations of psycholinguists believed that. However, this is not the case. In effect babbling is the expression of a state and not the designation of objects. Many sounds found in babbling are not later repeated in the child’s speak. The first words uttered by a child are often either less distinct or quite different in their phonological structure from the babbling of an infant. We would argue that in order to learn the sounds in a linguistic system, the child must inhibit the sounds in babbling. This
argument applies to many aspects of the ontogenesis of children’s voluntary movements. For example, it was formerly assumed that the grasping reflex emerges from innate reflexes. Only it has been a few days after birth; a child can have such strong grasping reflex that it is possible for an adult to lift the child by offering him/her two fingers. However, it has demonstrated that nothing emerges out of this grasping reflex. It can not in any way be taken as the prototype of future voluntary movements. Just the reverse is true. It is necessary to inhibit the grasping reflex before voluntary movement appears. The grasping reflex is a sub cortical act, whereas voluntary movement is a cortical act. The latter has a quite different origin and occurs only when the grasping reflex is inhibited. The same developmental sequence occurs in the case of speech. The first words arise not from the child’s babbling sounds, but from the linguistic sounds the child learns by perceiving the speech of the older people. Children language is always initially connected with their action and with their interaction with adults. In contrast to babbling, children’s first words do not express a state, but are directed toward and designate an object. However, initially these words are sympractical; they are closely tied to action. If the child is playing horses and utters ‘ipru!’ this utterance may mean ‘horse’ ‘sledge’ ‘sit!’ ‘let’s go!’ and/or ‘stop!’ depending on the situation and on the accompanying gestures and intonation. Therefore, child first words are directed toward an object but remain inseparable from action. It is only in later stages that the word begins to be separated from action and to acquire an independent character. While we can only speculate on how this process occurred in social history, we can follow it very closely in ontogenesis. Shortly after appearance of such rudimentary, sympractical words-approximately at the age of 18 to 20 months-, the child begins to acquire the morphology of the word. Then, instead of
he/she begins to utter `tprn`ka` thus adding the suffix-`n`ka to the diffuse word `tpru!`. The meaning of the word `tprun`ka` is less diffuse than its precursor. In stead of all the meanings associated with the uses of `tpru`, the meaning of `tprun`ka` is restricted to `horse`, `sledge`, or `cart`. With the addition of this suffix, it acquires the character of a noun and begins to have a clear objective meaning. It becomes independent of its sympractical context. Formerly, there had been amorphous words which could designate practically anything. As a result, the child was sable to manage with a small number of words which took on different meanings, depending on the situation, gesture and intonation. Thus, ontogenetic observations support the notion that words initially appear in sympractical context and only gradually become separated from action to become independent signs which designate objects, action, and properties and later also relationships. This shift from sympractical to synsemantic speech represents the real birth of the differentiated word, i.e., the word as an element of the complex system of codes and language. (Luria and Yudovich, 1956)

The Semantic Structure and Function of the Word:

We have already said that every word designated a thing, an attribute, an action, or a relationship. Does this mean, therefore, that the analysis of a word involves nothing more than its capacity to be used to refer to an object? Does the semantic structure of a word involve nothing more than the representation of an object? Let us consider these two Questions:

The basic function of a word is its `referential` function. In psychology, this claim reflects an acceptance of the position introduced into Soviet psychological literature by Vygotskian (1934, 1956, and 1960). According to him, any word possesses an object reference. It can function as a substitute for an object. A word is always directed toward an object. It may
designate an object brief case or dog), an act (lie or run), a properly (leather brief case or bad-tempered dog), or a relationship (the brief case is lying on the table or the dog is running out of the forest). That a word can designate different objects is reflected in the fact that it can assume the form of a noun when designating an object, a verb when designating an action, an adjective when designating a relationship. What advantage accrues to humans by having at their disposal words which have an object reference? The enormous advantage is that their world doubles. In the absence of words, humans would have to deal only with those things which they could perceive and manipulate directly with the help of language; they can deal with things which they have not perceived even indirectly and with things which were part of the experience of earlier generations. Thus, the word adds another dimension to the world of humans. It enables them to deal with things without having to have those present. Animals have one world, the world of objects and situations which can be perceived by the sense. Humans have a double world.

Further more, humans can elicit these images at will even in the absence of the object. As a result, humans no only can regulate their perception; they can also regulate their member by using images. They can control their actions. That is to say, words give rise not only to a duplicate world, but also to a form of voluntary action which could not exist without language. In addition, humans can act internally, this means that they can carry out trial and error thinking and other cognitive actions in the absence of real objective. Thus, they can compare the weights of two objects without having to have the objects in front of them. This is possible because humans can mobilize all the features involved in their linguistic representational system.

The final advantage of this second world is that humans can transmit information and knowledge from one individual to
another, thus making it possible for us to acquire the experience of previous generations. An animal has only two ways of organizing its behavior. These organizations can be based on the ‘inherited experience’ embedded in its instincts, or by acquiring new forms of behavior through its own object experience. Humans on the other hand, are not faced to depend solely on their personal experience. They can obtain experience from others because speech can serve as a source of information. The greater part of human’s experience is derived in this uniquely human way. This aspect of human mental development has been studied in detailed by A.N.Levon’ev, (1959, 1975).

The Categorical Meaning of a Word:
By the meaning of a word, we understand the capacity of a word not only to substitute or represent objects, not only to elicit associations, but also to analyze objects, to isolate and generalize their properties. A word not only substitutes for a thing, but also analyzes it by introducing it into a system of complex associations and reflections. It is this abstracting and generalizing function that is known as its meaning. We should also note that a word is not only an instrument for thinking, but also a means of communication. Every instance of communication requires that a word not only denote a specific object, but also introduce a generalized concept. If a speaker has a particular table in mind, but the listener does not grasp the generalized sense of the word, the word ‘table’ does have a generalized meaning.

As a result, the hearer can understand the speaker; as a result, when a speaker mentions a generalized thing he/she is able to convey the meaning of this thing. Thus, by abstracting and generalizing the property of an object, a word becomes an instrument of thought and a means of communication. All of this shows that a word not only duplicates the word, it also serves as a powerful instrument for analyzing this word. The
word takes one beyond the world of the sensory experience and leads to rational experience. In many developed languages (e.g., Russian, German, and in Turkic language), the word involves another meaning component—inflections. Inflections change with the various uses of the word. For example, if we analyze the word `chernil’nitsa` (ink stand), we see that its case status is indicated by inflections. By changing a word’s inflections, we do not change its meaning. In other languages which do not make use of inflections (e.g., English and French), the role of inflections is taken over by auxiliary words such as prepositions and conjunctions. In this case, the word is concerned with an object related to dyes (chern), to instrumentality (-il), to receptacles (nits), etc. However, the functional role of the object may change. In the nominative case or so-call citation form, ‘chernical’nitsa’ simply indicates the existence of the object. In the accusative case (chernial’nitsa), it indicates that the thing is the object of some action (e.g., ‘ya vishu’-I see the ink pot). In the genitive case, it is used to indicate a part of an object (‘karai chernil’nitsi’-the edge of the ink pot), or to indicate the absence of the object (‘U menya net chchernil’nitsi’-I do not have an ink pot). With the help of the instrumental inflection (‘chernil’nitsi’), we indicate that the object is used for some instrumental purpose. In other words, inflections give rise to new psychological possibilities for a functional designation of an object. They enable us not only to correlate the object to a certain category, but also to indicate the form of the action which the object performs in a given context. This is precisely what enables us to say that language is a system of codes adequate for independently analyzing an object and expressing any of its features, properties, and relationships. The word is the foundation of the system of codes which ensures the transition from the sensory to the rational world.
Lexical Functions and the Valence of Words:

Let us focus on some additional issues which will become important when we take up the analysis of sentence structure. Several investigators have noted that some of the words which are part of a given semantic group are characterized by greater ‘availability’ than others. A word’s availability determined the difficulty with which it can be chosen from among many items. It is explained partly by the context, partly by its habit strength and frequency of occurrence (Miller, 1967, Morton, 1971, Katz, 1966, 1972), and partly by speaker’s attitudes and direct experience. However, very often a word’s availability depends on its lexical connections. It is not difficult to understand that the word ‘doctor’ elicits the word ‘to treat’, that ‘broom’ reminds us of ‘to sweep’, that ‘axe’ calls forth the word ‘chop’, and that the word ‘needle’ makes us think of the word ‘to sew’. This is even more clearly the case for words denoting actions (i.e., verbs) and properties (i.e., adjectives). It has been customary to distinguish between intransitive verbs, which do not require an object (sleep, starve, live) and transitive verbs which require a word to complement them. To this latter class belong such verbs as drink (something), desire (something), give (something), borrow(something, from someone), etc. (cf. Fillmore, 1972, Fodor, Beaver, Caret, 1968a, Zoholkovskii, 1964, 1967). The same can be said of adjectives. They usually require the pressure of a noun. The choice of a noun is determined both by proximity in meaning and by the frequency of occurrence of the combinations (e.g., red-flag, Soviet-union, ripe-apple, sharp-knife). These facts about how certain words, when isolated, leave us with a feeling of incompleteness are concerned with the words’ valence. Valence is a factor that determines the readiness with which certain words are evoked when presented with others. That is why it is an important factor in the process of word selection.
These functions tie a word into the system of other words, and are of great significance in sentence production. The problem of word valence has been studied in Soviet linguistics. Those who have dealt with this problem have identified a few basic categories of lexical functions. For example, such investigators as Mel’chuk (1970, 1974), Zholkovskii (1969), and Après an (1974) have identified the following connections: ‘incip’ or ‘to start’ (e.g., ‘it has started raining’ ‘the verse comes to mind’), ‘fin’- or ‘to finish’ (e.g., ‘the quarrel has ended’), ‘autumn is over’. ‘func’- or ‘to function’ (e.g., ‘a cook has the function of preparing food’, a clock has the function of telling time’, and ‘caus’- to cause’ (e.g., ‘an engine causes motion’, ‘a push causes movement’). Semantic groups like these give rise to the connections among words and determine one word’s probability of occurrence after another. It is not difficult to see that this goes beyond the simple assertion that a word refers to a thing and that it identifies and generalizes a property of an object. The words differ in their tendency to elicit the words (i.e., in their valences) is of great importance (cf. Fodor et al., 1968a, Fillmore, 1972, Kiefer, 1972). Thus, the word ‘love’ and ‘hate’ have one valence (love-whom, hate-whom) the words ‘chop’ and ‘dig’ have two valences (chop-what, and with what, dig what, and with what), the words ‘buy’ and ‘sell’ have three valences (buy-what, from whom, and for how much? Sell-what, from whom, and for how much?). The Russian word ‘odolzhit’ (led, borrow) has four valences (lend-borrow-what, to whom, from whom, and for how long?). Recent linguistic research has demonstrated that in Russian there are words which have no more than three or four (or a maximum of five) valences. Consequently, every word has a limited number of lexical connections. This idea will become important when we deal with sentence production.
The Objective Study of Semantic Fields:
Perhaps the most widely known method used to investigate semantic fields is the association experiment. Subjects are given a list of words and asked to respond to each with the first word that comes to mind. Studies of this problem have shown that such associations are almost never random. They can be divided into at least two large groups on the basis of whether an ‘external’ or ‘internal’ association is involves.

External associations always have been understood as associations by contiguity. In this case, the word evokes some components of the concrete situation in which the referent of the first word appears such associations as `house`- `roof`, `dog`- `tail`, `cat`- `mouse` are examples of external associations. Internal associations are usually understood to be associations evoked by the inclusions of a word in a certain category. Associations such as dog- animal, chair- furniture, and oak- tree are examples of this type of association. In classical psychology, these were called association by similarity or association by contrast. Many investigators have tried to examine the case with which these links can be evoked and the probabilities of their occurrence with the first problem, researchers often use response time (the time required to produce an associated word). This method showed that more complex forms of association require a longer response time than the simpler forms. This method also enabled us to trace the development of verbal associations in ontogenesis and it has been used to examine the affective inhibition caused by some words (cf. Jung, 1906, 1910, Luria, 1932).

A second issue is the probability with which a certain word will be elicited when a subject is presented with a word. This usually studied by counting the frequency a word occurs in response to a given word. Perhaps the first such study was that of Kent and Rossanoff (1910). In some of our own early research (Luria, 1930) we examine the dependence of the
response frequency on the subject’s personal background. We demonstrated that associations in the speech system of a rural child were more permanent than those in the speech system of an urban child or a homeless child with far more diverse life experiences. In recent years, response possibility has been studied in detail by several American investigators (e.g., Deese, 1962). This widely used method obviously can play an important role in the detailed study of semantic fields.

The Use of Scales to Measure Semantic Fields:
A second technique that allows one to analyze semantic relations has been developed by the well known American psychologist Osgood,(1964). Also Osgood, Sauce, and Tannenbaum, 1957). Osgood utilized a method giving subjects a word (or a person’s name) and asking them to place the word on a scale or continuum ranging between two opposite qualities (e.g., strong- weak, good- bad, bitter- sweet). Subjects are asked to indicate the point on the scale occupied by the item. Naturally on the `sour- sweet` scale the word `lemon` occupies an extreme position near the first term. On this same scale, the word `sugar` occupies the opposite position, and the words `apple`, `plum` and `pear` occupy intermediate points. The Osgood method undoubtedly introduces certain new dimensions into the study of semantic fields However, his critics (Carroll, 1964, Weinreich, 1958) correctly pointed out that this method is rather limited, since it allows subjects to arrange the connotative meanings in accordance with only one or two artificially selected scales. The important of this method also limited by its heavy reliance on subjective judgment and by the fact that the semantic differential developed by Osgood is concerned with the affective meaning the word.
Objective Methods for Investigating the Multi-dimensional Associations of a Word:

In order to investigate a word’s associations, one needs a set of objective psychological methods as already being mentioned like (comparison, differentiation, and classification). An association to a given word can vary quite widely. Sometimes, a certain word suggests a characteristic feature of the object that it designates (e.g., dog-barks, cat-meows, etc.). Sometimes, though seldom in normal case, a word may occur that is phonetically similar with the given word, e.g., in response to ‘koshka’ (cat), one may find ‘kroshka’ (crumb) or ‘kryshka’ (lid). Also, in some cases, a response may be based on situational factors (e.g., cat- milk) or semantic links (e.g. cat- animal). As we have said, simple associative experiments make it possible to determine which type of association occurs most readily and which predominates. Another variant of this method involves free association. In this case, a subject is given a word and is asked to say any words they may enter his/her mind without trying to inhibit any items. The subject is asked to continue producing free associations until the experimenter asks him/her to stop. This method of free associations was used by Freud. He showed that the flow of associations that come to mind in such cases may be determined by cognitive, situational, or conceptual process or by affective process. It is easy to see that this method can also play an important role in analyzing the dynamics of fields. However, all of the methods mentioned so far provide only indirect evidence for the analysis of semantic fields. That is why it is so important to devise an objective method for investigating semantic fields. The first attempt at developing such a method can be seen in the early words of Rees (1940) and Ryazan (1949), later continued by Shavarts (1948, 1954), and finally, a version of this method was utilized by Vinogradova (1956) and Eisler (1959). All of these authors
used techniques based on conditioned-reflex methodology. This allowed them to use indices which reflect the structure of semantic fields objectively either through motor responses or vascular responses induced by conditioned reflexes. Vinogradova devised a special technique based on the orienting reflex in order to study semantic fields. This technique is based on the fact that each new stimulus gives rise to a reflex which is manifested in a series of motor, psychophysiological and autonomic indicators (e.g., constriction of blood vessels in the fingers and expansion of blood vessels in the brain).

We found that words which are phonetically connected with the test word do not elicit any response. This meant that phonetic associations are normally inhibited. They do not enter into any relationship with the test word. On the other hand, words which are semantically close to the test evoked either a specific or nonspecific orienting response. With normal subjects, the word ‘myshka’ (mouse) or ‘sobaka’ (dog) evoked a response similar to that evoked by test word ‘koshka’ (cat), and the word ‘mandolin’ (mandolin) evoked a response similar to that evoked by test word ‘skripka’ (violin). Finally, the study showed that there is a third group of words which also form part of the semantic field evoked by the test word, but occupy a secondary position in this field. These words are located on the periphery. For example, in the condition in which the test word is ‘skripka’ (violin) neither ‘struna’ (string) nor ‘fortepiano’ (piano) triggered a specific response to pain, but they do evoke an orienting response. We therefore, have an objective criterion for establishing the degree of proximity of a word to the test word. Our methodology provides us with an important means for examining semantic fields evoked by words. Our objective method allows us to do this without questioning the subject. This method enables us to identify whether, the phonetic, the situational, or the
connotative aspects in a subject’s system of associations predominates.

The Motive of an Utterance:
It is incorrect to think that speech production always entails the same structure or that motives play the same role in the production of every utterance. Extremely simples, e.g., exclamations or verbal responses to some sudden stimulus, require no special motive and in the power of sense of the term, should not be called speech utterances. Involuntary utterances, occurs for instance, in response to pain, fear, or stress and do not require any special complex motive, they have become automotive. Also belonging to this class are affective exclamations, such as ‘to the devil with it! ’, Gosh! And sometimes words of abuse that one is accustomed to using.

The Utterance Plan:
The motive is only the initial factor in speech production. In and of itself, it does not have any specific content. The next stage in the process of speech production is utterance plan, which some linguists term the initial semantic graph. The content of the utterance is determined at this level. The overall scheme of the utterance is established at this point. It is the first point at which the theme of the utterance is separated from the rhyme (the new material to be included in the utterance. Psychologically, this may be described as the stage in which the general subjective sense of the utterance is formed. A characteristic of this stage is that the subject begins to understand what it is that is to be transformed into an utterance. Later, this subjective sense will be converted into a system of expanded speech meanings that are comprehensible to others. This brings us to one of the central problems of psychology. One would have supposed that the concept of a thought is one of clearest notions in psychology, but this turns out not to be true. However, paradoxical this may sound;
thought remains largely uninvestigated in psychology. Several factors contribute to this paradox. First, analyses of the relationship between a thought and an utterance usually are based on the erroneous assumption that a thought is some kind of ready-made formation and that speech serves merely to embody it. As Vygotsky pointed out long ago, the process of the transition from thought to speech actually is much more complex than generally assumed. According to him, speech does not simply embody a thought. Rather, a thought passes through several stages in the process of becoming formed, or as Vygotsky said, a thought is complicated in speech. This is a complex process of the formation of a speech utterance. That still remains to be investigated. It involves the conversion of an unclear thought into clear and expanded chain of speech.

The second factor that makes the psychological description of thought so complex is a methodological problem—the difficulty of separating the subject matter of thought from the act of observing this thought. It is not easy to reflect on the flow of one’s own conscious thought and to continue thinking. Naturally, this interferes with describing the process involved in thought and its role in speech production. These difficulties account for the fact that attempts to describe thought have made little headway.

The results of these investigations were paradoxical. The subjects agreed overwhelmingly that the thinking process involved neither sensory images nor words. After listening to the sentences, subjects usually did not identify any sensory images. When sensory images were perceived, they tended to distract subjects from the thought that gave rise to them. At the same time, it was shown that the comprehension of sense did not necessarily require any verbal formation. This finding resulted in a negative description of the act of thinking as an act that involved neither imagery nor verbal formulation. The members of the Wurzburg School thought that they could
identify at least two necessary components in a psychological
description of the thought process. On the one hand, they
identified the intention or directionality toward a solution, and
on the other they identified the act of ‘perceiving a
relationship’ the latter component involved the emergence of a
ready solution, which is sometimes tied to a particular logical
feeling. Other experiments of the Wurzburg School led to
similar conclusions. These studies were conducted in order to
analyze subjects’ understanding and selection of logical
relationships (part-whole, whole-part, genus-species, and
species-genus). These studies led to the conclusion that
sensory (image-bearing) and verbal components play only a
minor role in thinking and sometimes are altogether absent.
Obviously these conclusions are unsatisfactory, because
instead of providing a positive description of thinking, they
characterize it in a negative way. Clearly, the relation between
thought and expanded speech could not be understood on the
basis of these studies.

**The Formation of an Expanded Speech Utterance:**

There are two crucial factors in analyzing an expanded speech
utterance. First, the utterance is part of ongoing social
interaction which involves the communication of information
one person to another. Second, it is composed not of a single
sentence, but of a chain of mutually connected sentences.
These sentences make up a single integrated system and
possess the quality of a single integrated structure. The
extreme complexity involved in integrating successive
utterances into a coherent text has been noted by many writers,
beginning with Humboldt (1905, 1907). Humboldt pointed out
that the language used in communication is not ‘Erg on’ (i.e.,
related to individual things and relations) but ‘Energeia’ (i.e.,
included in the complex process of communication that
unfolds across time). This idea was also discussed by several
writers of much later period: *Austin* (1962, 1969), *Grice*
(1957, 1968), Holliday (1973, 1975), Layoff (1971, 1972), Rommetveit (1968, 1974), Wretch (1974, 1975), and Wittengenstein (1972). They pointed out that sentences always occur in a practical or speech context and that the context must take into account not only the intention of the speaker, but also the attitude of the listener. These sentences together form a text and can not be studied outside of their context, or to use Rommentveit’s (1974) term, they can not be studied ‘in vacuo’. In this connection, writers such as Rommetveit (1968, 1974), Holliday (1973, 1975) and Wretch (1974, 1975), pointed out that sentences included in a text possess not only referential meaning (which points to a specific object or event) but also social-context meaning (which is concerned with the communicative context. It is precisely of this, because of these writers pointed out, that a bare linguistic analysis of speech production is insufficient. Such linguistic analysis must be viewed as only one of the factors in a broader psychological and perhaps even socio-psychological analysis, (Rommetveit (1968, 1974), Holliday (1973, 1975) and Wretch (1974, 1975).

A psychological analysis takes into consideration the communicative situation, the motives of the speaker, the nature of the information being conveyed, the attitude of the hearer, etc. in order to develop such account, we must examine the theme, or what the utterance is about and the rhyme, or what the utterance will convey-i.e., we must examine the counter parts of the inner speech theme and rhyme in the external utterance. The inner speech entities must be substantially expanded into an entire chain of connection in a complex program. One of the most important requirements of this, of course, is that both the theme and the rhyme should remain stable. The set created by the task of conveying certain information should be able to inhibit other influences which might divert attention from it. If this does not happen, then the expanded text loses its coherence. It ceases to be a closed
semantic system and becomes a system that is exposed to all kinds of outside influences. We shall have occasion below to deal with this kind of breakdown when we consider early stages in ontogenesis and certain pathological conditions, where the overall text ceases to be subordinated to the initial goal. Instead, we find individual, unconnected fragments rather than a text with a single coherent purpose. These facts support the notion that speech utterance can profitably be consider as a complex form of speech activity which in principle possesses the psychological structure as another form of psychological activity.

The notion of activity has been studied extensively in Soviet psychology (e.g., A. N. Leontief, 1959, 1975). As is true with all other forms of mental activity, we must identify in speech activity the motive which gives rise to it, the goal that it serves, and the task that arises as a result of setting this goal in a certain context. That is, our analysis of speech activity must distinguish between the individual stages or acts and the operations that carry out these acts. Such an analysis must take into account all the units that make up speech production.

**Data Analysis and Discussion**

The researcher designed tables so to use them for analyzing digital information by means of reaching results. Before that these digitals are discussed by linking the analyzed ones with the items included in the questionnaire statements.

**Table No. (1) Students pronounce English consonants easily.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: field study 2017

It’s clear that from table No. (1) The number of the respondents who said (agree) is seventeen (17) and it is
represented by (85%). Whereas the number of those who say (disagree) is (3) three represented by (15%). So the result that the majority agreed with that “Students pronounce English consonants easily”.

**Table No. (2) Students can pronounce combination of consonants properly.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: field study 2017

It’s clear that from table No.(2), the number of the respondents who said (agree) is (11) eleven represented by (55%). Whereas the number who said (disagree) is (9) nine represented by (45%). So the majority agreed with that “Students can pronounce combination of consonants properly”.

**Table No. (3) Students do not distinguish consonants phonetic symbols”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: field study 2017

It’s clear that from table No (3). The number of the respondents who say (agree) is (10) ten represented by (50%). whereas the number of those who say (disagree) is (10) ten. The result is the majority agreed with the “students do not distinguish consonants phonetic symbols”
Table No. (4) Students pronounce English vowels simply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: field study 2017

It’s clear that from table No. (4), the number of the respondents who said (agree) is (16) sixteen represented by (80%). Whereas the number of those who said (disagree) is (4) four represented by (20%). So the majority agree with that “Students pronounce English vowels simply”.

Table No. (5) Students pronounce combination of vowels sounds properly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: field study 2017

It’s clear that from table No. (5), the number of the respondents who agreed is (13) thirteen and represented by (65%). Whereas, the number of those who disagreed is (7) seven and it is represented by (35%). So the majority agreed with that “Students pronounce combination of vowels sounds properly”.

Table No. (6) Students do not distinguish vowel phonetic symbols.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: field study 2017

It’s clear that from table No. (6), the number of the respondents who said (agree) is (12) twelve and represented by (60%). Whereas, the number those who (disagreed) is (8) eight
represented by (40%). the majority agreed with that “Students do not distinguish vowel phonetic symbols”.

**Table No. (7)** Students confuse with pronunciation vowel and consonant sounds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: field study 2017

It’s clear from the table no. (7), the number of the respondents who said (agree) is (13) thirteen and represented by (65%). Whereas, the number of those who said (disagree) is (7) seven which represented by (35%). So the majority agreed with the statement which says that “Students confuse with pronunciation vowel phonetic symbols”.

**Table No. (8)** Students face problems with pronunciation of diphthongs and trip thongs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: field study 2017

It’s clear from table no. (8) That the number of the respondents who said (agree) is (15) fifteen and it is represented by (75%). Whereas, the number of those who said (disagree) is (5) five which represented by (25%). So, the majority agreed with that “Students face problems with pronunciation of diphthongs and trip thongs”.
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Table No. (9) Students do not utter speech sounds properly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: field study 2017

It’s clear that from table No. (4.9), the number of the respondents who said (agree) is (9) nine and it is represented by (45%). Whereas, the number of those who disagreed is (11) eleven which represent by (55%). So the majority agreed with that “Students do not utter speech sounds properly”.

Table No. (10) Pronunciation is important for using language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: field study 2017

It’s clear that from table No. (10), the number of the respondents who agreed is (20) twenty and it is represented by (100%). So, the majority agreed with the statement that says “Pronunciation is important for using English Language.
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