AN ERROR ANALYSIS IN SEGMENTAL FEATURES AT
SPEECH PERFORMANCE AT SPEECH (SEA) AND PUBLIC SPEAKING
CLASSES AT ENGLISH DEPARTMENT
UNIVERSITAS NEGERI PADANG

THESIS

Submitted as a Partial Fulfillment of Requirement to Obtain Bachelor of Education
(B.Ed.) in English Language Education Program

By:

YON VISONI

15018112

Advisor: Leni Marlina, S.S, M.A.
NIP: 19820718 200604 2 004

ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE DEPARTMENT
FACULTY OF LANGUAGES AND ARTS
UNIVERSITAS NEGERI PADANG
2020

ABSTRAK

Visoni, Yon. 2020. An Error Analysis in Segmental Features of Speech Performance at Speech (SEA) & Public Speaking Classes at English Department Universitas Negeri Padang: Skripsi. Padang: Jurusan Bahasa dan Sastra Inggris. Fakultas Bahasa dan Seni. Universitas Negeri Padang.

Tidak dapat dipungkiri bahwa pelafalan Bahasa Inggris yang baik dan mudah dipahami adalah tujuan yang masuk akal bagi pelajar bahasa Inggris, karena itu membantu mereka berkomunikasi secara efektif. Namun, kesalahan pengucapan sering mengganggu pemahaman dalam komunikasi. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menguji bunyi yang sering salah diucapkan dan jenis kesalahan dalam konteks fitur segmental. Penelitian ini menyelidiki kesalahan pengucapan pada konteks pidato untuk mendapatkan pengucapan yang lebih naturalistic sebagai data. Sumber data penelitian ini adalah tiga puluh empat rekaman pidato yang dibawakan oleh siswa di kegiatan berbahasa Inggris & kelas berbicara di depan umum UNP. Rekaman dianalisis untuk mendapatkan kesalahan pengucapan dari pidato. Setelah selesai, kesalahan diukur dan ditafsirkan. Hasil penelitian ini mengungkapkan [ð], [æ], [iː], [əʊ], [ə], [eɪ], dan [θ] sering membuat kesalahan. Suara-suara ini secara bergantian diganti sebagai beberapa suara. Oleh karena itu, disarankan agar kesalahan spesifik ini harus dipertimbangkan ketika mengajar Bahasa Inggris kepada siswa EFL Indonesia L1.

Kata kunci: Pelafalan, fitur segmental, analisis kesalahan, pidato.

ABSTRACT

Visoni, Yon. 2020. An Error Analysis in Segmental Features of Speech Performance at Speech (SEA) & Public Speaking Classes at English Department Universitas Negeri Padang: Skripsi. Padang: Jurusan Bahasa dan Sastra Inggris. Fakultas Bahasa dan Seni. Universitas Negeri Padang.

Intelligible pronunciation is undeniably the realistic goal for English language learners, for it accommodates learners to communicate effectively. However, pronunciation error often interferes with understanding in communication. This present study aims to examine commonly mispronounced sounds and types of errors in the context of segmental features. This study investigated pronunciation error of speech performance to get more naturalistic pronunciation as data. The source of data of this study was thirty-four speech recordings delivered by students at spoken English activities & public speaking classes UNP. The recordings were analysed to obtain pronunciation errors from the speeches. After it is done, the errors are were measured and interpreted. The result of this study revealed [ð], [æ], [i:], [əʊ], [ə], [eɪ], and [θ] were frequently made error. These sounds were interchangeably substituted as several sounds. Therefore, it is suggested that these specific errors should be taken into consideration when teaching English to L1 Indonesian EFL students.

Keywords: Pronunciation, segmental features, error analysis, speech.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF APPENDIXES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Problem

Broadly speaking, if the ultimate goal of English language learning is to be able to communicate effectively, then pronunciation should be taken into consideration, and in fact, be taught thoroughly by English language teachers. The role of pronunciation is vital to proceed smoothly without constrains in communication. The quality of pronunciation is a contributing factor for listeners to be able to decode and understand the message. If the pronunciation is proper, the message would be decoded easily by listeners. In contrast, if the pronunciation is weak, it would cause problems for the transmission of the message. Therefore, considering the role of pronunciation in oral communication, it deserves special treatment from English language teachers so that learners can attain the goal of English language learning.

However, some researchers (for example, Morley, 1991; Harmer, 2007; Gilakjani & Sabouri, 2016; Gilakjani, 2017) argue that pronunciation remains overlooked. The majority of English language teachers incline to give special attention to grammar and vocabulary, making students highly proficient in writing and reading. Nevertheless, pronunciation is given the least attention due to some constraints such as lack of pronunciation knowledge (phonetic and phonological knowledge), lack of appropriate materials of teaching pronunciation, lack of motivation and confidence, and inadequacy of time (Pourhossein Gilakjani & Sabouri, 2016: Mathew, 2005). Consequently, many of either ESL or EFL have unintelligible pronunciation.

If their pronunciation is incomprehensible, which is hard to be understood, then obviously that they cannot communicate effectively (Harmer, 2007, p.248).

Hismanonglu (2006) & Gilakjani (2017) highlighted that pronunciation is a fundamental aspect of communicative competence that plays a significant role in oral communication. Some researchers – for example, Yates & Zielinski, 2009; Singh, 2017 – have noted the importance of pronunciation that even if a learner has a wide range of vocabulary and perfect grammar, it will be useless if nobody can understand them when they speak. Along with this, people might judge them as 'incompetent or even stupid' and 'they do not know much English.' Otherwise, those who have intelligible pronunciation will remain to be understood, although they make errors in other aspects. Moreover, Yates & Zielinski emphasise that learners should have 'a practical expertise' of intonation, rhythms, sounds, connected speech in English, and how they are used in spoken English (2009, p.11).

Gilakjani (2017, p.1253) has developed this point further that teacher's role is paramount in the field of pronunciation that they should behave as 'pronunciation model' as well as giving feedback and encouraging students to enhance their pronunciation slowly. Besides, Zielinski (2017, p.1) supported that although it is challenging to teach pronunciation to beginner students, teachers must still teach it from the very beginning to prevent pronunciation errors. Taken together, these statements advocate that teachers should not only focus on making students competent in writing and reading. They have to teach students how to pronounce English sounds correctly right from the very beginning of learning English to prevent pronunciation errors.

In the last decade, there has been a dramatic increase in pronunciation research on segmental features. In general, the research on segmental features has employed a different research approach to provide a comprehensive view of pronunciation in second language learning, and error analysis is one of the approaches mostly employed. On top of that, it is the approach of this present study. Many studies on segmental features have been undertaken in the past. Nosratinia & Zaker 2014; Stibbard 2004; Muhyidin 2016; Hadi 2015; Ehsan 2017; conducted their study which topic was both on consonants and vowels. Nosratinia & Zaker (2014) conducted a study of error analysis on Iranian learners' pronunciation between the ages of 19 and 26 by using reading aloud tasks. They were randomly selected among those who were attending EFL courses at seven different language schools, and their English proficiency ranged from intermediate to advance. It was found that consonant sounds are the main problem of the students.

A similar study was conducted by Stibbard (2004) on segmental errors. He studied the audio recordings made in 1997 of the speech of undergraduate studying on BA and BSc courses at Hong Kong Baptists University. This study focuses both on interaction and monologue, and the underlying reason behind this method is to record the data for analysis more naturalistic. This study concluded that the errors students made are (1) cannot distinguish between the long and short vowels, (2) substitution of sounds from Cantonese, (3) non-release of final plosives, and (4) devoicing of voiced consonants are widespread.

Another study focused on both consonants and vowels was carried out by Muhyidin (2016). He attempted to find phonological interference in English

pronunciation made by elementary students of Elementary school Rahmat, Kediri, East Java by using, again, reading aloud tasks. It was found nineteen types of interference on the segmental aspects, which consisted of nine vowel substitutions, two vowel shortenings and four consonant substitutions, two deletions of consonants, and two additions of consonants. Besides, Hadi (2015) conducted a study on the pronunciation of ESL students at English department of Al-Hikmah teacher institute. He studied ten students who have passed pronunciation class. In collecting the data, the students were asked to read an English passage loudly. He found that the differences phonological system between Indonesian and English was the reason for pronunciation errors.

Besides, Ehsan (2017) carried out a study on pronunciation – again by using reading aloud tasks – in Iran. He attempted to find the errors 30 high school boys who are native speakers of Persian aged between 18 and 19 years old who were selected randomly from among 87 participants by using contrastive phonological analysis. The finding revealed that the participant's first language had a considerable effect on their pronunciation.

Moreover, several studies on English vowel sounds have been conducted (Donal 2016; Frijuniarsi 2018; Hambur 2018). Donal (2016) examined the difficulties that Indonesians had in pronouncing English diphthongs. He studied thirty-five students of the University of Pasir Pengaraian, Riau province, by using reading aloud tasks. He found that the sound that students have difficulty with is [aʊ]. In addition to this, Frijuniarsi (2018) went further by analysing errors in pronouncing English vowels. He studied 40 students of English I course of Informatics Program

4

at Faculty on Engineering Mathematics and Science University of Indraprasta Persatuan Guru Republik Indonesia. Again, this study employed reading aloud tasks to gain data. The finding of this study revealed that errors occur because of the interference of the first language. A similar study that also focused on vowels was conducted by Hambur (2018). In her study, she employed reading aloud tasks that were read by Javanese native speaker secondary students who learn English as their second language. Diphthongs are the sounds that cause problems for the students.

Besides, other studies focus on English consonant sounds (Umantari, Laksminy & Putra 2016; Fauzi 2014; Anggraini, 2016; Kurniawan 2016; Mulyadi, Ansat & Kholid 2018). Umantari, Laksminy & Putra (2016) studied the error in consonant sounds encountered by 20 senior high school students of SMAN1 Tabanan. In this study, the researchers used reading-aloud tasks; as for the analysis of the data, the contrastive phonological analysis was used. Fauzi (2014) also conducted a study to analyse pronunciation errors on consonants, but it is more focused on English fricative sounds. In his study, he examined pronunciation errors made by Sundanese speakers in pronouncing English by giving them a list of words and asked them to pronounce them. Along with this, Mulyadi, Ansat & Kholid (2018) conducted a study on English fricative consonants on 13 Pattani's students who study at English Study Program of UIN Raden Intan Lampung. They examined the pronunciation errors by asking the students to read a passage and then record it. They found that [θ] and [ð] are the sounds that caused errors the most.

Furthermore, Anggraini (2016) analysed the error of aspirated and unaspirated consonant sounds produced by four students at English club senior high

school of TriSuksesNatar Lampung Selatan. The data collection techniques were observation, in-depth interviews, and focus groups. Kuriniawan (2016) conducted a study on consonants that focused on dental fricative consonants [θ] and [ð]. One hundred twenty students were asked to pronounce 30 words that have dental fricative consonant sounds. It is found that the percentage of the correct pronunciation of [θ] and [ð] is low. It is also found by Riyani & Prayogo (2013), and Mathew (2005) that /θ/ and /ð/ are some of English sounds that are a problem for Indonesian. Pallawa (2013) conducted a study of comparative analysis between English and Indonesian phonological systems and found that students faced difficulties in pronouncing English consonants due to different phonological systems.

Besides, several studies on segmental features at English department Universitas Negeri Padang have done by Ilahi (2011); Irmy (2017); Fauzia (2018); Putri & Rosa (2020); Saadah & Ardi (2020). Ilahi (2020) examined pronunciation errors on English vowels [ə], [æ], and [ɑː]. The sample of this study is thirty-two educational students' program. This study employed reading aloud to get the data. This study found that among those three sounds, the pronunciation [æ] was poor. Furthermore, Irmy (2017) studied pronunciation errors on [ʒ], [v], [p], [t], and [k]. She found that errors mostly happened in [ʒ] and [v]. Another study was done by Fauzia (2018) on diphthongs. She found that the error percentage of [aʊ] was the highest. Putri & Rosa (2020) conducted a study on vowel sounds. They found that [æ] was the most problematic sound. Lastly, Saadah & Ardi (2020) studied pronunciation errors on diphthongs. They discovered that centring diphthongs were the most problematic for the students.

In general, one of the limitations of the previous studies is that the focus is on testing the individual sound and reading aloud tasks, rather than actual performance to get the natural and unconscious pronunciation. Only a small number of took part in testing the actual performance, and there is no doubt that there remains a need to dig deeper into studying errors in English Pronunciation made by EFL students in actual performance such as in speech, storytelling, and debate rather than testing individual sounds. Also, there is still limited information available in the literature on pronunciation errors on segmental features made by West Sumatra learners. This present study, therefore, is intended to develop this point further, which focuses on errors in segmental features at EFL students' live performance, in this case, the researcher chooses speech.

There are two reasons why the researcher chose the speech. Firstly, the researcher wanted to get an instinctual and involuntary pronunciation sample of the students. Secondly, based on the preliminary research that was done by the researcher on English monophthongs at speech class MID performance, the researcher found that the students have many problems in pronouncing monophthongs sounds. It was found that the vowels /i:/, /æ/, /ɑ:/ are the most problematic sounds. Based on that evidence, this study is conducted to fill in the gap and to cover all of the segmental features to reveal other problematic sounds. Therefore, this study seeks to describe which segmental feature is frequently mispronounced by students, to classify the errors by its types, and to examine the sources of the errors.

1.2 Identification of the Problem

Following the background above, in the field of pronunciation, several problems can be studied—first, the different phonological systems and distinctive features between English and Indonesian. Second, segmental features. On the perspective of segmental features, put it simply, pronunciation can be studied as individual speech sounds that can be classified into two broad categories, namely, vowel and consonant sounds. Third, suprasegmental features. From the perspective of segmental features, some fields can be studied, for example, stress, rhythm, intonation, and linking sound.

1.3 Limitation of the Problem

Based on the identification of the problem above, the researcher limits the study on the pronunciation of English segmental features at speech class (SEA) and public speaking class at English department Universitas Negeri Padang. The researcher selected these two classes because, as stated before, the researcher wanted to obtain a natural genuine pronunciation sample of the students. Besides, although there were several types of classes such as debate, singing, poetry reading, and drama, it is considered to be impractical to analyse all of the pronunciation errors of the classes. Besides, these two classes were considered to be reasonably representative.

1.4 Formulation of the Problem

The problem of this research is formulated in this question: "What are the pronunciation errors in segmental features that take place at speech class (SEA) and public speaking class Universitas Negeri Padang?"

1.5 Research Questions

The researcher formulates the research questions like the following:

1. Which sounds are frequently being the errors in pronouncing English segmental features at the performances of speech class (SEA) and public speaking class?

2. What are the types of errors taking place in pronouncing English segmental features at the performances of speech class (SEA) public speaking class?

3. What are the sources of errors in pronouncing English segmental features at the performances of speech class (SEA) and public speaking class?

1.6 Purpose of the Research

The purposes are phrased as the following:

1. To identify errors in pronouncing English segmental features of the performances of speech class (SEA) and public speaking class.

2. To classify the errors by its types in pronouncing English segmental features of the performances of speech class (SEA) and public speaking class.

3. To examine the sources of errors in pronouncing English segmental features of the performances of speech class (SEA) and public speaking class.

1.7 Significance of the Study

The result of this study is meant to contribute both theoretically and practically. Theoretically, this study contributes to an understanding of pronunciation errors in a speech-related study, which is still barely studied. Along with this, this study can also be a source that might help other researchers to find references for further research on pronunciation. Practically, this study contributes to give an insight to teachers, lecturers, and maybe curriculum developers, which part of English pronunciation students have difficulty producing correctly, and which error types and sources alleviate students from having intelligible pronunciation so they would be able to help them with that.

1.8 Definition of the Key Terms

A. Pronunciation

Pronunciation is the way of saying a word. It is the correct way to pronounce a word in English.

B. Segmental Features

Segmental features are the features of pronunciation that deal with the individual sounds of a language that consist of consonants and vowels.

C. Error analysis

Error analysis is a process involving several activities that are identifying, determining, classifying, describing, and interpreting the errors made by someone who learns a foreign or second language.

D. Speech (SEA) class

Speech class is one of many classes available at spoken English activity (SEA) that is used to sharpen students' skill in giving a speech in English.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

5.1 Interpretation of Findings

This study discovered that the sound [ð] was strikingly problematic to the participants as every participant except one made the error. This result was surprisingly overwhelming in English department students' points of view considering that these participants have passed phonetics and phonology class. For some reasons, they must have some knowledge of the sound and must have thought how to make the sound. It can thus be suggested that they have not fully realized the sound in their disposal, i.e., they know about the sound and perhaps could pronounce it in isolation, but the sound has not become automatic for them.

Besides, in terms of a universal problem, looking across the prior studies, there is good agreement between the results of this study with previous findings of current research in the error analysis of pronunciation. Several studies put forward that the fricatives [ð], and [θ] are found to be problematic (Riyani & Prayogo, 2013; Emran & Anggraini, 2017; Islamiyah, 2012; Nosratinia & Zaker, 2014; Mathew, 2005; Pallawa 2013). Kurniawan (2016) conducts a distinctive study that focuses on [ð] and [θ] and found that the percentage of correct pronunciation is low. These studies found that [d] is a common substitution for [ð], and [t] is a common substitute for [θ]. This is similar to the results of this study. Islamiyah (2012) discovered that [s] also being substituted for [θ], and Stibbard (2004) also found that [f] being substituted for [θ]. However, these are not found in the current study.

Another important finding is the sound [æ], which marks the second mispronounced sound in this study. This study found that [e] is a common substitution for [æ]. This is in line with previous results (Putri & Rosa, 2020; Islamiyah, 2012; Hadi, 2015). The characteristics of realizations are almost the same, which are [e], [a], and [ʌ], but this study did not find [ʌ] being substituted for [æ]. In the current study, it was found that [æ] was substituted as [e], [a], and [ʌ], but the most significant resemblance is that [e] is the common substitution for [æ].

Moreover, turning to diphthongs sounds, this study found that [əʊ], [eɪ], [aʊ], [aɪ], and [ɪə] were made errors. Donal (2016), in his study of pronunciation error on diphthongs made by Indonesian, showed a good correlation with this study. He found that [əʊ] was substituted by [ɒ] which is in line with this study, but this study also revealed that it is realized as [aʊ]. The diphthong [eɪ] was realized as [aɪ]. This study confirms this, but not at a significant level. [eɪ] was realized as many different sounds, and [e] is the most common substitution for the diphthong [eɪ] found in this study. Furthermore, he found that [aʊ] was substituted only as [oʊ] which is correlates with this study, but [ɒ] and [a] are also a substitute for [aʊ]. The diphthong [aɪ] was realized as [eɪ] and [ɪ]. This study, however, has been unable to demonstrate that [eɪ] being a substitute for [aɪ]. Lastly, [ɪə] was realized as [e] and [ɪ]. This study only confirms the realization of [ɪə] as [ɪ]. In short, the results of this study are in agreement with Donal (2016) in terms of the shared realization of those sounds except that this study found more realizations.

The sound [ə] was significantly realized as many different sounds. The results differ to some extent, considerably from those of Emran & Anggraini, 2017;

Nosratinia & Zaker, 2014. They found that [ə] was substituted limitedly as [ɒ], [ɪ], and [e]. The current study confirmed these two realizations, but this study a large variety of realizations. Emran & Anggraini, 2017 also found that [e] was substituted as [ɪ] and [iː]. This study has been unable to demonstrate the evidence of the substitution of [e] as [iː]. This study found that [e] was realized a [eɪ], [æ], [ə], [ɪ], and [a]. Likewise, in contrast to these studies, no evidence of error on [ʌ] was detected. This study found [ʌ] was substituted as several sounds, but the most prominent is [ɒ].

Equally important, many studies showed that the distinctive feature between long and short vowels are not realized, i.e., long vowels are shortened (Stibbard, 2004; Islamiyah, 2012; Habibi, 2016; Emran & Anggraini, 2017). They found that [iː] was shortened to [ɪ], [uː] to [ʊ], [ɜː] to [ə], [ɔː] to [ɒ], and [ɑː] to [ɑ]. This latter point correlates reasonably well with the results of this study except that the long vowel [ɑː] was realized as the Indonesian vowel [a] in the current study. These studies highlighted that errors on long vowels occur because they cannot be found in the first language vowel inventory.

This study found that [v] was realized as [f] and [p]. This finding collaborates with Mathew (2005), who also found a similar error in her study, but compared to this study, the error did not occur at a significant level. Nevertheless, several previous studies on the pronunciation of Indonesian confirm [v] was also realized as [p], and that they found [v] is problematic because this phoneme does exist in Indonesian (Habibi, 2016; Hadi 2015). Regarding the phoneme [f], this study found that [f] was realized as [p], and this result has only been confirmed by Mathew

(2005). Habibi (2016) &Hadi (2015) have been unable to demonstrate this result. Furthermore, these previous studies reported that [t], [d], and [k] were unreleased and deleted. These results match perfectly with the findings of this study. Mathew further explained that the final [d] is not found in Indonesian (2005), and the feature between Indonesian [t] and [k] and English [t] and [k] slightly differ.

The sounds [s], [z], [ʃ], [ʒ], and [tʃ] are found to be confusing. In accordance with the present results, a large majority of previous studies have demonstrated the same findings (Habibi, 2016; Mathew, 2005; Lubis, Yusri & Zuhria, 2017; Islami-yah, 2012; Riyani & Prayogo, 2013; Hadi, 2015). They noted that [ʃ] was substituted as [s] & [z]. The phoneme [s] was substituted as [ʃ] & [z]. The phoneme [z] was substituted as [s], especially at final position. The phoneme [ʒ] was realized as [s], [ʃ], and [z]. These findings are in perfect correlation with this study, except that [z] did not find to be a substitute for [ʒ]. Furthermore, Mathew (2005) found [tʃ] was realized as [ʃ], [k], [ts], and [dʒ]. However, there is no evidence [tʃ] is realized as [k] and [dʒ] in this study; only [ʃ] and [ts] are confirmed in this study. A possible explanation for these results may be the lack of adequate words containing the sound [tʃ] in participants' speech.

Interestingly, the errors on [dʒ], and the insertion of [g], [w], [h], [b], and [e] have not previously been described in the previous studies. This worth mentioning because these findings reinforce that spelling interference is a significant cause of the errors.

To conclude, some mispronunciations found in the current study happened because of developmental factors that found to have a good correlation between this study and previous findings. However, looking at the evidence, there is a significant influence of the first language in the present data. A simple and more intuitive explanation described by Stibbard is that one speaks English with the segmental inventory of their first language (2004, p. 137).

5.2 Implications

The result of this study is meant to give both practical and theoretical contributions.

5.2.1 Practical

From the data, it is shown that a sound is realized as many sounds, and at least one participant produced an unacceptable realization of the error sounds. This means that each phoneme being the error in this study has not been fully realized. This finding encourages that the crucial importance of each segmental feature should be taken into account considering the number of times each phone occurs in an unknown quantity of words if not, a thousand words of English. A pedagogical program for pronunciation teaching of segmental features in English for Indonesian could be addressed based on the frequency of errors showed in this study, and sounds that do not exist in the first language are being addressed first, such as long vowel sounds because they are difficult for Indonesian to articulate. Besides, both aural and oral practice need to be included in pronunciation teaching so that not

only can learners distinguish the phonemes by ear, they can also differentiate the phonemes in speaking.

5.2.2 Theoretical

This study found that interlingual transfer is considered to be a significant role contributing to a significant number of errors, and in some cases, developmental process holds an account. This provides some supports to the conceptual premise that in early stages, the second language system has not been built yet, so the native language is the only linguistic system that they can refer to in producing the target language. At a particular stage, second language development started to build some errors yet still occurs like faulty generalization because of incomplete development. Besides, this study contributes to making several additional errors and realizations to the current literature that have not been highlighted before using reading aloud and testing individual sounds.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

6.1. Conclusion

This study has found that [ð], [æ], [iː], [əʊ], [ə], [eɪ], [θ], [v], [uː], [ɜː], [t], [ɔː], [ɪ], [ʌ], [ʃ], [ɑː], [aʊ], [d], [e], [l], [s], [g], [ʤ], [z], [tʃ], [ɒ], [aɪ], [ʒ], [f], [k], [ɪə], [h], [r], [w], and [j] were the sounds that erroneously mispronounced by the participants. Taken as a whole, the majority of errors occurred in vowel sounds, which made up 62% of the total errors. On the other hand, errors in consonants were 38% of the total errors. Substitution was the highest proportion of types of errors followed by omission and addition, and the least was misordering. Furthermore, interlingual factor was found to be strikingly significant the rationale why the participants made errors and followed by developmental factor or developmental process and unique errors. These results suggest that first language interference is a major contributing factor to participants' errors.

6.2. Suggestions

A number of significant limitations need to be considered. First, the scope of this study was limited in prepared speech performance. Second, the current instrument was limited by the recordings of the students. Third, the current research was not specifically designed to analyze factors related to suprasegmental features such as stress and connected speech.

It is recommended that future work be done in the context of spontaneous speech sample to get more potential pronunciation errors to understand the nature of error of L1 Indonesian learners. Moreover, further research could address for varying instruments of the research, such as tests and interviews. Also, other parts of suprasegmental features such as intonation, rhythm, and connected speech are vital issues needed to be further researched to investigate errors in this area. They are fundamental to be carried out to draw the whole picture of Indonesian EFL errors, and to improve pronunciation teaching in Indonesia.

REFERENCES

Anggraini, F. 2016. Error Analysis of Aspirated and Unaspirated Consonant Sounds Produced by Students at English Club Senior High School of Tri Sukses Natar South Lampung. *The Fourth International Conference on Education and Language (4th ICEL).* Universitas Bandar Lampung (UBL), 68-71.

Bluman, A. G. 2014. *Elementary Statistics: A Step by Step Approach* (9th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Education.

Brown, H. D. 2006. *Principles of language learning and teaching (5th Ed).* White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.

Carr, P. 2013. *English Phonetics and Phonology: An Introduction.* Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Celce-Murcia, M., Brinton, D. M., & Goodwin, J.M. 1996. *Teaching Pronunciation: A Reference for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chaira, S. 2015. Interference of First Language in Pronunciation of English Segmental Sounds. *English Education Journal*, *6*(4), 469-483.

Crystal, D. 2008. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics (6th Ed.).* Oxford: Blackwell

Donal, A. 2016. Indonesia Students' Difficulties in Pronouncing English Diphthongs. *Journal of English Education*, *2*(2). 55-62.

Dulay, H., Burt. M., Krashen, S. 1982. *Language Two.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Ehsan, N., D. 2017. Pronunciation problems of high school EFL students: An error analysis approach with pedagogical implication. *International Journal of English Research*, *3*(4), 77-82.

Ellis, R. 1994. *The study of Second Language Acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Emran, A. M., & Anggani, D.L.B., 2017. The Errors of Segmental Phonemes among Libyans English Students Studying in Semarang City, Indonesia. *Journal of Language and Literature.* *11*(2), 183-197.

Erdogan, 2005. Contribution of Error Analysis to Foreign Language Teaching. *Mersin University Journal of the Faculty of Education*,1(2), 261-270.