AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS' ERROR IN PERCEPTION OR PRODUCTION IN PRONOUNCING ENGLISH SOUNDS WHICH HAVE DIFFERENT DISTRIBUTIONS WITH THEIR NATIVE LANGUAGE

Ryan Biantoro, Amir Sisbiyanto, Suprapto ✉

English Department, Faculty of Languages and Arts, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Article Info	Abstract
	This paper is written based on the error analysis on perception or production in pronouncing English sounds which have different distributions by the students of SMP N 2 Demak in Academic Year of 2015/2016. The study was aimed to describe and to explain the most common problems faced by the students in learning English final voiced stops [b, d, g]. This study is using qualitative approach. The population of the study was the eight grader students of SMP N 2 Demak. The total numbers of the population used in this research are 310. Random sampling technique was used to get the sample. The data of this study was obtained from listening and speaking tests. The result of those tests were used as the source of data collection. Then, the result was interpreted by using Tinambunan's criterion grading. In perception test, the error proportion of the 30 students was 6,07% while in the production test, the error proportion was 28,2% out of 30 students. Based on the results, it is concluded that the students were considered exellent in perceiving but fair in pronouncing final voiced stops [b, d, g].

✉ Correspondent Address:
B3 Building FBS Unnes
Sekaran, Gunungpati, Semarang, 50229
E-mail: ryanbiantoro@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Language is a means of communication. Many people in the world use the different languages because of their different locations and historic backgrounds. English as a means of communication plays an important role. It can be seen in the newspapers that vacancies need persons who can speak English well. The implication is that English should be taught to the students earlier before they continue their study to higher level. Especially, the students in the universities must be equipped with English because many of the books are written in English. In addition, in order to understand English text books and fulfill the requirement of vacancies, people try to develop their ability to master both spoken and written English.

English as a foreign language has got a special attention in Indonesia. English has been taught not only in junior high school, senior high School, and vocational school but also in elementary school or even in PAUD. Like any other learners of English as a foreign language, Indonesian learners also meet difficulties in learning English since their native is quite different from English. They are not used to produce English sounds. And therefore they may do some errors in pronouncing words in English.

This study is motivated by the fact that the main goal of teaching and learning English is communicative competence which is aimed to enable the students to create texts fluently based on the context. One of the components of communicative competence is linguistic competence. Linguistic competence refers to creating grammatical sentences, good pronunciation, or having many vocabularies. A good pronunciation is important because different pronunciation may have different meaning and may cause misunderstanding. According to Ramelan (1994:6-7) there are several kinds of pronunciation problems appeared in learning foreign language: (1) The existence of a given sound in the target language which is not found in the student's language. (2) Sounds which have the same phonetic features but differ in their distributions. (3) Similar sounds with different allophones. (4) Similar sounds with a slight difference in their phonetic features. (5) Consonant clusters.

This research will be focused on analyzing students' error in production and perception in pronouncing English sounds especially those that have different distributions [b, d, g] with their native language. I want to find out the difficulties faced by the students in listening or producing English words, especially, in SMP Negeri 2 Demak.

METHODS

This research uses descriptive qualitative method to find the answer of the objective of the study that is to describe whether the students do errors in perception or production while pronouncing english words which contains English sounds [b, d, g], by collecting, analyzing the data, and drawing conclusion based on the data analysis. The conclusion cannot be expressed in number, but in sentences.

Qualitative research is a research that produces a procedure of analysis. It doesn't use a statistical procedure of analysis or the other quantitative method (Moleong, 2010: 6). The purpose of descriptive research is to record exactly what happened, whether the researcher is describing an experimental treatment or something occurring in the natural habitat of study participants (LeCompte et al. 1993: 39).

Moore (1983:110) as quoted by Sulistyo (2008:29) states population means a complete set of individuals or object having some common observable characteristic. Moreover, a population is a set or collection of all elements possessing one or more attributives of interest."

I chose the eighth graders students of SMPN 2 Demak as the population of this research. It was based on consideration as the population is homogeneous for the research because they were all the same year. The total numbers of the population used in this research are 310 from the eighth grader students SMPN 2 Demak.

After determining the population, then sample was selected. A good sample is one that representatives and reflects the condition of the population from which it was selected. I used a random sampling technique in collecting data because the population was homogenous. I picked up them randomly as the sample of this research. By using this technique, I hoped that the samples would be representative.

Instrument plays important role in a research project in which the reliability of the instrument will affect the reliability of the data obtained in the research. Tinambunan (1988:75) states some advantages of using multiple choice forms. The advantages are as follows:

1. The multiple choice item is adaptable to subject matter content areas as well as different levels of behavior. It can be used in assessing ability to reason, discriminate, interpret, analyze, make inferences and solve problems.
2. The structure of a premise with three alternatives provides less chance for guessing the correct response.
3. Three options in the multiple choice test provide more incorrect choice for selections of responses by the students who don't know the best or correct answer.
4. The difficulty of multiple choice item can be controlled by changing alternatives. The more homogeneous the alternatives, the more difficult it is to select the correct response from the given alternatives.

From the statements above, I use multiple-choice test to obtain data because multiple choice is easy to analyze and to determine how well each alternative functioned in discriminating between the higher achieving and the lower achieving students.

Furthermore, the test consisted of 90 items. Each item contained a blank, in which the respondents were supported to answer by choosing and crossing the best answer a, b, or c. In constructing all the questions in the test items, I used daily vocabularies, which are familiar with the respondents. I hoped they would have no problem with the test items.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The study aims to analyze the cause of errors made by the eighth year students of SMPN 2 Demak, whether in the level of perception or production. The data collected through perception and production test. In the perception test, the students were asked to have listening test consisted of 90 multiple choice items and for the speaking test, the students were asked to pronounce 30 English words consisted the English voiced stop [b, d, g]. The tests were used to find the errors in the level of perception and production which later will be analyzed. The data analyzed in this study were those sounds that falsely judged by the students in listening test and English words that pronounced incorrectly in the spesking test. The following table, Table 1, shows the number of errors by the students in the listening test.

SAMPLE CODE	TOTAL	PROPORTION (%)
S01	2	2,2%
S02	10	11,1%
S03	1	1%

S04	1	1%
S05	4	4,4%
S06	12	13,3%
S07	12	13,3%
S08	11	12,2%
S09	15	16,7
S10	4	4,4%
S11	2	2,2%
S12	5	5,5%
S13	8	8,9%
S14	3	3,3%
S15	1	1%
S16	7	7,8%
S17	0	0%
S18	7	7,8%
S19	3	3,3%
S20	1	1%
S21	7	7,8%
S22	6	6,7%
S23	4	4,4%
S24	3	3,3%
S25	3	3,3%
S26	7	7,8%
S27	2	2,2%
S28	6	6,7%
S29	5	5,5%
S30	2	2,2%
Total	154	-
Average	5,13	6,07%

Table 3.1. Errors by the Students in the Listening Test

Table 1 shows that the students didn't find any difficulties in perceiving [b, d, g] sounds. The lowest proportion of errors was 0% and the highest proportion is only 16,7%. The average (mean) proportion of the errors in listening test were 6,07%, less than 10%, which means the students didn't find any difficulties to differentiate words contained English voiced stop [b, d, g] and the distractor words based on Brown absolute rating scale.

In the production test, the students were asked to pronounce 30 English words contains English voiced stop [b, d, g]. Then, I analyze the errors made by the students as shown in the table 2 below.

NO	WORDS	FREQ	PROPO-RTION
1	Cab	12	40,0%
2	Cob	8	26,7%
3	Cub	9	30,0%
4	Hob	14	46,7%
5	Mob	9	30,0%
6	Nab	12	40,0%
7	Nob	11	36,7%
8	Rib	13	43,3%
9	Rob	11	36,7%
10	Tab	12	40,0%
Total Errors		111	-
Average		11,1	37%

Table 3.2. Substitution errors of voiced stop [b]

Table 2. shown the errors made by the students of SMPN 2 Demak in production test. The first 10 items in the production test were the English words that contains final voiced stop [b]. They were cab, cob, cub, hob, mob, nab, nob, rib, rob, and tab. As shown in the table 4.2 there were a total of 111 errors made by the students, with the average errors of 11,1 (37%). The highest frequency of error was also found in the item number 4 for 46,7% of the students made error. The words number 4 is 'hob', the correct pronounciation is [hab] where the students' pronounciation was [hap]. Since in bahasa the voiced stops are never found in utterance final position, indonesian students may have difficulty to pronounce the final voiced stop.

NO	WORDS	FREQ	PROPO-RTION
1	Bad	9	30,0%
2	Bed	8	26,7%
3	Code	3	10,0%
4	Food	8	26,7%
5	Had	13	43,3%
6	Hid	4	13,3%
7	Kid	5	16,7%
8	Led	7	23,3%
9	Nod	6	20,0%
10	Sad	7	23,3%
Total Errors		70	-
Average		7,0	23,3%

Table 3.3. Substitution errors of voiced stop [d]

The second 10 items in the production test were the English words that contains voiced stop [d]. They were *bad, bed, code, food, had, hid, kid, led, nod,* and *sad*. As shown in the table 4.3 there were a total of 70 errors made by the students, with the average errors of 7,0 (23,3%). The high frequency of error was also found in the item number 5 for 43,3% of the students made error. The words number 4 is '*had*', the correct pronounciation is [hæd] where the students' pronounciation was [had]. Since in bahasa the voiced stops are never found in utterance final position, indonesian students may have difficulty to pronounce the final voiced stop.

NO	WORDS	FREQ	PROPO-RTION
1	Bag	8	26,7%
2	Brig	9	30,0%
3	Bug	7	23,3%
4	Dog	9	30,0%
5	Dug	7	23,3%
6	Log	5	16,7%
7	Mug	8	26,7%
8	Pig	5	16,7%
9	Rig	6	20,0%
10	Tag	9	30,0%
Total Errors		73	
Average		7,3	24,3%

Table 3.4. Substitution errors of voiced stop [g]

The last 10 items in the production test were the English words that contains voiced stop [g]. They were *bag, brig, bug, dog, dug, log, mug, pig, rig,* and *tag*. As shown in the table 4.4 there were a total of 73 errors made by the students, with the average errors of 7,3 (24,3%). The high frequency of error was also found in the item number 2, 4, and 10 for 30,0% of the students made error. The word number 2 is '*brig',* word number 4 is '*dog*', word number 10 is '*tag*' , the correct pronounciation for the word *brig* is [brɪg] where the students' pronounciation was [brɪk], second, the correct pronounciation for the word *dog* is [dɔg] where the students' pronounciation was [dɔk], third, the correct pronounciation for the word *tag* is [tæg] while the students' pronounciation was [tæk]. The students found it difficult to pronounce the English word '*brig',* '*dog*', and '*tag*' since in bahasa the voiced stops are never found in utterance final position.

From the table 1, we can see that the students found it easy to determine the right answer in the listening (perception) test. It can be seen from the value of the mean or the average errors of the students. Tinambunan (1988:103) says the mean is the average of a group of scores. It is represented by the letter M or (X). The mean is the sum of all the values in a distribution divided by the number of cases or it is the average or arithmetic average of a group of scores. Tinambunan (1998: 103) also adds "the computation of mean from ungrouped data is done by adding a series of scores and then dividing this sum by the number of scores."

There are an average of 84,8% of correct answers, while the incorrect answers are on the average of 5,51%. I classified the students' achievement by using five letters, those are A, B, C, D and F, which expressed various level of achievement. In addition, it was relatively easy to translate from letter grading to percentage grading.

The standard is as follows:

Percentage of Correct Answer	Grade	Level of Achievement
93-100 percent correct	A = Outstanding	Outstanding achievement
85-92 percent correct	B = Very good	Above average achievement
75-84 percent correct	C = Satisfactory	Average achievement
60-74 percent correct	D = Very weak	Below average achievement
Below 60 percent correct	F = Fail	Insufficient achievement

The students' achievement could be classified based on the categorization or grade. Based on the categorization, the students' achievement can be classified as follows:

Number of Students	Grade	Percentages of Students
20	A	66,7 %
9	B	30 %
1	C	3,3%
0	D	0 %
0	F	0%

The result of the test showed clearly that 20 students or 66,7 % got A, 9 students or 30 % got B, and 1 students or 3,3 % got C. The result from the analysis showed that 29 students or 63.33% of 30 students got very good grade. It means that they found no difficulties in the listening test.

		SPEAKING TEST	
NO	SAMPLE CODE	CORRECT	INCORRECT
1	S01	96,7%	3,3%
2	S02	56,7%	43,3%
3	S03	73,3%	26,7%
4	S04	80,0%	20,0%
5	S05	96,7%	3,3%
6	S06	93,3%	6,7%
7	S07	30,0%	70,0%
8	S08	46,7%	53,3%
9	S09	70,0%	30,0%
10	S10	90,0%	10,0%
11	S11	96,7%	3,3%
12	S12	70,0%	30,0%
13	S13	76,7%	23,3%
14	S14	0%	100%
15	S15	93,3%	6,7%
16	S16	40,0%	60,0%
17	S17	86,7%	13,3%
18	S18	76,7%	23,3%
19	S19	40,0%	60,0%

20	S20	93,3%	6,7%
21	S21	66,7%	33,3%
22	S22	96,7%	3,3%
23	S23	0%	100%
24	S24	73,3%	26,7%
25	S25	53,3%	46,7%
26	S26	33,3%	66,7%
27	S27	90,0%	10,0%
28	S28	70%	30%
29	S29	73,3%	26,7%
30	S30	80,0%	20,0%
	AVERAGE	**68,11%**	**31,89%**

From the table above, we can see that the students found it easy to determine the right answer in the listening (perception) test. It can be seen from the value of the mean or the average errors of the students. There are an average of 84,8% of correct answers, while the incorrect answers are on the average of 5,51%. I classified the students' achievement by using five letters, those are A, B, C, D and F, which expressed various level of achievement. In addition, it was relatively easy to translate from letter grading to percentage grading.

CONCLUSIONS

After conducting the research, doing the analysis, and presenting the results, in this last chapter, I will draw a conclusion from what I have discussed in the previous chapters. Subsequently, I will also offer a number of suggestions regarding with the teaching and learning practice in SMP N 2 Demak.

Based on the interview in the school under study, narrative text was stated to be the most difficult one among the other text types (functional text, procedure, recount, descriptive, report) for the students. In narrative text, students are often asked to figure out the message, main idea, and even particular information from the story. To overcome this problem, the teachers manage this problem by implementing various kinds of teaching techniques. One of them is deducing meaning from context. It is applied as a technique which enables the students to deduce meaning of a word by observing its context. This was the reason why this research is conducted whether or not there was a significant correlation between the students' mastery of deducing meaning from context and their reading comprehension of narrative text.

The data analysis showed that both students' mastery of deducing meaning from context and reading comprehension of narrative text were still poor. It was proved from the average of deducing meaning from context was 53.3 and reading comprehension of narrative text was 56.7.

The result of the data analysis also showed that the correlation coefficient between the two variables was 0.85, while the critical value for 5 % significance level was 0.433. Thus, it could be concluded that there was a very significant correlation between the students' mastery of deducing meaning from context and their reading comprehension of narrative text.

From the result of analysis it could also be seen that in general both the students' mastery of deducing meaning from context and their reading comprehension of narrative text were still poor.

Based on the finding, i would like to give some suggestions to be considered.

1. Teachers as the center of the teaching and learning process play an important role in every development of their students. Language teaching is different from other subjects, teachers not only dealing with the language itself but has to know the art of using the language, the art of how the native people using their language. English teachers, they play more than two roles since they're not only dealing with English itself but also the native language of their students. Many of the students still carry the attributes of their mother language. Teachers must learns more about pronunciations. They should be a good model for their students. Instead of just showing whats right or wrong, they can ask their students the reason why it is right or wrong.

2. The students often struggle to pronounce some unfamiliar words in English. So it will be better if the students enrich their vocabulary through real life, such as television, social media, and internet. Social media can be extremely useful to them if they use it well.

REFERENCES

Alderson, J. Charles. 2000. Assessing Reading. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Arikunto, Suharsimi. 2010. Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik. Jakarta : Rineka Cipta.

Bastian, AJ. 2013. A Correlation Study between Student's Reading Interest toward their Vocabulary Mastery. Skripsi. Salatiga : STAIN. Pdf

Brown, H. D. 2001. Teaching by Principles an Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy (2nd Ed). San Francisco State University.

Brown, Douglas H. 2004. Language Assessment, Principle and Classroom Practices. San Francisco: Longman.

Cahyono & Widiati. 2006. The Teaching of EFL Reading. TEFLIN Journal, 17(1):46.

Context Clues. http://www.warrencountyschools.org/userfiles/1593/context%20clues%20multiple%20choice%20exercise.pdf. Retrieved on June, 15 2016

DeLuca, Betty. 2010. Learn New Words Using Context. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina. http://www.learnnc.org/lp/pages/3971. Retrieved on December, 25 2015.

English Language Arts 2013. http://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/contact -us. Retrieved on June, 15 2016

English Language Arts Reading Comprehension test. Massachusetts English Language Arts Curriculum Framework (2001). http://www.doe.mass.edu/ frameworks/current.html. Retrieved on June, 15 2016

Fitriani, Walida Wahid. 2008. The Influence of Skimming Technique on Reading a Narrative Text. Final Project English Department FBS UNNES.

Hudson, T. 2007. Teaching Second Language Reading. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Margono. 2004. Metode Penelitian Pendidikan. Jakarta : Rineka Cipta.

Mart, Çağrı Tuğrul. 2012. Guessing the Meanings of Words From Context: Why and How. International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature. 1. 6. http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/ijalel.v.1n.6p.177. Retrieved on December, 12 2015.

Mikulecky, Beactrice S and Jeffries, Linda. 1997. Basic Reading Power. New PYork: Addison Wesley Longman.

Mikulecky, Beactrice S. 1990. A Short Course in Teaching Reading Skills. New York: Addison Wesley Publishing Company.

Neo, E. 2003. Narrative for O' Level English. Singapore : Pearson Education Education Asia Pte Ltd.

Nuttal, C. 1996. Teaching Reading Skills in a Foreign Language. Oxford: Heinneman.

Oklahoma School Testing Program. Oklahoma Core Curriculum Tests. http://sde.ok.gov/sde/sites/ok.gov.sde/files. Retrieved on June, 15 2016.

Pradana, Hendry Setia. 2011. The Correlation Between Vocabulary Mastery and Reading Comprehension of The Tenth Grade Students of SMK Negeri 1 Batang in Academic Year of 2010/2011. Final Project English Department FBS UNNES.

Prihasiwi, Paramita Rizkie. 2011. Improving Students' Vocabulary Mastery in Reading Comprehension through Deducing Meaning of Unfamiliar Words from the Context and Vocabulary Building in Class VIIG of SMP N 2 Pleret in the academic year of 2010/2011. Thesis. Yogyakarta : UNY. Pdf

Saleh, Mursid. 2012. Introduction to Linguistic and Educational Research. Semarang : UNNES.

Sari, Dian Puspita. 2011. The Use of Directed Reading – Thinking Activity in Teaching Narrative text Reading. Final Project English Department FBS UNNES.

The Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System. Release of Spring 2002 Test Items. http://www.doe.mass.edu. Retrieved on June, 15 2016.

Toba, Rostanti. 2009. Students' Mastery of Reading Skills and its Correlation with their Reading Comprehension Ability. Thesis. Bandung : UPI. Pdf.

Vallette, Rebecca M. 1997. Modern Language Testing. English : Harcourt College Publication. California Standards Test.

Wiyasa, Pangestu Adi. 2015. Improving Students' English Reading Skills by Using Peer Assisted Learning Strategies of Grade VII Students of SMP 1 Jogonalan Klaten in the Academic Year of 2013/2014. Thesis. Yogyakarta : UNY.Pdf.