LILICS
Journal of Literature, Linguistics, and Cultural Studies
Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 221-237
E-ISSN: 2986-9552
Website: http://urj.uin-malang.ac.id/index.php/LILICS/index

Monocentric Concepts in Phonetic Errors of 'Bimanese' EFL Learners

Irianti
English Literature Study Program, Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang
rianti1703@gmail.com

DOI: https://doi.org/10.18860/lilics.v1i1.2685

How to Cite: APA Style 7th edition

Submission Track:
Received:
20-03-2023
Available online:
28-04-2023
Corresponding Author:
Irianti
rianti1703@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The open debate between monocentric and plurecentric concepts on pronunciation makes this research carried out. Monocentric is the concept which tends to emphasize an English learning approach for non-native speakers based on standard English or anglo-american style and believes in the existence of error sounds, while plurecentric considers the errorneous as the variety of English instead of error sounds. However, the researcher only tried to investigate the error, which sounded particularly phonetic, by taking 10 Bimanese college students. 50 words were given to the participants, and the record test was used during the pronunciation test. This test became the data to answer what phonetic errors were produced by Bimanese EFL learners using error analysis in the form of qualitative method and descriptive analysis. The communication problems that were caused by phonetic errors were identified as well becoming the second research question to be answered. This was done considering the relationship between intelligibility and pronunciation. The communication processes of two Bimanese Youtubers with foreigners were investigated for understanding the phenomenon of intelligibility and pronunciation using observation tests on four video vlogs. The findings showed that vowels were the most deviated errors produced by Bimanese. The deviation that occurred was barely caused by fossilization and mother tongue interference; the illiteracy of the participants in the pronunciation and the inconsistency of English sound systems took the most. Eventually, the researcher discovered misunderstandings and a lack of confidence that were caused by phonetic errors in the communication process.

***Keywords**: monocentric, plurecentric, phonetic errors, communication problems*

INTRODUCTION

In learning English, skill that is neglected by EFL teachers and students is speaking, particularly in Indonesia. One of the reasons that is caused this problem is learning English by proficiency test oriented. This is supported by the fact that the common test Indonesian

LILICS
Journal of Literature, Linguistics, and Cultural Studies
Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 221-237
E-ISSN: 2986-9552
Website: http://urj.uin-malang.ac.id/index.php/LILICS/index

institutions used such as TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) and TOEIC (Test of English for International Communication) only consist of listening, grammar and reading sections. Consequently, teachers or students ignore mastering speaking and writing skills in depth. However, writing skill is not as crucial as speaking because EFL teachers and students still orient to have the final writing such as an article, journal, BA thesis, thesis or even dissertation in formal learning.

On the other hand, Nunan (1991) states that the most significant component of language skill was speaking. Through spoken language, people could deliver the message they wanted to get across as a means of communication. There were three components that influenced speaking skills. Those were vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation. From the three components, pronunciation was the most underestimated to be learned (Setyaningsih et. al., 2019). Whereas Prashant (2018) declares that to have good communication, it needed the correct pronunciation. Pronunciation affected the meaning of the words people produced. Specifically, incorrect pronunciations caused the intelligibility problems (Cakir & Baytar, 2014). If it happened between the speakers, it made them getting confused and misunderstood while they were in language interaction. Rajadurai (2016) also added that having correct pronunciation would avoid not only intelligibility problems for speakers but also stereotyping and stigmatizing them in school, the workplace, etc.

In fact, the intelligibility problem in pronunciation is still in open debate by two opposing concepts. They are plurecentric and monocentic. Plurecentric concept considers that intelligibility refers to the understandability where listeners understand at a given time in a given situation (Nelson, 1982). The understandability was gained by three steps: recognizing the expression, knowing the meaning, and relating it to the sociocultural context (Bamgbose, 1998). In other words, if people applied those three steps, intelligibility could be achieved even if they had the error sounded or incorrect pronunciation. Otherwise, the monocentric concept believed that intelligibility was reached if people pronounced the words or sentences accurately so that the listeners could easily and comfortably understand them (Ur, 1996). To be specific, monocentric saw how people knew the meaning if the words or sentences were not clear or correct. Only with correct pronunciation, the meaning of the words or sentences be understood.

Monocentric was considered as the acquiring and learning language process which was close to linguistic codes and native speakers' patterns of communication. The output must be like the Anglo-American form of English and its cultural conventions (Dimova, 2020). Since the standard English pattern was emphasized in monocentric concepts, this concept believed that there would be errors sounded and fossilization produced by non-native speakers. However, monocentric was also convinced that errors or fossilization could be fixed on the assumption that non-native speakers could master the full level of pronunciation proficiency, reaching the level of native speakers (Rahal, 2018). Meanwhile, the plurecentric concept examined that there was no error sounded or fossilization in language. The non-native spoken language was considered a language variation in this concept (Rahal, 2018). The main thing was that people understand each other during the communication process, although they did not have the correct pronunciation.

The previous studies on this subject explained the causes or reasons why speakers got error sounded, but in this study, that case was not discussed. This study identified the communication problems that speakers faced when they got error sounds instead.

Corresponding author: rianti1703@gmail.com

LILICS
Journal of Literature, Linguistics, and Cultural Studies
Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 221-237
E-ISSN: 2986-9552
Website: http://urj.uin-malang.ac.id/index.php/LILICS/index

Moreover, this study only focused on investigating the pronunciation that affected communication. Identifying the communication problems that were caused by error sounds could also be the way to understand the intelligibility phenomenon. To be specific, how error sounds could affect the understandability between two or more speakers when they were having communication or conversation in the Target language was explored in this study.

Accordingly, this present study was decent to be done because it identified the error sounded, particularly phonetic errors, of Bimanese EFL learners as promoted by the monocentric concept with the aim of clarifying the intelligibility phenomenon by investigating what communication problems Bimanese faced when they got errors sounded/phonetic errors.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study used an interpretive paradigm and a qualitative approach. In gaining the data, there were some research instruments that were used in this present study. Those instruments were the researcher herself, an audio recorder, and a list of words that were pronounced by participants. The words were constructed by the researcher herself with the help of the English club website that provided difficult words to be pronounced at www.Englishclub.com. In composing the words, the researcher considered that the words contained 12 vowels and 24 consonants, and for the rest of the 14 words, the random and difficult words included diphthongs and triphthongs.

10 Bimanese college students who could read Quran properly were asked to be participants in this study. They were taken from different universities and different semester. Besides, their departments were not only related to English subjects such as English Literature but also the other departments, particularly Economics, Accountancy, Banking, Islamic Education, etc. (the detailed information of participants was in the appendix). These criteria for participants aimed to have random participants. Random participants with different skills were expected to get the standard error by Bimanese in English phonetic sounds. The second primary data was taken from Bimanese youtube channel. They were Vivi Indryani and Muji Jibu Channels.

There were four video vlogs that were identified as secondary data. The first was Muji Jibu's video as datum 1 (D1): https://youtu.be/2QWmbLZ5-YQ and datum 2 (D2): https://youtu.be/fU7HmNfwFsE. Then, the second vlog was Vivi Indriyani's videos as datum 3 (D3): https://youtu.be/w-4oVKgXHVo and datum 4 (D4): https://youtu.be/7eVb2_nrJ3M. The data collection was conducted on October 25th, 2021. The researcher used two techniques to collect the data. First, a test was used to identify the first research question (RQ). Second, observation was used to analyze the second RQ.

Corresponding author: rianti1703@gmail.com

LILICS
Journal of Literature, Linguistics, and Cultural Studies
Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 221-237
E-ISSN: 2986-9552
Website: http://urj.uin-malang.ac.id/index.php/LILICS/index

FINDINGS & DISCUSSION

Phonetic Errors

Consonants

Table 1. Plosive Sounds

	Phoneme Deviations		Word	English Phonetic (IPA) transcription	Bimanese EFL learners' phonetic representation	Position
1.	4	/t/ -> /f/	Caught	/kɔːt/	/kaʊf/	Final
2.	1	/k/ -> / ʧ/		/kɔːt/	/ ʧaːg/	Initial
3.	1	/g/ -> /k/	Exhaustive	/ɪgˈzɔːstɪv/	/eksaʊstif/	Medial
4.	2	/g/ -> / ʤ/	Egg	/eg/	/eɪʤ/	Final

PD: Phoneme Deviations

As seen in table, there were three plosive sounds which got error (/t/, /k and /g/). For PD 1.1, /t/ and /d/ sounds were in the same manner of articulation, plosives. They both were produced by contacting the tongue with the front teeth or the tongue touched the alveolar ridge directly. Their differences were just on voiced and voiceless. /t/ was an alveolar stop without vibration in a vocal cord (voiceless) while /d/ was an alveolar stop with vibration on the vocal cord (voiced). In American style, this deviation was considered to be right pronunciation. Yet, since the researcher used the oxford dictionary, it was included as error because the sounds are deviated. In PD 1.1, the error was caused by the participants read the word literally in Indonesian. There was a letter 'g' in word 'caught' which sounds /g/ in Indonesian so they pronounce it with /g/ sounds. Therefore, the deviation from (/t/ -> /g/) was happened. Then, English has some words which are structured almost same. For example, laugh and caught (gh). Since 'laugh' is pronounced /laːf/, it was possible to be pronounced /kaʊf/ also for 'caught' by participants because they considered them alike. That illustrate of why the deviation on 1.3 was occurred.

The deviation from plosives to affricates occurred in PD 1.2 (k/ -> / ʧ/). The possibility of this error might come from the first letter of 'caught' (c) which was pronounced like /ʧ/ sounds in Indonesia. Thus, the participants literally read the word in Indonesian phoneme and it caused an error. While phoneme deviation from /g/ -> /k/ was the deviation which happened in the same manner of articulation. They both were plosives. What makes /g/ and /k/ are different is based on the vocal cord vibration. When the tongue lays against the lower teeth, the soft palate get contact with the back of tongue and the vocal cords are vibrated, the /g/ sound is produced. Otherwise, if the vocal cords are not vibrated while the tongue lies against the lower teeth and the soft palate get contact with the back of tongue, the /k/ sound is produced. That was why this deviation existed. Last, PD 4.1 (/g/ -> / ʤ/) was caused by the possibility in reading the letter 'g'. In English, letter 'g' is pronounced in /ʤ/ sound. This can become the reason of why 'egg' is pronounced as /eɪʤ/.

Corresponding author: rianti1703@gmail.com

LILICS
Journal of Literature, Linguistics, and Cultural Studies
Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 221-237
E-ISSN: 2986-9552
Website: http://urj.uin-malang.ac.id/index.php/LILICS/index

Table 2. Fricative Error Sounds

	Phoneme Deviations	Word	English Phonetic (IPA) transcription	Bimanese EFL learners' phonetic representation	Position
1.	1 /f/ -> /p/	Physics	/'fɪzɪks/	/p̲ɪsɪk/	Initial
2.	1 /v/ -> /f/	Evidence	/'evɪdəns/	/efidens/	Medial
		Flavour	/'fleɪvə(r)/	/flʌf̲ɔ:r/	Medial
3.	2 /θ/ -> /d/	Thumb	/θʌm/	/d̲ʌm/	Initial
4.	1 /ð/ -> /t/	Leather	/'leðə(r)/	/leɪt̲er/	Medial
		Then	/ðen/	/t̲en/	Initial
5.	2 /ʃ/ -> /s/	Ocean	/'əʊʃn/	/os̲ean/	Medical

Fricative sounds were also found in the phonetic errors of Bimanese. Seeing the table, it could be included that from all of fricative sounds, /s/, /z/, /f/, /h/, /θ/, /ð, only /s/ sound that did not get error because this phoneme also existed in Indonesian (Bimanese) word. To pronounce /s/ sound was not hard or the participants did not get any difficulty in pronouncing /s/ sound. Physics' becomes /p̲ɪsɪk/ because the letter 'p' in 'Physics' was pronounced with phoneme /p/ as like as Indonesian phoneme. This also occurred in 'T̲humb' that became /t̲ʌm/, 'Hear t̲h' became /hɑ:t̲/, 'Wor t̲hless' became /wɔ:rt̲ləs/, 'Lea t̲her' became /leɪt̲er/, 'T̲hen' was pronounced /t̲en/, 'Phys̲ics' became /fɪs̲ɪk/. Those indicated that when the participants did not have knowledge to pronounce the correct word, they directly pronounced it in their first language phoneme or Indonesian phoneme.

The deviation from /ð/ -> /d/ might happen because Indonesian people usually pronounce the words that contain the letter 'th' with /d/ sound such as word 'The' they pronounce /de/. This possibility of errors influenced the word 'Leather' became /'led̲ər/, 'Then' became /d̲ən/, /ʃ/ sound itself was substituted with /z/ and /s/ in word 'Ocean'(/'əʊʃn/) that became /oʊz̲ən and /os̲ean/.

Table 3. Affricate Error Sounds

	Phoneme Deviations	Word	English Phonetic (IPA) transcription	Bimanese EFL learners' phonetic representation	Position
1.	**/tʃ/ ->** /ʃ/	Future	/'fju:**t̲ʃ**ə(r)/	/fi:**ʃ**ər/	Medial
2.	/tʃ/ -> /t/	Attitude	/'ætɪ**t̲j**u:d/	/etɪ**t̲**ʊd/	Medial
3.	**/dʒ/ ->** /g/	Giraffe	/**d̲ʒ**ə'rɑ:f/	/**g**ɪreɪf/	Initial

Analyzing the affricate errors which were found in the table above, /tʃ/ sound was substituted with /ʃ/ and /t/ while /dʒ/ was changed with /g/ and /z/. The way to pronounce the affricatice sounds is producing the plosive which is directly followed by fricative. Hence, the deviation of /tʃ/ sound was **/tʃ/ ->** /ʃ/ and /tʃ/ -> /t/ because /tʃ/ is the sound which is integrated from the plosive /t/ and the fricative /ʃ/. Besides, for the word 'Attitude' the participants simply pronounced the word by the phoneme they know in Indonesian phoneme ('Atti**t̲**ude' became /etɪ**t̲**ʊd/) as in PD 2.3. This also occurred in the deviation from /dʒ/ to /g/ where the word 'Giraffe' was directly pronounced with /**g**ɪreɪf/ as in PD 3.3

Corresponding author: rianti1703@gmail.com

LILICS
Journal of Literature, Linguistics, and Cultural Studies
Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 221-237
E-ISSN: 2986-9552
Website: http://urj.uin-malang.ac.id/index.php/LILICS/index

Table 4. Nasal Error Sounds

Phoneme Deviations	Word	English Phonetic (IPA) transcription	Bimanese EFL learners' phonetic representation	Position
1. /ŋ/ -> /g/	Tongue	/tʌ**ŋ**/	/tɒ**g**/	Final

As seen in the table above, there was only one error sound that occurred in nasal sounds, /ŋ/ sound. The probability of this error might come from the word which was simple pronounced in Indonesian sound by participants. The word 'Tongue' is composed with the letter 'g'. This caused the deviation from /ŋ/ to /g/ (nasal to plosive sounds) because the participants literally pronounced it with /g/ sound which in Indonesian phoneme, letter 'g' is pronounce with /g/ sound.

Vowel

Short Vowel

Table 6 Short Vowel Error Sounds

Phoneme Deviations	Word	English phonetic (IPA) Transcription	Bimanese EFL Leaners phonetic representation	Position
1. 1 **/ʊ/ ->** /u:/	Wood	/w**ʊ**d/	/w**u:**d/	Medial
2. 1 **/ɒ/ ->** /u:/	Loss	/l**ɒ**s/	/l**u:**s/	Medial
3. 2 /ɒ/ -> /oʊ/		/l**ɒ**s/	/l**oʊ**s/	
4. 1 **/e/ ->** /eɪ/	Egg	/**e**g/	/**eɪ**ʤ/	Initial
	Leather	/'l**e**ðə(r)/	/l**eɪ**ter/	Medial
5. 2 /e/ -> /ɪ/	Egg	/**e**g/	/**ɪ**g/	Initial
	Bet	/b**e**t/	/b**ɪ**t/	Medial
	Evidence	/'**e**vɪdəns/	/**ɪ**fɪdens/	Initial
6. 3 /e/ -> /i:/	Treasure	/'tr**e**ʒə(r)/	/tr**i:** ʃər/	Medial
	Leather	/'l**e**ðə(r)/	/'l**i:**dər/	Medial
7. 1 **/æ/ ->** /e/	Bad	/b**æ**d/	/b**e**d/	Medial
	Attitude	/'**æ**tɪtju:d/	/**e**tɪtʊd/	Initial
	Jacket	/'dʒ**æ**kɪt/	/dʒek**e**t/	Medial
	That	/ð**æ**t/	/ð**e**t/	Medial
	Perhaps	/pə'h**æ**ps/	/perh**e**ps/	Medial
	Motherland	/'mʌðəl**æ**nd/	/mʌdərl**e**n/	Medial

Based on the table above, the /ʌ/ vowel was suprisingly the most substituted short vowel. It is substituted with /ʊ/, /ɒ/, /oʊ/, /e. Meanwhile, /ʌ/ vowel is the sound that can be produced by Indonesian because that sound appears in Indonesian phonemes. Yet, they failed it the most. Therefore, it can be concluded that the error of /ʌ/ vowel did not cause by the fossilization from the participant's organ of speech but the error came from the ignorance of the participants about the words they pronounce or the participants simply did not have any knowledge to read and pronounce the words. Additionally, this ignorance also makes the participants pronounce the words by adjusting with their first language phoneme when they did not know what the correct one is. For example, Rubber /'r**ʌ**bə(r)/ was pronounced alike with the way Indonesian phoneme /ʊ/ (r**ʊ**be(r)/), 'M**o**therland' turned to /m**ɔ:**ðərlend/.

Corresponding author: rianti1703@gmail.com

LILICS
Journal of Literature, Linguistics, and Cultural Studies
Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 221-237
E-ISSN: 2986-9552
Website: http://urj.uin-malang.ac.id/index.php/LILICS/index

Long Vowel

Table 7. Long Vowels Error Sounds

Phoneme Deviations	Word	English phonetic (IPA) Transcription	Bimanese EFL Leaners phonetic representation	Position
/ɑ:/ -> /eɪ/	Giraffe	/dʒə'r**ɑ:**f/	/gɪr**eɪ**f/	Medial
/ɑ:/ -> /ʌ/			/gɪr**ʌ**f/	
/ɑ:/ -> /ə/			/gər**ə**f/	
/ɑ:/ -> /e/			/dʒər**e**f/	
/ɑ:/ -> /aɪ/			/gɪr**aɪ**f/	
/ɑ:/ -> /ɒ/	Hearth	/h**ɑ:**θ/	/h**ɒ**θ/	Medial
/ɑ:/ -> /ɜ:/			/h**ɜ:**t/	
/ɑ:/ -> /ɪ/			/h**ɪ**ɒrt/	
/u:/ -> /i:/	Future	/'fj**u**:tʃə(r)/	/f**i:** tʃʊr/	Medial

All five long vowels were deviated in table above. The /ɑ:/ vowel was the most deviated phoneme for long vowels. This open central-back vowel was shifted with other eight sounds /eɪ/, /ʌ/, /ə/, /e/, /aɪ/, /ɒ/, /ɜ:/, and /ɪ/. In fact, /ɑ:/ vowel is supposed to pronounce by open a fully mouth, the center and the back of the tongue is lowered in a neutral shape of lips. Then, /u:/ which should be produced by having slight rounded lips while the back of tongue is raised was switched to /i:/, /ju:/, /ʊ/. Then, /i:/, the least error vowel, was changed with /e/ vowel by the participants. Next, /ɔ:/ is assumed to pronounce by rounding extremely the lips and uplifting the tongue in the middle of mid-close and mid-open position. Unfortunately, this sound was substituted with /aʊ/, /ɑ:/, and /ʌ/ by the participants. Last, a mid-central vowel, /ɜ:/, meant to be pronounced by neutralising the shape of lips and raising the center of the tongue in the middle of mid-close and mid-open position was deviated with /ɒ/ and /ɔ:/ vowels.

Diphthong

Table 7. Diphthong Error Sounds

Phoneme Deviations	Word	English phonetic (IPA) Transcription	Bimanese EFL Leaners phonetic representation	Position
/əʊ/ -> /ɔ:/	Moment	/'m**əʊ**mənt/	/m**ɔ:**ment/	Medial
	Sole	/s**əʊ**l/	/s**ɔ:**l/	
/əʊ/ -> /oʊ/	Know	/n**əʊ**/	/n**oʊ**/	Final
	Ocean	/'**əʊ**ʃn/	/**oʊ**ʃn/	Initial
	Moment	/'m**əʊ**mənt/	/m**oʊ**men/	Medial
	Sole	/s**əʊ**l/	/s**oʊ**l/	Medial
	Lower	/'l**əʊ**ə(r)/	/l**oʊ**ər/	Medial
/əʊ/ -> /ɒ/	Comb	/k**əʊ**m/	/k**ɒ**mb/	Medial
	Psycho	/'saɪk**əʊ**/	/saɪk**ɒ**/	Final
	Ocean	/'**əʊ**ʃn/	/**ɒ**zean/	Initial
	Moment	/'m**əʊ**mənt/	/m**ɒ**men/	Medial
	Sole	/s**əʊ**l/	/s**ɒ**l/	Medial
/əʊ/ -> /aʊ/	Know	/n**əʊ**/	/n**aʊ**/	Final
	Lower	/'l**əʊ**ə(r)/	/l**aʊ**ər/	Medial
	Hear (d)	/h**ɪə**r(d)/	/h**i:**r/	
/ɪə/ -> /e/			/h**e**r/	
/ɪə/ -> /ɜ:/			/h**ɜ:**d/	
/ɪə/ -> /ɑ:/			/h**ɑ:**rt/	
/aʊ/ -> /ʌ/	Council	/'k**aʊ**nsl/	/k**ʌ**nsɪl/	Medial
/aʊ/ ->/ɒ/			/k**ɒ**nsɪl/	

Corresponding author: rianti1703@gmail.com

LILICS
Journal of Literature, Linguistics, and Cultural Studies
Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 221-237
E-ISSN: 2986-9552
Website: http://urj.uin-malang.ac.id/index.php/LILICS/index

Considering the table above, /əʊ/ and /eɪ/ were the most substituted vowels in diphthong. They both have six of error substituted sounds. For /əʊ/ vowel, it was shifted with /ɔ:/, /oʊ/, /ɒ/, /aʊ/, /ʌ/, and /e/ and /eɪ/ was switched with /e/, /aʊ/, /ʌ/, /aɪ/, /ɒ/, and /ə/.

Almost all diphthongs above were substituted with short vowels except /oʊ/, /aʊ/ and /aɪ/. /oʊ/, /aʊ/ and /aɪ/ were become the exception because they were pronounced alike with the Indonesian word itself using Indonesian phonemes (word 'Layer' from /'l**eɪ**ə(r)/ to be /l**aɪ**er/, word 'Know' from /n**əʊ**/ to be /n**oʊ**/, word 'Flavour' from /'fl**eɪ**və(r)/ becomes /fl**aʊ**ər/). Accordingly, this could be inferred that Bimanese as the participants in this research tended to not have any glide or the movement from one vowel to another vowel. It might happen because the way to pronounce the first vowel in diphthong is longer and stronger than the last vowel causing the lack of loudness of last vowel.

Triphthongs

Table 8. Triphthongs Error Sounds

Phoneme Deviations	Word	English phonetic (IPA) Transcription	Bimanese EFL Leaners phonetic representation	Position
/eɪə/ -> /aɪə/	Layer	/'l**eɪə**(r)/	/l**aɪe**r/	Medial
/əʊə/ -> /ɒwe/	Lower	/'l**əʊə**(r)/	/l**ɒwe**(r)/	Medial

According to the table, the errors came again from the ignorance of the participants to produce the words. Consequently, they simply pronounced the words with their first language phoneme. This made word 'Layer' was pronounced literally in Indonesian sounds, from /'l**eɪə**(r)/to be /l**aɪe**r/, and the word 'Lower' was turned to be /l**ɒwe**(r)/ from /'l**əʊə**(r)/. Furthermore, as stated by the researcher in the background of the research above that Bimanese tend to produce word /e/ sound or there is no schwa sound /ə/ totally in Bimanese words. Therefore, this created Bimanese unconsciously produced the /e/ sound when they did not have any knowledge about the correct sound of the letter 'e'.

Monocentric Concept on Non-native Speaker Pronunciation

Since monocentric concept stated that non-native speaker could achieve the full level proficiency of English skills particularly in pronunciation, the researcher tried to reinvestigate it by identifying how much correct sounds that can be produced by the non-native speaker (Bimanese) and percentage it to know how close the English level proficiency of pronunciation with Anglo-American pattern or native speaker style by Bimanese. To get the percentage, the researcher used Sudjono's pattern or formulation (2004). The formula is: $\% = \frac{CS}{ToP} \times 100$

Note: CS = Correct Sounds, ToP: Total of Participants

Table 9. The Percentage of Vowels

Sounds	CS	%	Sounds	CS	%
/i:/	10	100	/ə/	10	100
/ɪ/	10	100	/u:/	10	100
/e/	10	100	/ʊ/	10	100
/ɜ:/	5	50	/ɔ:/	10	100
/æ/	3	30	/ɑ:/	8	80
/ʌ/	10	100	/ɒ/	6	60

ToP = 10 participants

Corresponding author: rianti1703@gmail.com

LILICS
Journal of Literature, Linguistics, and Cultural Studies
Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 221-237
E-ISSN: 2986-9552
Website: http://urj.uin-malang.ac.id/index.php/LILICS/index

From the table above, only 3 participants could pronounce correctly /æ/ sound (30%), 5 participants produced the correct sound of /ɜ:/ (50%), 6 participants articulated /ɒ/correctly (60%), and 80% the percentage from the proper sound of /ɑ:/ (8 participants). Other than those sounds are voiced correctly. Surprisingly, if the sounds were observed as a whole, the schwa sound /ə/, which was considered to be one of Bimanese fossilization, was turned out 100% correctly produced. This could be concluded that the /e/ sound did not become fossilized because of considering bimanous organs of speech, which tend to produce /e/; they just did not know where and what the words should be produced with /ə/ and /e/.

Table 10. The Percentage of Diphthongs

Sounds	CS	%	Sounds	CS	%
/ʊə/	1	10	/eɪ/	10	100
/ɔɪ/	5	50	/aʊ/	10	100
/ɪə/	6	60	/aɪ/	10	100
/əʊ/	1	10	/eə/	0	0

ToP = 10 participants

/eə/ was the most incorrect diphthongs by Bimanese. All of the participants could not articulate it correctly (0%). This might be caused by the way or the manner to articulate /eə/ sound. This sound was difficult enough to be produced as it needed to make the spread lips because of producing /e/ should be immediately moved on the neutral shape of lips. The other reason was the ignorance of Bimanese pronuncing this sound. The next incorrect diphthongs are /ʊə/ and /əʊ/. There was only 1 participant can voice these two sounds (10%). The incorrect diphthongs also came from /ɔɪ/ (5 participants or 50%) and /ɪə/ (6 participants or 60%).

Table 11. The Percentage of Triphthongs

Sounds	CS	%
/aʊə/	4	40
/aɪə/	8	80
/eɪə/	6	60
/ɔɪə/	1	10
/əʊə/	0	0

Top = 10 participants

As seen in the table, the /əʊə/ was the most incorrect triphthong. In ten participants, no one could produce this sounds correctly (0%). On the other side, the sound that was articulated correctly was /eɪə/ sound with 8 participants who could voice it (80%). The possibility of this case was the tendency of Bimanese to produce /e/ sound and the similarity of the last vowel of /eɪə/, /ɪə/ sound with the sound /y/ (j:) in Indonesian phonemes. Then, there only 1 participant for /ɔɪə/ (10%), 4 participants for /aʊə/ (40%), and 6 participants for /eɪə/ (60%) spoke those sounds rightly.

Corresponding author: rianti1703@gmail.com

LILICS
Journal of Literature, Linguistics, and Cultural Studies
Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 221-237
E-ISSN: 2986-9552
Website: http://urj.uin-malang.ac.id/index.php/LILICS/index

Table 12. The Percentage of Consonants

Sounds	CS	%	Sounds	CS	%
/p/	10	100	/ʃ/	8	80
/b/	10	100	/ʒ/	0	0
/t/	10	100	/ʧ/	10	100
/d/	10	100	/ʤ/	10	100
/k/	10	100	/m/	10	100
/g/	10	100	/n/	10	100
/f/	10	100	/ŋ/	8	80
/v/	10	100	/r/	10	100
/θ/	2	20	/l/	10	100
/ð/	3	30	/w/	10	100
/s/	10	100	/j/	10	100
/z/	10	10	/h/	10	100

Top = 10 participants

/ʒ/ is the most incorrect consonant to be sounded by Bimanese (0%). They could not make the high degree of pressure in the tongue creating a shallower groove there with a bit more oval than round opening. The fricative /θ/ and /ð/ followed after /ʒ/, 20 % (2 participants) for /θ/ and 30% (2 participants) for /ð/. Yet, the researcher believes that all participants could produce these two fricative sounds correctly because they were the experts on reciting *Quran* which they should be able to pronounce them as Arabic language had these two sounds (ذ for /ð/ and ث for /θ/). Illiteracy affected /ʃ/ and /ŋ/, only 8 participants who articulated these two sounds. For the rest, 2 of the participants might be capable of producing the sounds because of the existence these two sounds in Indonesian phonemes, but they have illiteracy about the sounds they produced.

Communication Problems that are Caused by Phonetic Errors

To find out the communication problems caused by phonetic errors, the researcher investigated on the conversations carried out by Bimanese youtubers on their channels, Vivi Indriyani and Muji Jibu. There are two videos that the researcher identified on Vivi Indriyani's channel. All of them contained material about English speaking practice through of interviews with some foreigners from different countries. On Muji's channel, there are two videos also that were analyzed. The videos accommodated Muji's conversation with the foreigners in Lakey Beach (the name of beach in Bima) and some of the Israelis on OME TV. Virtually the following data are some of the researcher's findings of communication problems by phonetic errors from their videos.

Misunderstanding

Based on Oxford dictionary, misunderstanding is the state of a failure to understand correctly something. This misunderstanding absolutely is found in phonetic errors that occurred in the conversation or during the communication process of Bimananese and Foreigners. To understand the data below, the researcher used symbol F for Foreigner, V for Vivi and M for Muji. The researcher found there are two kinds of misunderstanding effect, confusing and the gone wrong topics.

Firstly, the researcher discovered the confusing state. This can be seen by repeating the statements which were going to be asked by Bimanese (interviewer) and re-asking sentence of the foreigners (informant) in data below.

Corresponding author: rianti1703@gmail.com

LILICS
Journal of Literature, Linguistics, and Cultural Studies
Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 221-237
E-ISSN: 2986-9552
Website: http://urj.uin-malang.ac.id/index.php/LILICS/index

Datum 1
V: Do you like the weather?
/duː//juː/ /laɪk//de/ ***/wiːdər/***
F: What?
/wɒt/

Considering datum 1 From data 3 (D3) (in minutes 2.35- 2.40), the foreigner got confused by reasking the Vivi (V) in the sentence 'what?'. This indicated that foreigner could not catch up what was the intended sentence that were asked by Vivi. This could happen caused by a phonetic error which occurred in Vivi's question. Specifically, the word 'weather' got error. The standard English transcript of word 'weather' should be **/'weðər/** but Vivi pronounced it **/wiːdər/** which brought confusion for the foreigner. The confusion was caring on until Vivi moved her hands in the air hoping that the foreigner got her aim asking the weather. Luckily, because of the body movement, the foreigner could grab her aim and fixed the pronunciation of 'weather' with standard English.

Datum 2
V: Where do you go in Manokwari?
/wer//duː//juː//goʊ/ /ɪn//mʌnokwʌrɪ/
F: There are many places, one of them is the montain
/ðeər//aːr//'meni/ /pleɪsəs/, /wʌn/ /əv/ /ðem/ /ɪz/ /ðə/ /'maʊntən/
V: what? The montain?
/wɒt//de/ / moʊnteɪn/
F: no, montain (moving his hand to shape a montain)
/nəʊ/, /'maʊntən/
V: oh, I see (noding her head)
/aɪ//siː/

Secondly, researcher found the gone wrong topics because of the phonetic errors. Simply, the question of the interviewers were understood totally different by the informant (foreigners) with their aims. Consequently, the foreigner answered the question with different topics such as existed on datum 3 and datum 4, below.

Datum 3
V: How many day you spend in Indonesia?
/haʊ/ /meni/ ***/daɪ/*** */juː/ /spend/ /ɪn/ /ɪndonesja/*
F: We buy many clothes from Bali for example this skirt and this cute
*/wi//**baɪ**/ /klәʊðz//frәm/ /bʌlɪ/ /fɔːr//ɪg'zaːmpl/ /ðɪs/ /skɜːt//ənd/ /ðɪs/ /kjuːt/*
bag (pointing on her body)
/bæg/

Based on the datum 3 above, the aim question of Vivi was how many days the foreigner spends in Indonesia. However, the foreigner got misunderstood. Instead of answering the day, the foreigner told about what were the things that she bought in Bali. This occurred as the word 'day' which should be pronounced /deɪ/ was pronounced **/daɪ/** by Vivi creating the interpretation of the foreigner that Vivi's word was buy **/baɪ/**. Therefore, the foreigner answered with different topic with Vivi's aim.

In standard English, the word 'attack' is pronounced as **/ə'tæk/** but Muji pronounced it as like as Indonesian phoneme as **/ʌtʌk/.** This phonetic error caused the topic answered different.

Corresponding author: rianti1703@gmail.com

LILICS
Journal of Literature, Linguistics, and Cultural Studies
Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 221-237
E-ISSN: 2986-9552
Website: http://urj.uin-malang.ac.id/index.php/LILICS/index

Datum 4
V: It is a famous beach in Indonesia
/ɪt/ /ɪs/ /ə/ /feməs/ ***/bɪtʃ/*** */ɪn/ /ɪndonesja/*
F: What? Sorry? (saying in glaring, while her eyebrows raised)
/wɒt/ /'sɒri/
V: Yeah, it is like Raja Ampat beach, Kuta beach
/ɪt/ /ɪs/ /laɪk/ /rʌdʒʌ/ /ʌmpʌt/ ***/bɪtʃ/,*** */kuːtʌ/* ***/bɪtʃ/***
F: ooh, Beach (reliefing her breath). Yeah I may search first (laughing at the end).
/biːtʃ/ */aɪ/ /meɪ/ /sɜːtʃ/ /fɜːst/*

By looking at the datum 4 above, Vivi tried to explain one of the famous beach in Indonesia. Yet, the way she pronounced the word 'beach' created a problem. The foreigner got shocked and considered Vivi said the impolite word. Vivi pronounced the word' beach' which is pronounced as **/biːtʃ/** in standard English became **/bɪtʃ/**. This phonetic error was totally gone wrong as it has impolite meaning in English. There is the deviation from **/iː/ to /ɪ/** that occurred in this phonetic error.

Lack of Confidence

Confidence is one of things that should be had in communication process. There are a lot of factors affect people having good confidence in speaking such as vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation and etc. In this research, the researcher just focused on the pronunciation. The phonetic errors that cause lack of confidence in communication can be seen in the following data.

Datum 5
V: What do you think about Indonesian weather?
/wɒt//duː/ /juː/ /θɪŋk/ /ebaʊt/ /ɪndonesjan/ ***/wiːter/***
F: (quiet with the confusing face)
V: wheather? (asking her friend for right one, her friend answered " wheater") oh weather
/wiːter/ ***/'weðər/*** ***/'weðər/***
F:Oh wheather, now. it is rainy, but yesterday the. wheather is good
/'weðər/ */naʊ/ /ɪt/ /ɪs/ /'reɪni/, /bʌt/ /jestədeɪ//ðə/ /'weðər/ /ɪs/ /gʊd/*

Based on datum 5 From data 4 (D4) (in minute 3.17 - 3.26) above, the deviation occurred in the world 'weather' to **/wiːter/**, **/e/** to **/iː/**, **/ð/** to **/t/** and **/ə/** to **/e/**. Consequently, the interviewer (Vivi) got doubt with her pronunciation by seeing the response face from the foreigner after she said the word. Because of the foreigner's expression, she asked her friend who held the camera and her friend spontaneously pronounce the standard English one **/'weðər/**. After hearing the word that pronounced by Vivi's friend, the foreigner can directly answer the weather in Indonesia. In this moment, the researcher found and observed the gesture, the body movement, and facial expression of the interviewer after saying the error pronunciation. She looked afraid to start producing the word she was doubt to. Moreover, her worried was grown after seeing the confused face of the foreigner. Hence, one of the causes of communication anxiety is doubt to self-ability. The phonetic error increased her confidence and caused she pronounced the word in doubt, avoiding a mistake.

Datum 6
M: What is different, ee sorry my English is not really good
/wɒt//ɪz/ ***/diferen/,*** */soriː/ /maɪ/ /eŋlis/ /is/ /not/ /riːli//guːd/*

Corresponding author: rianti1703@gmail.com

LILICS
Journal of Literature, Linguistics, and Cultural Studies
Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 221-237
E-ISSN: 2986-9552
Website: http://urj.uin-malang.ac.id/index.php/LILICS/index

F: It's okay, go on
/ɪts/ /əʊˈkeɪ/ /gəʊ//ɒn/

In datum 6 from data 2 (D2) (in minute 2.10- 2.15), the indication of Bimanese had lack of confidence was the statement of the person itself. Muji clearly said the sentence "ee sorry my English is not really good" showed that he got the lack of confidence. This might be occurred as he said that sentence after realizing that he got phonetic error on word 'different' which had the standard English as **/'dɪfrənt/** turned to **/diferen/**. As Bimanese tend to produce /e/ sound, the deviation happened in datum 2.2 was caused by mother tongue interference. Muji had no knowledge to pronounce the word correctly than he substituted the sound with the sound he tended to produce.

Considering the findings of the research that were presented above, the research questions of this presented study have already been answered. The research questions, in summary, are; 1) what are phonetic errors found in Bimanese EFL learners as promoted by monocentric concept? And, 2) how such phonetic errors cause the communication problems of Bimanese EFL learners? The findings reveal numbers of phonetic errors by Bimanese EFL learners, showed the monocentric concept on Bimanese pronunciation and provided the possible causes of communication problems by phonetic errors.

To identify the phonetic errors, the researcher separated the sounds in two parts; consonants and vowels. For consonants, there were 4 sounds that got error by Bimanese. Those were plosives, fricatives, affricates and nasals. In plosive sounds, the participants got error in /t/, /k and /g/ sounds. The deviation was mostly occurred because the sounds were in the same place such as /t/ to be /d/, /g/ to be /k/. Those sounds were still in the same manner of place, plosives, but different in voiced and voiceless (Birjandi & Salmani-Nodoushan, 2005).

Another reason of this error was not caused by the participants failed in creating the complete obstruction of the air flow over the nose and the mouth in the oral cavity but rather the illiteracy of the participants in pronouncing the vocabs. In other words, the participants did not really understand about the language system of a target language so that the error could exist (Corder, 1974). The consequence of this phenomenon was the participants tried to make their own hypothesis based on their limit experience and knowledge about the target language. This was included to developmental errors (Richards, 1974). For instance, the participants produced the words literally like Indonesian phonemes as can be seen in one of the deviation of the sound /k/ to be / ʧ/ from the word 'Caught'. The participants directly pronounced the word with the letter 'C' which is pronounced as / ʧ/ in Indonesian phoneme. They hypothesized the /k/ sound to be the sound they used to have in Indonesian, / ʧ/ for 'C'.

Next, the source of error was got from mother tongue influence. For example, the sound /ə/ was mostly substituted by /e/. As the researcher mentioned in the background of study, Bimanese used to have /e/ sound because there is no a single vocab in Bimanese language using /ə/ sound or all bimanese language vocabs use /e/ sound. Thus, the participants tended to uplift the front of tongue above mid-close and mid-open position while their lips were spread instead of uplifting the centre of tongue between mid-close and mid-open position on neutral shape lips. This could be said as an impact of the mixing code elements in one word. According to Richard, this was called an interference errors.

This study is in line with the study of Anwar and Kalisa (2020) which concerned not only to understand students' error pronunciations but also to know how well studets'

Corresponding author: rianti1703@gmail.com

LILICS
Journal of Literature, Linguistics, and Cultural Studies
Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 221-237
E-ISSN: 2986-9552
Website: http://urj.uin-malang.ac.id/index.php/LILICS/index

pronunciation in uttering the sounds by percentaging them. Yet, Anwar and Kalisa used Tinambunan's criterion to achieve the aim in knowing the correct sounds but this present study used Sudjono's pattern or formula. The researcher explained deeply how the Sudjono's formula worked for this study to fulfill the weakness of Anwar and Kalisa in previous research. They did not mention clearly how Tinambunan's criterion was applied.

As Ellis (1997) stated that to find out the error sounds must be done in some steps (collecting, identifying, describing, and explaining), this study applied those steps were alike with the way Kaharuddin (2020) did on their research. The step was stated by investigating the phonetic features such as the place and the manner of articulation. Kaharuddin et all only chose one variety for their data, those students who have the same score in TOEFL PBT, but this study chose 10 random Bimanese students who come from different knowledge background with constrasting skill in English (the highest, middle, and lowest skill).

This finding was also similar to Firdaus (2019) who conducts the research in UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya taking the English graduates. In his research, the error pronunciation was probably affected by the mother tongue interference and the inconsistency of English sound systems. The similar was just lied on the cause of error pronunciations. For the way to analyze the error sounds, this present study was slightly different with Firdaus. Firdaus did not mention the exact positions where the words were stressed incorrectly in his study. meanwhile, this present study showed those words in medial, initial and final positions.

For vowels, unexpectedly, were the most substituted sounds by Bimanese EFL learners. The detail classification of the most substituted in vowels were; /ʌ/ sound for short vowel, /ɑ:/ sound for long vowel, /əʊ/ and /eɪ/ for diphthong and most all sounds for triphthong as triphthong consists of diphthong + /ə/ sound which is considered as the fossilization sound of Bimanese. This finding also matches with the study by Arafiq, Yusra and Saputra (2020) who investigate the phonological error in West Nusa Tenggara that Bimanese tend to deviate the vowel sounds. By having the persentage of the correct sounds especially schwa sound /ə/, this present study refuted the research of Arafiq, Yusra and Saputra (2020) which states that the /ə/ is a fossilization for Bimanese. On the contrary, in this study Bimanese clearly can utter the /ə/ sound, they just did not have a knowledge of the English vocabs that they tried to pronounced.

The researcher used the error analysis as promoted and launched by monocentric concepts in analyzing the error sounds phonetically. Moreover, the researcher also shows the percentage how close the participants achieving the correct sounds as stated by monocentric concept that non-native speaker can achieve the full level of proficiency in English. After identifying the individual sound, the researcher got surprised because of the average of the error sounds percentage was good. Apparently, the /ə/ which is believed as the fossilization for Bimanese could be produced properly and correctly. However, the achieving of the sounds was nothing when then sounds are combined in one word. In result, much erroneous were produced such as presented in the table of phonetic errors. Yet, this indicates there are still the hopes to fix the pronunciation as the erroneous did not really come from the fossilization but rather from the illiteracy of the participants. If they were taught to produce the word correctly before, it would be lack of in pronunciation.

The researcher found and formulated some communication problems that were caused by phonetic errors of Bimanese EFL learners. By seeing, observing and analyzing

Corresponding author: rianti1703@gmail.com

LILICS
Journal of Literature, Linguistics, and Cultural Studies
Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 221-237
E-ISSN: 2986-9552
Website: http://urj.uin-malang.ac.id/index.php/LILICS/index

the videos that become the second primary data (Bimanese youtubers), the researcher then included that there were two kinds of communication problems. They were misunderstanding and the lack of confidence of Bimanese. For misunderstanding problems, the researcher noticed two types, confusing and the gone wrong topics. This finding could be a proof that correct pronunciation was the way to gain the intelligibility. Levis (2018) elaborates that intelligibility is widely defined as the state when the speaker's message is genuinely understood by listener. Thus, when the listener got confused as presented in datum 1, 2, 3, how could be the intelligibility gained? Virtually, correct pronunciation led to the on right track meaning or the message that would be delivered to the listeners. For the lack of confidence problems, the researcher observed by seeing the facial expression, body movement, gesture, and also the attitude.

This finding was also stated by Alyan (2013). He argued that speaking particularly pronunciation was the most stressful skill. He interviewed 20 students of large Palestinian university who explained that they get shyness when they have inability to pronounce the language fluently. Alyan (2013) considered this category, the lack of confidence, as psychological barriers. On the contrast with Alyan, the researcher of this present study achieved the lack of confidence as the cause of error pronunciation by analyzing the words that were used by the participants and the circumstainces that occurred. For instance, on datum 2.1 From data 4 (D4), the deviation occurred in the world 'weather' to **/wi:ter/**, **/e/** to **/i:/**, **/ð/** to **/t/** and **/ə/** to **/e/**. as a consequence, the interviewer (Vivi) or the participant as well got doubt with her pronunciation by seeing the response face from the foreigner after she said the word. Because of the foreigner's weird expression too, she asked her friend who held the camera and her friend spontaneously pronounced the standard English **/'weðər/**. As a result, the participant could not bring off the communicative compentence as purposed by Hymes because no colloboration of underlying knowledge and skills in language which enables individual speaker to communicate effectively (Cazden, 2011).

CONCLUSION & SUGGESTION

This present study investigated the phonetic errors that were produced by Bimanese EFL learners. In identifying the sounds, the researcher classified them into two parts, consonants and vowels. In consonants, there were four kinds of error sounds based on the manner of articulation. Those were plosives, fricatives, affricates, and nasals. Then for vowels, the most substituted sounds were /ʌ/ sound for short vowel, /ɑ:/ sound for long vowel, /əʊ/ and /eɪ/ for diphthong and most all of sounds for triphthongs. This indicated that the most deviated sound in phonetic errors by Bimanese was vowels.

This study also used the monocentric concept in analyzing phonetic errors. Besides error analysis, this concept believed that non-native speakers could reach full-level proficiency in English particularly pronunciation. This thought was reinvistaged in this present study by showing the percentage of correct sounds from all of the participants. Surprisingly, when the sounds were identified individually, the participants could achive the correct sound of the phoneme, even for the /ə/ schwa sound, which was considered the fossilization sound in Bima. Yet, when the sounds were combined into one word, the error sound was created by Bimanese EFL learners. This could be concluded that there was no actual fossilization for Bimanese. Fossilization could be fixed by learning and exercising the sounds because God created humans with the special organ of speech to produce the

Corresponding author: rianti1703@gmail.com

various sounds from all of the words. Indeed, things that made people get error wrong sound came from the illiteracy of the participants about the sound or the fact that they did not have the basic knowledge about the sound before in depth and the inconsistency of English itself. Therefore, to solve the problems, we needed proper learning and good exercise.

The researcher found the source of error as stated by Richards (1974) in this study. Those are; the mother tounge inluence (Interference errors), the illiteracy of participants or have no knowledge in pronuncing the words (Intra lingual errors), the English words production which is read alike in Indonesian phoneme and the words adjustment with the phoneme in reading alphabet (Developmental errors).

Considering the benefits of having the correct pronunciation particularly phonetics, the researcher tried to find out the communication problems that were caused by phonetic errors in order to give the awareness to the EFL students that having the correct pronunciation was strictly important. The researcher discovered two kinds of communication problems that occurred in four video vlogs by Bimanese youtubers which became the second primary data in this present study. Those problems were misunderstanding and the lack of confidence.

REFERENCES

Alyan, A. A. (2013). Oral communication problem encountering english majir students: perspectives of learners and teachers in Palestinian EFL university context. *Arab World English Journal*, *4*(3), 234.

Anwar, Y., & Kalisa, P. (2020). Students' problems in pronouncing non-existing English diphthongs in Indonesian language. *Journal of Language and Literature*. *15*(1), 17-25.

Arafiq, A., Yusra, K., & Saputra, A. (2020). Mapping students' phonological problems in pronouncing English sounds: A study on speakers of local languages in West Nusa Tenggara. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*. *465*(0): 199-201.

Bamgbose, A. (1998). Torn between the norms: Innovation in world Englishes. *World Englishes*. *17*(1), 1-17.

Birjandi, P., & Salmani-Nodoushan, A. M. (2005). *An introduction to phonetics*. Iran: Zabankadeh Publications.

Cakir, I., & Baytar, B. (2014). Foreign language learners' views on the importance of learning the target language pronunciation. *Journal of Language and Linguistics Studies*, *10*(1), 106.

Cazden, B. C. (2011). Dell Hymes's construct of "Communicative Competence". *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *42*(4), 364.

Corder, S. P. (1974). *Error analysis*. London: Longman.

Dimova, I. (2020). In search of the way forward: Implementing the pedagogical perspective of English as an international language in Bulgaria. *English Language and Literature Teaching*, *17*(2), 181.

Ellis, R. (1997). *Second language acquisition*. United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

Firdaus, R. M. (2019). *Segmental and selected suprasegmental mispronunciations among English Department graduates of UINSA*. Unpublished Thesis. Surabaya: Faculty of Arts and Humanities UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya.

Corresponding author: rianti1703@gmail.com

Hoben, B. J. (1954). English communication at Colgate re-examined. *Journal of Communication*, *4*(0), 77.

Kaharuddin., Hasyim, M., Kaharuddin., Tahir, G. M., & Nurjaya, M. (2020). Problematic English segmental sounds: Evidence from Indonesian learners of English. *Palarch's Journal of Archaelogy of Egypt/Egyptology*, *17*(6), 9105-9112.

Levis, J. M. (2018). *Intelligibility, oral communication, and the teaching of pronunciation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Nelson, C. (1982). Intelligibility and non-native varieties in English. In B. B. Kachru (Ed). *The other tongue: English Accross Cultures* (pp. 58-73). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Nunan, D. (1991). *Language teaching methodology*. USA: Prentice Hall.

Prashant, D. P. (2018) Importance of pronunciation in English language communication. *Pronunciation and Communication*, *7*(2), 15.

Rahal, A. (2018). Phonetic Fossilization: Is It a matter of Perfection or Intelligibility? Duygu Buga, & Muhlise Cosgun Ogeyik (Eds), *Psycolinguistics and Cognition in Language Processing* (pp. 248-259). USA: IGI Global.

Rajadurai, J. (2016). Pronunciation issues in non-native contexts: a Malaysian case study. *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research*, *2*(0), 44-45.

Richards, J. C. (1974). *Error analysis perspectives on second language acquisition*. London: Longman.

Setyaningsih, P. K., Wijayanto, & A., Suparno. (2019). English vowels and diphthongs problems of Sundanese learners. *ELS-Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies on Humanities*, *2*(4), 571-581.

Sudjono, A. (2004). *Pengantar statistik pendidikan*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Perkada

Ur, P. (1996). *A Couse in language teaching: Practice and theory*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Corresponding author: rianti1703@gmail.com