PROCEEDINGS

universitas bandar lampung
SOLUTION FOR PRESENT AND FUTURE
INDONESIA

IN COOPERATION WITH

CHINA

THE HONG KONG POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY
香港理工大學
HONGKONG

INTERNATIONAL ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY MALAYSIA
MALAYSIA

THAILAND

4th ICEL 2016

THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION AND LANGUAGE

20-21 May 2016
Bandar Lampung University,Indonesia

PROCEEDINGS

**THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
ON EDUCATION AND LANGUAGE**

4th ICEL 2016

20 -21 MAY 2016

PREFACE

The activities of the International Conference are in line and very appropriate with the vision and mission of Bandar Lampung University (UBL) to promote training and education as well as research in these areas.

On behalf of the Fourth International Conference of Education and Language (4th ICEL 2016) organizing committee, we are very pleased with the very good responses especially from the keynote speakers and from the participants. It is noteworthy to point out that about 80 technical papers were received for this conference

The participants of the conference come from many well known universities, among others: International Islamic University Malaysia (IIUM), Malaysia, Hongkong Polytechnic University, Hongkong, Shanghai Jiao Tong University (SJTU), China, Shinawatra Univesity, Thailand, University of Texas, Austin, USA, University Phitsanulok Thailand, STIBA Bumigora Mataram, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, STKIP-PGRI Lubuklinggau, Indonesia University of Education (UPI), Universitas Sanata Dharma, State Islamic College (STAIN) of Jurai Siwo Metro Lampung, State University of Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa and Universitas Lampung.

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to the International Advisory Board members, sponsors and also to all keynote speakers and all participants. I am also grateful to all organizing committee and all of the reviewers who contribute to the high standard of the conference. Also I would like to express my deepest gratitude to the Rector of Bandar Lampung University (UBL) who gives us endless support to these activities, so that the conference can be administrated on time.

Bandar Lampung, 20 May 2016

Drs. Harpain, M.A.T., M.M
4th lCEL 2016 Chairman

PROCEEDINGS

The Fourth International Conference on
Education and Language (4th ICEL 2016)
BANDAR LAMPUNG UNIVERSITY
Bandar Lampung, Indonesia
May 20,21 2016

STEERING COMMITTEE

Executive Advisory
Dr. Ir. M. Yusuf S. Barusman, MBA
Dr. Hery Riyanto
Dr. Lintje Anna Marpaung, S.H.,M.H
Dr. Thontowie, M.S

General Chairman
Mustafa Usman, Ph.D

Chairman
Drs. Harpain, M.A.T., M.M

Co-Chairman
Helta Anggia, S.Pd., M.A

Secretary
Yanuarius Y. Dharmawan, S.S., M.Hum

Treasurer
Samsul Bahri, S.E.
Dian Agustina, S.E.

Technical Committee
Susanto, S.S., M.Hum., M.A., Ph.D.
Deri Sis Nanda, S.S., M.Hum., M.A., Ph.D.

International Advisory Board

Garry Hoban, Prof. Dr., University of Wollongong, NSW Australia
S. Mohanraj, Prof., Dr., The English and Foreign Languages University, India
Ken Cruickshank, Prof., Dr., University of Sydney, Australia
Mohamad Sahari Nordin, Prof., Dr., IIUM, Malaysia
Baverly Derewianka, Prof. Dr., University of Wollongong, NSW Australia
M. Yusuf S. Barusman, Dr., Universitas Bandar Lampung, Indonesia
Mustofa Usman, Ph.D, Lampung University, Indonesia
Ahmad F. Ismail, Prof., Ph.D., IIUM, Malaysia
Harpain, M.A., Universitas Bandar Lampung, Indonesia
Raihan B. Othman, Prof., Dr., IIUM, Malaysia
Andala R. P. Barusman, Dr., Universitas Bandar Lampung, Indonesia
Jayashree Mohanraj, Prof., Dr., The English and Foreign Languages University, India
Ujang Suparman, Ph.D, Lampung University, Indonesia
Ahmad HP, Prof., Dr., Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Indonesia
Nuraihan Mat Daud, Prof., Dr., IIUM, Malaysia
Udin Syarifuddin W, Prof., Dr., Open University, Indonesia
Hery Yufrizal, Ph.D, Lampung University, Indonesia
Khomsahrial Romli, Prof., Dr., Universitas Bandar Lampung, Indonesia

Organizing Committee

Chair Person
Dra. Yulfriwini, M.T.

Secretary
Bery Salatar, S.Pd.

Treasure
Samsul Bahri, S.E.

Proceeding and Certificate Distribution
Yanuarius Y. Dharmawan, S.S., M.Hum
Helta Anggia, S.Pd., M.A
Bery Salatar, S.Pd.
Dina Ika Wahyuningsih, S.Kom

Documentation
Noning Verawati, S.Sos., M.A.
UBL Production

Sponsorship & Public
Ir. Indriarti Gultom, MM.
Yulia Hesti, S.H., M.H.

Transportation and Accommodation

Irawati, S.E.
Zainal Abidin, S.E.
Desi Puspitasari, S.H.
Tissa Zadya, S.E., M.M.

Special Events

Dameria Magdalena, S.Pd., M.Hum
Yanuarius Y. Dharmawan, S.S., M.Hum
Helta Anggia, S.Pd., M.A
Kartini Adam, S.E.

Consumption

Siti Rahmawati, S.E.
Aminah, S.E., M.Akt.

Table Of Content

Keynote Speakers :

Paper Presenters :

IMPROVING STUDENTS' PRONUNCIATION BY USING AUDIO-VISUAL-ASSISTED TEXT

A) Yanuarius Yanu Dharmawan[1]* and B) Mutiatus Saniyati[1]**

[1]Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, UBL, Indonesia
* Corresponding email: yanu@ubl.ac.id
**Corresponding email: Uuttsanie@gmail.com

Abstract

This research describes the use of audio-visual assisted text to improve students' pronunciation. In other words it is to find out whether audio-visual assisted texts are effective to improve students' pronunciation or not. The subjects of this research were the second semester students of English Education Study Program in Bandar Lampung University. The instruments used for collecting data were tests consisted of pretest and posttest. The data analysis of this research was quantitative. The finding of the research revealed that there was significant improvement in using audio-visual assisted text to improve students' pronunciation. It could be seen from the students' achievements of pretest and post test. Students' achievement in posttest was higher than in pretest. Based on the research, it was found that the use of audio-visual assisted text was effective to improve students' pronunciation. Therefore, it was suggested to use audio-visual assisted text as a media in teaching English generally and teaching pronunciation particularly.

Keywords: Audio-visual assisting text, students' pronunciation, improvement

1. INTRODUCTION

Language is an important aspect in our daily life because it enables us to communicate. We can use language to communicate with other people about what we feel and think. Our feelings and thoughts are something abstracts. Therefore, we can use language to make them understandable and meaningful by other people. Fernandez and Cairns (2011) state that language is the primary communication system for the human species. In ordinary circumstances it is used to convey thoughts through speech.

We know that English is the international language. It becomes an international language because it is used in many countries in the world. Nowadays mastering English becomes really important to survive in globalization era because it is regarded as the language which provides communication universally. In mastering English there are four skills which should be considered namely speaking, reading, writing, and listening. Those skills are important to be mastered, but speaking is the crucial aspect in communication. As we know, someone is considered as a good English learner if he can speak well.

However pronunciation has the important role in speaking beside grammar and vocabulary. Wong (1987) as cited in Wei (2006) points out that even when the non-native speakers' vocabulary and grammar are excellent, if their pronunciation falls below a certain threshold level they are unable to communicate effectively. Pronunciation is an essential component not only of learning a language but also of using that language. For this reason, learning of proper pronunciation is very important for English students. However there are still so many people generally and students particularly who find difficulties and errors in pronouncing English words. Their mother-tongue has big influence on their difficulties and errors.

The researchers found that students got confused on different sounds of one specific symbol. The students cannot notice different sounds which are occurred by one specific symbol because in Indonesia there is no such difference. They commonly will generalize the sound. For example, symbol 'u' in word 'University' is pronounced /juːˈnɪˈvɜːˌsə.ti/, while in 'umbrella' it is pronounced /ʌmˈbrel.ə/. However the students often pronounce it /juːmˈbrel.ə/. It must be because they thought that 'u' symbol represents 'ju' sound, so they generalize it.

The researchers also found that students found difficulty and error to pronounce some sounds which are not common and even do not exist in their mother-tongue. During the process, they had difficulty to differentiate sounds between /θ, ð/ as they commonly pronounced it /t, d/. For example, in word 'underneath' /ʌndəˈniːθ/ they change the dental /θ/ with the alveolar /t/, so they pronounce it /ʌndəˈniːt/. While in word 'that' /ðæt/ they change

the dental /ð/ with the alveolar /d/, so they commonly pronounce it /dæt/. Another problem is that students are not familiar with cluster sounds. Students do not notice these kinds of sounds as they commonly pronounce the whole possible sounds of symbols. For example in word 'scent' /sɛnt/, they pronounce it /skɛnt/.

The researchers thought that there must be a solution of the problem above. The researchers tried to use audio-visual assisted text to solve that problem and to improve students' English pronunciation. Although commonly the use of audio-visual material is believed effectively to improve students' listening ability, the researchers realize that it can also be used to improve students' pronunciation. The audio-visual materials assisted text will ease students to listen audio while they can also directly read the text of it, so they can notice and imitate proper pronunciation of every single word appeared in the audio.

It is difficult to non-native students to speak with native-like pronunciation, even if they can speak so fluently, there are always some mistakes. Actually they do not need to speak perfectly like native speakers do, but at least they can sound like the standard one. Although it is also hard to speak like standard, many people are able to be close to it. Therefore this research attempts to find out the suitable way that can help students to improve their pronunciation ability, so that they can speak with better pronunciation. The aim of doing this research entitled "developing students' pronunciation by using audiovisual-assisted text" is to find out whether Audio-visual assisted text is effective to improve students' pronunciation.

2. UNDERLYING THEORY

Pronunciation is the way of pronouncing words. It refers to two kinds of speech features, namely segmental and supra-segmental. Ladefoged and Johnson (2010) stated that segmental is a unit of sound of the size of a consonant or vowel, while supra-segmental is phonetic feature such as stress, length, tone, and intonation. Pronunciation is an essential part in human communication. People cannot understand what other people mean if they speak with unclear pronunciation. As cited in Adult Migrant English Program (AMEP) Research Centre journal (2002) Learners with good pronunciation in English are more likely to be understood even if they make errors in other areas, whereas learners whose pronunciation is difficult to understand will not be understood, even if their grammar is perfect. So, it cannot be denied that clear pronunciation is one of important requirements to have good communication.

For this reason, teaching pronunciation has crucial parts in English language teaching. By learning pronunciation they will also learn to speak clearly so that they can have a good communication with other people. Gilakjani (2012) as cited in Mikuláštíková (2012) stated that only communications where speaker of English is pleasant to listen to and where it is clear what the speaker is saying are the goals of pronunciation trainings. In connection with this, Harmer (2005) claims that the way how to achieve clear communication is not getting students to produce correct sounds or intonation, but it is rather the way to show them how English is spoken in the real world.

Using audio-visual can be one of good ways in teaching pronunciation because it can be used to help presenting information by stimulating a response of sight, sound, or combination of both devices. Ngozi,B.O et al. (2012) unanimously agreed that audio-visual materials are very important and useful in education because the normal learner in so far as the functions of his preceptor mechanisms are concerned, gains understanding in terms of multiple impression recorded through the eye, ear, touch, and other series. This research used audio visual assisted text consisted of audio visual (video) and printed text. It eased the students to watch, listen, and read the text of the video. By using audio visual assisting text also students could combine both their listening and reading skill to improve their pronunciation ability.

There are two hypotheses applied. They are the null (Ho) and the alternative hypothesis (Ha). The null hypothesis was applied when there is no impact of using audio-visual assisting text on students' pronunciation ability. The alternative hypothesis (Ha) was applied when there is impact of using audio-visual assisting text on students' pronunciation ability.

3. METHOD

This research is a quantitative research with one group pretest and posttest design. Creswell (2012) stated that one group of pretest and post test design is a design which includes a pretest measure followed by a treatment and a posttest for a single group. In this research, the subject of the research was firstly given pre-test to know their basic pronunciation ability before treatment was given. Treatment was given to the students in 3 weeks by using audio-visual assisted text. Post-test was given after treatment finished. It was done to know how far the influence of using audio-visual assisted text is to improve students' pronunciation.

The subject of this research is the second semester students of English Education Study Program in Bandar Lampung University. The number of population is approximately 21 students. Since this research is one group design, the researcher took one class as a sample of study. The researchers chose Speaking 2 class because the materials were suitable for them, and speaking ability also cannot be separated with pronunciation. Due to the class was speaking 2 class, all materials given were to provide them some additional information for both their online and offline class.

The research was carried out at Bandar Lampung University. It is located at Jl. Z.A. Pagar Alam, Kedaton, Bandar Lampung. The research was held in April-Mei 2016. There are approximately 25 students in Speaking 2 class. However there are 4 of them did not join the complete process. They come from various cultures and backgrounds. The instrument used in this research was test. The objective of the test was to identify students' improvements in pronunciation. The researcher did analysis on three important pronunciation features; vowels, consonants, and word stress. The standard pronunciation used in this research was International Phonetic Transcription (IPA).

Pre-test was the first activity of this research. It was conducted on Tuesday, April 12, 2016 followed by 21 students. The researchers asked the students to read 60 words taken from the videos used in the research. The researcher hold the phonetic transcription of words which are tested to evaluate the students' pronunciation, the researcher would underline every single word pronounced improperly. After giving pre-test, the researchers gave the first treatment. The video and its printed text were given, so the students asked to pay attention and watch the video while they should also read the printed text. After watching the video the teacher asked to the students what the video is about, and they had small discussion about it. When they had understood enough about the topic of the video, the teacher played them a video review contained some possible difficult words to pronounce. Every single word in the video is pronounced slowly, so that students could possibly repeat it. The treatments were given by the researchers in 3 weeks. Every week consisted of one meeting. In every meeting the researchers gave different video but with the same procedures as the first treatment. Post-test was the last activity of this research. It was conducted on Wednesday, May 4, 2016. It was done by reading the list of the words used in pre-test. The procedures of doing post-test were also the same as pre-test. After those procedures were done, the researchers started to distinguish between pre-test and post-test result.

In order to get the data, the researchers used pretest and posttest. Pretest was given in the first meeting, while posttest was given in the last meeting or after treatments were done. The researchers asked the students to read list of words used during the process and gave scores by comparing between how students pronounced the words and phonetic transcription of the words. After getting the raw score, the researchers tabulated the results of the test and calculating the score of pretest and posttest. Then, statistic calculator website was used to calculate the mean and to find out whether there are improvements or not after students given audio-visual assisting text. The data were computed through statistics calculator website (www.mathportal.org). The hypothesis analyzed at the significance level of 0.001. If the obtained score was higher than t-table score by using 0.001 of significance level, Ho was rejected. It means that Ha was accepted: "There was a significant difference in students' achievements after getting treatments by using audio-visual assisted text".

4. FINDING

There are some steps applied in conducting this research. They are pretest, treatment, and posttest. Pretest and posttest were given to collect the scores of the students. The result of pretest and posttest will be analyzed using t-test in order to know whether audio-visual assisting texts are effective to improve students' pronunciation. The t-test for one group design is appropriately adopted in some steps to calculate the result of t-test.

First, the researchers calculated the pretest score of the students. Pretest was conducted on Tuesday, April 12, 2016. The students were asked to read 60 words taken from the video used in the research. In the pretest students' scores were as follows:

Table 1. Pretest Score

NO	NAMA	Score
1	NOVI YANTI	92
2	NISA SEPTIANI M	57
3	DEASY PRISHILA	73
4	DESKA KURNIA	75
5	SRI SITI SETIAWATI	60
6	ADI NUGROHO	82
7	SITI HARYANTIE	82
8	MIFTAKHUL JANNAH	70
9	RESTI FITRI WANDIYANTI	83
10	ZHELFY NURUL CARISSA	82
11	SEFIRA AGISTA	80
12	VINTYA SRI MENAN UTAMI	77
13	HANNY FEBRIYANTI	78
14	RISMA PUTRI MAULI	82
15	HERMA ALVILI RIANA	80
16	TASYA INDAH WIDJAYA P	85
17	GITA AMELIA	75
18	NANDA ADITYA	58
19	REDITA PUSPA NASTITI	68
20	B ISHINI AMANDI MENDIS	92
21	RISKI A P	73
	TOTAL	1604
	MEAN	76.38

From the table above, we can divide the lowest and highest scores in the pretest. The lowest score is 57 and the highest score is 92. The total score of pretest is 1604 and the average score is 76.38. It can be said that the students' achievements in pretest is good enough. So, the researchers concluded that the students were familiar enough with the words presented during the process although there were some students pronounced with improper pronunciation. They made poor pronunciation with some words which have cluster sounds, such as *scent, scientist, and acknowledgment*. They commonly read the whole possible sounds of symbols, so they pronounced /skɛnt/, /ˈskaɪən.tɪst/, /əkˈknɒlɪdʒmənt/.

They also made poor pronunciation with some sound which did not exist in their mother-tongue, such as /θ/ in the word underneath. They changed the dental /θ/ with the alveolar /t/, so they pronounced it /ʌndəˈniːt/. The students also got confused on different sounds of one specific symbol. Most of them generalized the sound, such as in word *indulgence* /ɪnˈdʌl.dʒəns/ and *elegant* /ˈel.ɪ.gənt/. In the word *indulgence*, symbol g is pronounced /dʒ/, while the word *elegant* is pronounced /g/. The students could not notice and got confused of such difference, so they pronounced symbol g in word *indulgence* by /ɪnˈdʌl.gəns/. It is the same as in word *elegant* /ˈel.ɪ.gənt/.

In analyzing the word stress, the researchers followed the pattern from International Phonetic Transcription (IPA). The words used in this study happened on both first and middle syllable. However, there are some students put the wrong stress on the words *showcase*. It was caused by the poor pronunciation. The stress should be put on the first syllable but they put it on the middle syllable.

Second, the researchers calculated the posttest score of the students. Posttest was conducted on Wednesday, May 4, 2016. The students were asked to read list of words used in the pretest. In the posttest, the students' scores were as follows:

Table 2. Posttest Score

NO	NAMA	SCORE
1	NOVI YANTI	100
2	NISA SEPTIANI M	83
3	DEASY PRISHILA	98
4	DESKA KURNIA	95
5	SRI SITI SETIAWATI	83
6	ADI NUGROHO	95
7	SITI HARYANTIE	90
8	MIFTAKHUL JANNAH	83
9	RESTI FITRI WANDIYANTI	95
10	ZHELFY NURUL CARISSA	88
11	SEFIRA AGISTA	88
12	VINTYA SRI MENAN UTAMI	93
13	HANNY FEBRIYANTI	90
14	RISMA PUTRI MAULI	95
15	HERMA ALVILI RIANA	100
16	TASYA INDAH WIDJAYA P	92
17	GITA AMELIA	93
18	NANDA ADITYA	78
19	REDITA PUSPA NASTITI	97
20	B ISHINI AMANDI MENDIS	98
21	RISKI A P	93
	TOTAL	1927
	MEAN	91.76

From the table above, the lowest score of posttest is 78 and the highest is 100. The total score is 1927 and the average score is 91.76. It shows that there is an improvement for students' achievements posttest. It can be concluded that after students got treatment with audio-visual assisting text, they made a significant improvements. There are 2 students who got perfect score, and most of the students made less improper pronunciation. They made poor pronunciation in words such as scientist and indulgence. It was because the students got difficulties in pronouncing cluster sounds and they got confused on the distribution of the same phonetic features in English and Indonesian. However, they made improvements on some words.

After calculating the students' score in pretest and posttest, the researchers would calculate the t-test. In calculating t-test the researchers used statistic calculator website (www.mathportal.org) in order to make the statistics calculation simpler and more valid. In using this kind of website the researcher only need to put the score of pretest and posttest into the website, then it will be calculated by the website. Here is the result and its explanation of statistics calculating by www.mathportal.org:

Summary

	Posttest	Pretest
Mean	91.7619	76.381
Variance	37.0905	94.0476
Stand. Dev.	6.0902	9.6978
N	21	21
T	**10.0134**	
degrees of freedom	**20**	
critical value	**3.85**	

Explanation
Step 1: Find *t* value and **degrees of freedom**
To find *t* value and degrees of freedom we will use following formulas:

$$t = \frac{\overline{X_D}}{\frac{S_D}{\sqrt{n}}}$$

$$d.o.f = n - 1$$

$\overline{X_D}$ = Mean of differences between pairs

S_{X_D} = Standard deviation of differences between pairs

$d.o.f$ = degrees of freedom

n = Total number of values in first(second) dataset

In this example we have:

$$\overline{X_D} \approx 15.381$$

$$S_{X_D} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(X_{Di} - \overline{X_D} \right)^2} \approx 7.039$$

After substituting these values into the formula for t we have:

$$t = \frac{\overline{X_D}}{\frac{S_D}{\sqrt{n}}} = \frac{15.381}{\frac{7.039}{\sqrt{21}}} \approx 10.0134$$

The degrees of freedom is:

$$d.o.f = n - 1 = 20$$

Step 2: Determine critical value for t with degrees of freedom = 20 and $\alpha = 0.001$.
In this example the critical value is 3.85. The calculated t exceeds the critical value (10.0134 > 3.85), so the means are significantly different.
The result of analysis by using statistic calculator website (www.mathportal.org) showed that t-score is higher than t-table. Therefore, null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. Based on the finding of the research, it was found that there is significant improvement of using audio-visual assisting text on students' pronunciation.

5. CONCLUSION

Based on the data, the researchers concluded that audio-visual assisted text can be used as media to improve students' pronunciation. It can be seen by the significant differences between pretest and posttest of second semester students of English Education Study Program in Bandar Lampung University. After conducting the data, the researchers concluded that providing audio-visual assisted text was effective to improve students' pronunciation. It was proved by the obtained score of t-test. The t-test showed that t-score is 10.0134 which is higher than t-table 3.85. It means that Ha was accepted and Ho was rejected.

Since the t-score was higher that the t-table, there was a significant difference in the achievement between students in their pretest and posttest. The average score of pretest was 76.38 and the average score of posttest was 91.76. It means that there are significant improvements of students after getting treatments.

REFERENCES

[1] Adult Migrant English Program (AMEP) Research Centre. (2012). *Fact sheet – What is pronunciation*. Accessed: March 6, 2012. http://www.nceltr.mq.edu.au/pdamep
[2] Creswell, John W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. 4th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
[3] Fernandez and Cairns. (2011). *Fundamentals of Psycholinguistics.* Willey-Blackwell.
[4] Harmer, J. (2000). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. London: Longman Group Ltd.
[5] Harmer, J. (2005). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
[6] Ladefoged, P. and Johnson, K. (2010). *A Course in Phonetics* Sixth Edition. Canada: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
[7] www.mathportal.org
[8] Mikuláštíková. (2012). *Teaching Pronunciation at Secondary Level*. Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci.
[9] Ngozi, B.O, Samuel A.O, Ameh O.I. (2012). *Motivating use of Audio-Visual in a Nigeria Technological University Library*. Journal of Edcation and Social Research Vol. 2(1) Jan.
[10] Wei, M. (2006). *A Literature Review on Strategies for Teaching Pronunciation*. University of Maryland at College Park.

universitas
bandar lampung

SOLUTION FOR PRESENT AND FUTURE