

An Analysis of Students in Pronouncing English Fricative At The English Department of Unida Gontor

***Diska Fatima Virgiyanti¹, Nurin Farzana², Dinar Dipta³, Aries Fachriza⁴, Eka Indah Nuraini⁵**

^{1,2,3,4,5} Universitas Darussalam Gontor, Indonesia

(*diska.fatima@unida.gontor.ac.id)

First Received: 11-08-2024

Final Proof Received: 30-11-2025

Abstract

Students of the English Department are required to be able to master pronunciation skills. However, based on a preliminary study conducted on students of the English Department in 3rd and 5th semesters at UNIDA Gontor has deficiencies in the pronunciation of words containing interdental and alveolar fricative sounds. Therefore, this research aims to investigate the types and factors of students' errors in pronouncing interdental and alveolar fricative sounds. The methodology of this research used descriptive qualitative with percentages. Interview guidance included a pronunciation test, questionnaire, and documentation utilized in this research as instruments. 7 out of 37 respondents were selected by purposive random sampling for the interview. Data analysis used three stages such as error identification, classification error, and explanation error. To validate the data, triangulation was used. The results of this study revealed that students made errors of all types. Specifically, there were 1,525 scores for misformation, 113 for addition, 80 for omission, and 26 for misordering. All respondents fell into a moderate classification for overall pronunciation errors, with the specific sounds /θ/, /ð/, and /z/ showing high error percentages at 79%, 81%, and 84%, respectively. Lastly, Students' pronunciation errors are influenced by 3 categories of error sources, namely interlingual transfer, intralingual transfer, and context of learning.

Keywords: Classification of Error Percentage; Factor of Error; Interdental and Alveolar Fricative; Type of Error.

The English language has its own characteristics and to master a new language, the learners need to recognize its characteristics. There are three components of the English language namely, pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar. According to Yates as cited in Lestari (2020), Yates said that pronunciation is the act of producing the sound of a word that has meaning. Variations in pronunciation can lead to differences in meaning. If a speaker fails to use appropriate English pronunciation, it

may result in misunderstandings among native English listeners. Therefore, pronunciation is a crucial subskill to master.

When acquiring a second language, learners are often prone to making errors in speech due to the ingrained habits of their first language. An error represents a noticeable divergence from the standard grammar of a native speaker and reflects the learner's current level of competence. In the context of second language acquisition, such errors are seen as

deviations influenced by the learner's mother tongue, arising from limited proficiency in the target language and the persistent influence of first language habits (Brown, 2014). Corder wrote in his book Error Analysis and Interlanguage that he classified errors into four kinds, they are omission, addition, wrong selection, and ordering.

Rogers as mentioned by Arivian that English orthography or spelling is not proper with how to pronounce the words (Arivian, 2021). Conversely, Indonesian spelling is not different from its pronunciation. For example, in Indonesia's word "sapu" or a broom in the English language, it is still pronounced /səpo/. In an English word, for example, "thousand" /'θaʊzənd/ or ribu in the Indonesian language. English orthography is different from the way it is pronounced. Indonesian phonemes have five consonant fricatives, /f/, /s/, /z/, /χ/, and /h/ (Nirmalasari, 2021). It is different from English phonemes that have nine consonant fricatives, which are /f/, /v/, /s/, /z/, /ð/, /θ/, /ʃ/, /ʒ/, and /h/ (Situmeang, 2020). Phoneme /θ/ does not exist in Indonesian spelling or pronunciation. The Indonesian beginner learning English might mispronounce "thousand" as /taʊzən/. Previous studies show that the researcher examines students at SMA Negeri 1 Takengon, whose native language is Gayonese. The researcher found that students have difficulties pronouncing fricative sounds. Therefore, this gap becomes the problem, the researcher found the student mispronounced "thin" to be /tɪn/ with the mispronunciation of the phoneme /θ/, and the word "they" or in phonetic symbols /'deɪ/. This research also identifies the sources of pronunciation errors they are interlingual transfer, the effect of mother tongue, and intralingual transfer because of students on target language generalization (Maulidina, 2020).

Students of the English Department must have proficiency in English language skills, especially in English pronunciation. As English teachers in the future, they should be role models for their students in the future.

However, after doing the preliminary study, the researcher found that English students from the third and fifth semesters had a lot of errors in producing certain words that consisted of interdental and alveolar fricatives. This observation highlights a significant concern regarding their spoken proficiency. Fluency and accuracy are necessary, especially for English Department students. Even if the sounds were still recognized or understood, non-native speakers with a heavy accent may not gain respect and may find it difficult to advance in their careers (Rebecca, 1993). A preliminary study found that students had difficulty comparing voiced and voiceless in interdental and alveolar fricatives. Students tend to replace consonant voices, such as replacing /z/ sound with /s/ sound which is a consonant voiceless in alveolar fricative. The students do not realize or have less knowledge about /s/ sound and /z/ sound in the final word sound position. In the word like 'visitors', the students have interfered with L1 because they read visitors as /'visɪtə(r)s/. They pronounce the word equal to its spelling. But the correct pronunciation is /'vɪzɪtə(r)z/. While interdental fricative sounds, they substituted the voiceless consonants such as /θ/ with /t/, and consonant voices such as /ð/ substituted by /d/. In line with Komariah, as cited by Firdaus, Indonesian students had difficulty pronouncing certain consonant sounds, one of the difficulties is fricatives, such as /θ/, /ð/, /ʃ/, and /ʒ/ (Firdaus, 2020).

The phenomenon, urge the researcher to find out the variety of pronunciation errors from the fricative manner focus on interdental (/ð/, /θ/) and alveolar sounds (/s/, /z/) that mostly occurred in students of the English Language Teaching Department from the third and fifth semesters UNIDA Gontor. This research aims to examine and identify the common pronunciation errors made by English Department students at UNIDA Gontor in producing English fricative sounds, with the aim of understanding the influence of first language interference and guiding

improvements in their phonetic competence.
Error Analysis

Error analysis is a systematic way to clarify or identify as well as to declare errors found in students' spoken and written language production. In addition, based on Crystal's views, "error analysis is generally identified as a method of defining, classifying, and systematically interrupting the inappropriate forms generated by someone studying a foreign language" (Shakir, 2020). Besides, Corder adds, "error analysis has to do with the investigation of the language of second language learners" (Richards, 2015). Furthermore, in Vivian Cook's opinion in James's book entitled 'Errors in Language Learning and Use Exploring Error Analysis', he said that "Error analysis is a way of dealing with data. It is not a theory of how data is acquired". Furthermore, James puts his opinion that "Error analysis is the process of figuring out what causes language errors and how to fix them" (James, 2016). To sum up, error analysis can be defined as a method or action for identifying some of the error data that occur in learners' second languages, particularly in productive skills like speaking and writing.

Types of Errors

In this study, the researcher used surface strategy taxonomy to describe students' pronunciation errors, so that the researcher can identify errors through students' cognitive processes that underlie the learner's reconstruction of the new language (James, 2016). The researcher will know the learners' errors are based on some logic that is the outcome of the learners' use of interim principles to generate a new language, not of sloth or faulty reasoning. For example, learners may omit the necessary items or add unnecessary ones, or they may mistransform or misorder them. Therefore, there are four subtypes of categories in surface strategy taxonomies:

1. Omission

Omissions are the absence of some elements

in well-formed sentences or utterances that make them ungrammatical in forms. Dulay stated that characteristic omission errors are the absence of some item that must appear in a well-formed utterance (Rusmiati, 2021). For instance, the word 'first' /fɜ:st/ is pronounced as /fɜ:s/ omitting the phoneme /t/ sound.

2. Addition

An addition is the opposite of an omissions error; it is adding some unnecessary sound that should not appear in well-formed sentences or utterances (Kharmilah, 2019). For example, the word 'prejudice' /'predʒudɪs/, it is pronounced as /'predɪjʊsəs/ it adds sounds /iɪsʊs/ at the second and last syllables.

3. Mis-formation

Mis-formation is illustrated by the use of the wrong form of morpheme or structure of sentences or utterances (James, 2016). For instance, the word 'thousand' /'θauzndz/, it is pronounced as /'tauznd/, it wrong selection in utterance that sound /θ/ changes to be /t/ sound.

4. Mis-ordering

Misordering is illustrated by the use of incorrect placement of morphemes in an utterance, a productive skill like spoken and written (Kharmilah, 2019). For example, the word 'losses' is pronounced /'ləsəz/, but it is pronounced as /'ləzəs/.

Source of Errors

The existence of error is caused by several reasons; students' pronunciation errors must be identified to know the factors causing this problem. Hence, the researcher needs to use sources of errors to identify systematic steps toward understanding how the learners' cognitive and affective processes relate to the linguistic system to formulate the process of learners' learning a foreign language (Brown, 2007). There are four kinds of error sources: interlingual transfer, intralingual transfer, the context of learning, and communication strategy.

1. Interlingual Transfer

Native language or mother tongue is inclined to influence the acquisition of a second language. As Brown stated, interference can happen during the beginning stages of learning a second language because the language learners are unfamiliar with the linguistic system of the second language. So, they depend on the linguistic system of their native language (Brown, 2007). For instance, a student substituted /ð/ sound with /d/ sound in the word [other].

2. Intralingual Transfer

Intralingual interference describes learner-produced items that do not represent the mother tongue's structure but rather generalizations based on limited exposure to the target language. Richard classified intralingual errors are those that reflect the general characteristics of rule learning, such as faulty generalization, incomplete application of rules, failure to learn conditions under which rules apply, and false concept hypothesized (Angguni, 2020).

3. Learning Context

Context of learning is the third major source of error. It refers to the classroom situation and the social situation, which is untaught in learning second language acquisition. The learners might make an error while learning a language without a tutor, or teachers may make a misleading explanation (Brown, 2007).

For instance, students might have faulty generalizations on homograph words like the word "present," which can result in different meanings for both "to formally give something" as a verb and "a gift" as a noun. They are the same in spelling but technically different in pronunciation, a noun has stress at the first syllable, and a verb at the last syllable.

4. Communication Strategies

Brown argued communication strategy is related to students' learning style, it

becomes a source of error (Brown, 2007). Learners typically struggle to express what they want to say due to their limited knowledge, as anybody who has attempted to communicate will attest. They use several different types of communication tactics to resolve these issues. Related to this discussion, students are getting personal information regarding the pronunciation of certain English words. It is useful for the students to increase their ability to pronounce English words correctly.

Speaking Aspects

According to Brown and Yule in Rahman (2022), speaking is the ability to pronounce language sounds in order to express or convey thoughts, ideas, or feelings orally. In the context of language use, speakers who are not familiar with the use of a second language tend to string words together to create complex sentences to convey. As Tavakoli's statement said in planned language usage, L2 learners may use a target-language form. But in unplanned language use, they must adopt an interlanguage form (Tavakoli, 2012). This transitional linguistic system reflects the learner's developing competence and highlights the need for targeted instruction. To acquire speaking skills in the target language, language learners must master four speaking aspects: vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, fluency, and comprehension.

Pronunciation

Pronunciation is part of speech that contains the word, intonation, and the language of sound (Hadroh, 2020). English pronunciation plays an important role in learning the English language, and it is a basic skill that must be mastered in speaking skills. In alignment with Brown, as mentioned in Lestari, language learners aim to ensure that they can effectively convey what they are thinking, and they must be understood when they speak. In this case, how a word is pronounced is important (Lestari, 2020).

Besides, pronunciation is the capacity to speak English clearly and accurately using tools and strategies from sub-disciplines such as phonetics, phonology, and second language acquisition (Ubaydullayeva, 2021). Pronunciation inaccuracies can generate speech that is both unclear and inaccurate, resulting in ineffective communication.

Segmental phonology does not relate to the exact properties of speech sounds, but it focuses on the function of individual sounds in a certain language (Brown, 2014). The segmental sound consists of vowels and consonants. Richard stated vowel is a sound that is made without the substantial constriction of the air flowing through the mouth (Arevi, 2020). Vowel sound is consisted of three features; they are monophthongs such as (/i:/, /ɪ/, /ʊ/, /u:/, /e/, /ə/, /ɜ:/, /ɔ:/, /æ/, /ʌ/, /ɑ:/, /ɒ/), diphthongs such as (/ɪə/, /ʊə/, /ɛə/, /eə/, /əʊ/, /ɔɪ/, /aɪ/, /əʊ/, /au/), and triphthong such as (/eɪə/, /aɪə/, /ɔɪə/, /əʊə/, /auə/) (Pitaloka, 2021). Vowels are only one in one syllable, so consonants will complement vowels to make a word. Because the researcher only focuses on the consonant sound, the researcher does not explain more about vowel sounds.

Consonants sound opposite of vowel sounds and are a sound that is made from closure or narrowing in the vocal tract so that the airflow is incompletely blocked or constrained, and audible friction is produced. Underhill, as cited in Putra, stated that typical consonants are also called the beginning and end of syllables (Putra, 2019). Consonants have three characteristics to produce a word. First is the force of articulation, which has two kinds of consonants: voiced and voiceless. Voiced consonants need the vibration in vocal folds, which produces the sound with softer breath force, whereas unvoiced consonants do not need the vibration in vocal folds, which produces the sound with a stronger breath force (Knight. A, 2016). Here are the voiceless consonants of SSBE (Standard Southern British English) /p/, /f/, /θ/, /s/, /ʃ/, /t/, /k/, /h/, /tʃ/. and these are the voiced consonants such as

/b/, /v/, /ð/, /z/, /ʒ/, /d/, /g/, /m/, /n/, /ŋ/, /dʒ/, /l/, /r/, /j/, /w/ (Knight. A, 2016). They are produced differently depending on their place of articulation as follows.

Place of articulation can be produced by a passive articulator and an active articulator. A passive articulator is immovable and settles at the upper of speech organs while an active is a movable articulator that is in the lower place of speech organs. Yule as quoted in Hulu's journal stated there are seven types of places of articulation (Ambalegin, 2019). Namely, bilabial is a sound formed with the lower lips contacting the upper lips, labiodental is produced when the lower lips contact with the upper teeth, interdental is produced with the tongue tip inserts between the upper and the lower teeth, alveolar is formed with the tip of the tongue touching the alveolar ridge, palatal is pronounced when the tongue front touches the hard palate or bony surface behind the alveolar ridge, velar is formed with the back of the tongue touching the soft palate, and glottal is the sound produced with no constriction in the vocal tract and the airflow without any closure.

Third is the manner of articulation. After knowing about the place of consonant articulation, the important thing to know is the manner of air flow in the vocal tract. As outlined by Yule and presented in Hulu, the manners of articulation are categorized into six types: stops, fricatives, affricates, nasals, liquids, and glides. This research will focus on the fricative manner of articulation. It is only taking two places of articulation, the alveolar and interdental places of articulation.

Interdental and Alveolar Fricative

Fricative sound is audible friction or hissing, the articulator is constricting making the air flow through a very narrow passage (Knight. A, 2016). Sometimes fricative called spirant refers to the noises produced when two organs are so close together that the air traveling between them causes audible friction (Crystal, 2008). Fricative manner has

labiodental sound (/f/, /v/), interdental (/θ/, /ð/), alveolar (/s/, /z/), palatal (/ʃ/, /tʃ/), and also glottal (/h/). Nevertheless, this research is only focused on interdental and alveolar phonemes, such as /θ/, /ð/, /s/, and /z/.

1. The Sound and Letter of Interdental Fricatives

Interdental sound is consonant sounds that refer to the sound generated by the tip of the tongue between the teeth (Crystal, 2008). The phoneme /θ/ is a voiceless interdental fricative, it produces the sound without vibration in the vocal folds. While the phoneme /ð/ is a voiced interdental fricative, it produced the sound with vibration in the vocal folds (Merrita, 2021). Interdental fricative sound is always heard from the word that contains this spelling <th>. Language learners are occasionally misled by the English spelling system, which uses the same two letters to indicate both the voiceless and voiced variants. Bear in mind that these are distinct, elementary sounds. The spelling leads learners to believe that two sounds have been combined (Lodge, 2009). <th> spelling puts in a different part of the word sound. However, this research is only examining the initial word, medial word, and final word (Cruttenden, 2001). For instance, the phoneme /θ/ [thief, method, heath], and the phoneme /ð/ [there, gather, with].

2. The Sound and Letter of Alveolar Fricatives

The alveolar fricatives have two phonemes, /s/ and /z/; they are produced with the tongue touching the alveolar ridge that is placed behind the upper teeth (Cruttenden, 2001). Then, the airstream escapes from the gap between the tongue and the alveolar ridge, causing friction or a hissing sound. The alveolar ridge is a bony protuberance at the beginning of the roof of the mouth where the teeth are placed. It can be touched by either the tip or the blade (Lodge, 2009). The phoneme /s/ sounds voiceless, with no vibration in the vocal folds, while the phoneme /z/ is a voiced consonant and

has vibration in the vocal folds. Similar to interdental fricatives, alveolar fricatives will examine their part of the word. Despite being single phonemes, alveolar fricatives are represented by a variety of spellings. The /s/ sound, for instance, can be indicated by 's', 'se', 'ss', 'sc', or 'x', while /z/ is represented by 's', 'se', 'ss', 'z', or 'x'. This study focuses specifically on the spellings 's', 'sc', 'se', 'ss', and 'x', as identified in Cruttenden (2001), to examine the realization of /s/ (e.g., 'sat', 'losses', 'pass') and /z/ (e.g., 'easy', 'fees').

Method

This research used a qualitative approach with a research design using descriptive research with percentages. Alison and Susan stated the term qualitative research can be used to refer to research that is based on descriptive data and does not use statistical processes regularly (Mackey. A, 2005). Specifically, qualitative is the writing procedure by a textual description of the data. There were 37 respondents in this study and 7 respondents were selected by purposive random sampling to become interviewees in the interview. Suharsimi Arikunto urged purposive sampling is used when the sampling to be taken has a specific purpose (Saldana, 2011). Thus, this research used purposive random sampling to select the respondents randomly and the researcher purposed to select them because the respondents have studied pronunciation since 2nd semester in UNIDA Gontor.

There were three kinds of instruments in this research. Those are interview guidance included a pronunciation test, questionnaire, and documentation. Pronunciation test is used to find out the quality and English pronunciation attainment level of the English Department at UNIDA Gontor. Students read 88 words and 9 sentences that were taken from the Surah Al-Waqiah verses 4, 10, 15, 16, 18, 19, 22, 44, 87, and 81 which were translated into English. The questionnaire was designed to comprehensively assess respondents' habits and

perceptions concerning their pronunciation learning experiences.

The last, documentation is the real physical evidence that is acquired by the researcher, appropriate to the discussion (Sugiyono, 2017).

Data analysis was conducted through a three-pronged approach: first, identifying pronunciation errors; second, categorizing these errors by type; and third, determining the factors contributing to these errors. The researcher transcribed students' recorded sounds and compared them to the correct phonetics that were taken from the Cambridge Dictionary (Harley, 1999). Secondly, in the classification of errors, the researcher used a formula to make the scores become percentages as well as the classification of error percentages, as follows:

$$p = F/N \times 100\%$$

P = Percentage

F = Frequency of errors occurred

N = Number of cases (total frequent/ total individual)

Table 1. Classification of Error

No	Percentage	Classification
1.	66 – 100%	High Error
2.	36 – 65%	Moderate Error
3.	0 – 35%	Low Error

The last step is to explain the error; after classifying the data, the researcher had to make a valid conclusion by interpreting those errors and the source of errors using the written form. To validate data, the researcher used data triangulation which can strengthen and validate the data. As Sugiyono mentioned triangulation is a data collection technique that integrates or collects the various data collection techniques and data sources that have been obtained (Raju, 2019). Data was collected through three different instruments, questionnaires, interviews, and documentation; the data findings from these three instruments were then analyzed and compared in order to find a richer and deeper understanding of the phenomenon being studied.

Result & Discussion

The table below explains the percentage results among types of pronunciation errors obtained from pronunciation tests or first interviews. The test used four phonemes from interdental and alveolar fricatives which are /θ/, /ð/, /s/, and /z/. Then, pronunciation errors produced by thirty-seven students of the English Department are categorized among types of errors from surface strategy taxonomy, namely omission, addition, misformation, and misordering. The total score among phonemes is calculated to become a percentage, the researcher counted the frequency of error or score divided by total frequency and multiplied by one hundred.

Table 2. Percentage Recapitulation of Types of Errors

Pho-neme	Types of error			
	Mis-forma-tion	Addition	Omission	Misordering
	%	%	%	%
/θ/	24	0	19	4
/ð/	26	0	0	0
/s/	5	99	54	92
/z/	45	1	28	4

Based on the data analysis on error types, most students mispronounce the mis-formation error type 1525 times in the four phonemes studied, /θ/, /ð/, /s/, and /z/ (Muhammad, 2020). Misformation errors occur in all word sound positions including initial, medial, and final, except for the /s/ sound, which is the word sound in the middle position. All phonemes have a percentage of misformation errors, phoneme /s/ of 5% and phoneme /z/ is the phoneme that has the highest percentage of 45%. Phoneme /s/ substituted with /z/ and /ʃ/ sound, and the /z/ sound is replaced by the /s/ sound. The phoneme /θ/ of 24% and the phoneme /ð/ of 26%. Students mostly deviate by substituting the phoneme /θ/ with the phoneme /t/, and only several students replaced it with /ð/ and /d/. Most deviation occurred in substituting phoneme /ð/ with /t/ and /d/, some of the words were replaced by /θ/ and /h/ sound.

In line with the results of findings conducted by Juliardi, the findings of phoneme /θ/ were mostly replaced by the /t/ sound, and the phoneme /ð/ was mostly substituted by the /d/ sound (Juliardi, 2019).

Furthermore, there are 113 errors that occur in the addition error type. The additional error only occurs in two sounds, /s/ and /z/ sounds. The deviation that occurs in the /s/ sound is in the initial and medial position of the word sound, while the /z/ sound only occurs in the medial position of the word sound. Both phonemes have a percentage of addition error/z/ of 1% and phoneme /s/ has the largest addition error of 99%. Most of the students make deviations by adding other phonemes or sounds such as adding the /k/ sound after the /s/ sound and adding the /s/ sound after the /z/ sound.

Then, the omission error type has 80 errors in the three types of phonemes studied, /θ/, /s/, and /z/. The deviation in the sound /s/ occurs at the final of the word sound position, the deviation in the sound /z/ is placed at the initial and medial of the word sound position, and the final of the word sound in the phoneme /θ/. These three phonemes have a percentage of omission errors which are phoneme /θ/ by 19%, phoneme /z/ by 28%, and /s/ has the largest deviation which is 54%. Most students omit the sounds /θ/, /s/, and /z/ on the word list in the pronunciation test. Such as words spelling [x], [th], and the letter [s] at the end of nouns (plural) or verbs for third-person singular subjects.

The misordering error score was 26 errors across the three phoneme types analyzed, they are /θ/, /s/, and /z/. the sound /θ/ alternates with the phoneme in the middle position of the word sound. for example, the word [losses] is pronounced as /'luzəs/ instead of /'ləsəz/, while the sounds /s/ and /z/ alternate with the final position of the word sound. for example, the word [scissors] is pronounced by students as /'kirɔrz/ instead of /'sizərz/, and the word [toothpaste] as /'tuθ,_peɪst/, pronounced by students as /'θut,_peɪst/. Misordering errors

have a percentage in each phoneme, namely the /θ/ sound at 4%, the /z/ sound at 4%, and the /s/ sound has the largest misordering error at 92%.

Referring to the pronunciation test results, the researcher looks for the percentage of error frequency results. This percentage was classified so that researchers know the criteria for students' errors. To find out the criteria, the researcher quoted from the Ministry of Education and Culture (Kemendikbud), written in Raju's journal (Raju, 2019). There are 3 presentation scales, namely from 0 - 35%, including low errors, from 46 – 65%, called moderate errors, and from 66 – 100 % then the error has includes the highest error. The researcher discussed the percentage of errors for each respondent.

The researcher has arranged the total errors from the lowest to the highest. Based on the calculation, the lowest percentage was 38% obtained by the 21st respondent, then the highest percentage was 64% obtained by the 8th respondent. Both percentages fall within the moderate error category, as they lie within the defined range of 36% to 65%. Furthermore, after discussing the percentage classification of total error for each respondent. The researcher wants to discuss the classification of percentages among phonemes interdental and alveolar fricatives to declare which phonemes are in the high error classification and vice versa. The result is shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Total Error Percentage Among Phonemes

Phonemes							
/θ/		/ð/		/s/		/z/	
In- cor- rect	Cor- rect	In- cor- rect	Cor- rect	In- cor- rect	Cor- rect	In- cor- rect	Cor- rect
379	102	390	91	255	1188	712	139
79%	21%	81%	19%	18%	82%	84%	16%

Table 3 displays the total frequency and total percentage of phonemes. It shows the correct and incorrect, yet this research only focuses on the incorrect one. Based on the data

results presented in Table 3, the phoneme /s/ obtained an error percentage located on a low error classification scale of 0 – 35%. The other phonemes obtained a very different percentage of error from phoneme/s/, phoneme/θ/ of 79%, phoneme/ð/ of 81%, and phoneme /z/ of 84%. Thus, these three phonemes belong to the high error classification, which is included in the percentage range of 66 – 100%.

Based on the results of the preliminary study, the researcher found that students in semesters 3 and 5 always made mistakes in the /z/ sounds. Referring to the results of the analysis above, the researcher found 84% of errors on the /z/ sound and 45% of misinformation errors on the phoneme /z/. The findings of this research were related to Gustina's research results in that the students often replaced the /z/ sound with /s/ in all positions of word sounds (Gustina, 2023). This discussion also is strengthened by the results of the questionnaire which stated that many students answered neutral in questionnaire number 18 as they mentioned: *"I think the pronunciation of the word [is] is like /iz/".*

The statement was considered neutral because female students were hesitant to answer agree or disagree, so they decided to answer neutral. In addition, Komariah stated that interdental fricative or θ/ dan /ð/ sounds are consonant sounds that are difficult for Indonesian students to pronounce (Firdaus, 2020). The study's data revealed that students persistently mispronounced the target sounds /θ/ and /ð/ so that both enter the high error classification of 79% and 81%. phoneme /θ/ is always replaced by the sound's /t/, /ð/, and /d/, while phoneme /ð/ is always replaced by the sound's /d/, /t/, /θ/, and /h/. This discussion is reinforced by the results of questionnaire number 19 which stated neutral and agreed, as they said: *"For me, the pronunciation of the word [the] is like /de/".*

Many students answered neutral and agreed to the questionnaire stating that the wrong pronunciation of the word [the] is / de/, it should use the sound /ð/ in the initial

position of the word sound. The results of this questionnaire are strong evidence that students in the 3rd and 5th semesters of the English department at UNIDA Gontor still have range of mistakes in the pronunciation of the /θ/ and /ð/ sounds in the spelling of [th] in a word.

From the four sources of errors, the research shows that students in the 3rd and 5th semesters of the English Department at UNIDA Gontor are influenced by the sources of error of interlingual transfer, intralingual transfer, and context of learning (Brown, 2014). As Brown stated, interlingual transfer is interference that can happen during the beginning stages of learning a second language because the language learners are unfamiliar with the linguistic system of the second language. Therefore, they depend on the linguistic system of their native language. The research results revealed that although these students came from the English Department, they rarely trained themselves to talk to each other, with classmates or lecturers, using English. The language acquisition process was hindered by the students' failure to form habits and their unfamiliarity with the target language, allowing for significant first language influence. For example, the sound /θ/ is pronounced like /t/, the sound /ð/ is pronounced like /d/, the sound /z/ is pronounced like /s/, and the sound /s/ is pronounced like /z/ or /ʃ/.

Intralingual transfer is an error influenced by the target language, such as faulty generalization, incomplete application of rules, failure to learn conditions under which rules apply, and false concept hypothesized (Richards, 2015). The results of this study state that students tend to assume English pronunciation based on the written word and their experience learning pronunciation as happened to the word [losses], most students pronounced it like /'luzəs/ instead of /'ləsəz/. Moreover, they overgeneralize in pronouncing the word because students still lack in understanding or basic experience of the target language, such as the error in the addition error types such as /'skizərs/ and /

askən/.

Context of learning is a source of error that is influenced by the difference between the learning situation and the actual usage situation. Like the results of this study, students prefer to learn individually or through language content creators on Instagram and YouTube, and they also ask back what they do not understand from the lecturer's explanation. In line with Maulidina's research results it can be a source of an error where it could be that the content creator instructor and lecturers have explained misleading explanations consciously or unconsciously. Then students have a limited understanding of pronunciation competency. As stated by Respondent 28, students' reluctance to ask for clarification when they do not understand the lecturer's explanations contributes to potential errors in the learning context. This is because students tend to rely on their own interpretations, which can be inaccurate and negatively impact second language acquisition (Maulidina, 2020).

Untutored learning could affect the intralingual transfer which means students might derive false concepts hypothesized or faulty comprehension of distinctions in the target language (Richards, 2015). Some students read confidently and fluently thinking they will sound like native speakers. However, without realizing they had deviated from some words. For instance, students pronounce the word [month] as /mʌn/ instead of /mʌnθ/, the word [six] which is pronounced like /sik/ instead of /siks/, and the word [zips] is pronounced like /zip/ instead of /zips/.

Conclusion

Based on the results of the data analysis and the previous discussion, it can be concluded that the 3rd and 5th-semester students of the English Department at UNIDA Gontor obtained mispronunciation errors in all categories of error types. In general, the misformation error score was 1525 with all target phonemes, namely phoneme /θ/ by 24%, phoneme /ð/ by 26%, phoneme /s/ by 5%, dan

phoneme /z/ by 45%, while the addition error score is 113 with 2 phonemes in the addition error, namely phoneme /z/ by 1% and phoneme /s/ by 99%, then the omission error has a score of 80 errors with 3 phonemes, namely phoneme /θ/ by 19%, phoneme /z/ by 28% and /s/ by 54%. The misordering error type has a score of 26 with sounds that have misordering errors, namely the /θ/ sound by 4%, the /z/ sound by 4%, and the /s/ sound by 92%.

Furthermore, the data found from the analysis of the percentage classification of pronunciation errors among respondents stated that all respondents obtained a moderate classification of pronunciation errors. In addition, the percentage of errors between the target phoneme /s/ of 18% included the low mispronunciation classification. The sound /θ/ of 79%, the sound /ð/ of 81%, and the sound /z/ of 84%, these three phonemes included a high mispronunciation classification percentage. Students' pronunciation errors are influenced by 3 categories of error sources, namely interlingual transfer, intralingual transfer, and context of learning. Interlingual Transfer is influenced by the mother tongue which is not familiar with the target language because of lack of practice, Intralingual Transfer is students' overgeneralization of the target language, they tend to assume English pronunciation based on written words. Then the context of learning is influenced by the difference between the learning situation and the actual use situation.

In conclusion, English major students still have serious problems in pronouncing words containing interdental and alveolar fricative sounds, namely the /ð/, /θ/, /s/, and /z/ sounds in each spelling such as [th], [s], [ss], [sc], [x], and [se]. This issue cannot be ignored because English department students have to have high values for their English skills.

References

Ball, M. J. (2002). ALAN CRUTTENDEN, Gimson's Pronunciation of English, 6th edition. London: Edward Arnold. 2001. Pp. xx + 339. ISBN 0 340 75972 0. *Journal*

of the International Phonetic Association, 32(2), 223–236. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0025100303231121>.

Ambalegin. (2019). EFL Learners' Phonological Interference of English Articulation. *Jurnal Basis*, 6(2), 147.

Angguni, R. (2020). Interlingual and Intralingual Errors of Writing Descriptive Text Made By Third Semester Students of English Education Department Sarjanawiyata Tamansiswa University Yogyakarta. *JELLT (Journal of English Language and Language Teaching)*, 4(2), 79.

Arevi, M. Z. (2020). Students ability and problem in pronouncing English vowels made by the Second Semester Students of Universitas Negeri Padang. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 9(3), 26.

Arvian, E. (2021). Error analysis of silent letters pronunciation made by the fourth semester students of English department of STBA JIA. *Jurnal Ennichi*, 2(1), 22–37.

Brown, H. D. (2014). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching : A Course in Second Language Acquisition*. PEARSON.

C., J. (2016). *Errors In Language Learnig and Use Exploring Error Analysis*. Routledge.

Crystal, D. (2008). A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics. In *Language* (Vol. 80, Issue 1). Blackwell Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2004.0038>

D., B. H. (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching* (fifth). PEARSON.

Diah Pitaloka, A., Rifaddin, J. H. A. M., Baru, H., Loa, K., Ilir, J., Samarinda, K., & Timur, K. (2021). An Error Analysis Of Students' English Vowel Pronunciation. *Borneo Journal of Language and Education*, I(1), 2021.

Firdaus, S. F., Indrayani, L. M., & Soemantri, Y. S. (2020). The production of interdental fricatives by english as a foreign language students in english course bandung. *Linguistics and ELT Journal*, 8(1), 1–9.

Gustina, I. (2023). English Fricatives Sound Pronounced by The Students'. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, 6(1), 15–16.

Hadroh, A., English, A., Miftahul, M., Gondangrejo, U., & Pasuruan, G. (2020). A Study of Pronunciation Error in English Consonant. *Journal of English Education and Technology*, 01(03), 206.

Harley, A. (1999). *Cambridge Dictionary Online*. Cambridge University Press.

Juliardi, D., Susilawati, E., & Bunau, E. (2019). An analysis of students' pronunciation mastery of dental fricative and alveolar plosive sounds. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran Khatulistiwa*, 8(11).

Kharmilah, P., & Narius, D. (2019). Error analysis in writing discussion text made by students at english department of Universitas Negeri Padang. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 8(3), 327–335.

Knight, A. R. (2016). *Phonetics A Coursebook*. Cambridge University Press.

L, R. S. (2019). Pronunciation Errors Made By the Third Year Students of Mts Darul Hikmah Pekanbaru in. *Jom FKIP*, 6(2), 4.

Lestari, D. D. (2020). Pronunciation Errors Made By Efl Student Teachers in Speech Performance. *Prominent*, 3(2), 321.

Lodge, K. (2009). *A Critical Introduction to Phonetics*. Continuum.

Mackey, A, G. S. M. (2005). *Second Language Research*. LEA.

Merrita, D. (2021). the Production of English Consonants /θ/ and /ð/ By English Department Students. *Lingua : Jurnal Ilmiah*, 17(2), 26–44. <https://doi.org/10.35962/lingua.v17i2.85>

Muhammad, R. (2020). *An Error Analysis*

of English Approximant Consonants Made By the First Year Students of English Department At Muhammadiyah University of Makassar. Makassar: Muhammadiyah University.

Nirmalasari, Y. (2021). Kesalahan Bunyi Simakan Pemelajar Bipa Tingkat Pemula Asal Tiongkok. *Tabasa: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra Indonesia, Dan Pengajarannya*, 1(2), 147–164. <https://doi.org/10.22515/tabasa.v1i2.2692>

Putra, F. P. (2019). An Error Analysis of English Plosive and Fricative Consonants at Vocational High Schools. *Wanastra: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 11(2), 143.

Rebecca, M. D. (1993). *Accurate English A Complete Course in Pronunciation* (p. vii). Prantice-Hall.

Richards, J. C. (2015). Error analysis: Perspectives on second language acquisition. In *Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315836003>

Rusmiati. (2021). An Error Analysis of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) Students' Works on Simple Present Tense. *Jurnal Riset Intervensi Pendidikan (JRIP)*, 3(1), 21–28. <http://journal-litbang-rekarta.co.id/index.php/jrip/>

Saldana, J. (2011). *Fundamentals of Qualitative Research, Understanding Qualitative Research*.

Shakir, M. (2020). Error Analysis in English as a Second Language Students' Writing. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 14(8), 814.

Situmeang, I. T., & Lubis, R. F. (2020). Students' difficulties in pronouncing fricative consonant. *English Journal for Teaching and Learning*, 08(01), 38–46. <http://jurnal.iainpadangsidiimpuan.ac.id/index.php/EEJ>

Sugiyono. (2017). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. ALFABETA.

Tavakoli, H. (2012). *A Dictionary of Language Acquisition*. RAHNAMA PRESS.

Ubaydullayeva, D., & Rasulov, Z. (2021). Dealing With Phonetic Units in Teaching Pronunciation. *Конференции*, 1(1), 108. <https://doi.org/10.47100/conferences.v1i1.1085>

Maulidiana, Y. (2020). *An error analysis of English fricative sound pronounced by Gayonese students* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Islam Negeri Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh).