The Implementation of Tongue Twister Method to Improve Students' English Pronunciation

Hamzah Haz[1], Nurul Imansari[2*], Nurhaeni[3]
[1,2,3] Universitas Sulawesi Barat
[*]Correspondence: nurul.imansari@unsulbar.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui keefektifan penggunaan metode *tongue twister* pada pengucapan siswa. Penelitian ini merupakan penelitian kuantitatif dengan desain eksperimen semu. Populasi pada penelitian ini adalah siswa kelas II SMAN 1 Campalagian yang berjumlah 150 siswa, dan sampel terdiri dari 32 siswa yang dibagi menjadi dua kelompok; kelompok kontrol (16 siswa) dan kelompok eksperimen (16 siswa). Kelompok kontrol diajar dengan teknik lagu sedangkan kelompok eksperimen diajar dengan metode *tounge twister*. Peneliti menggunakan tes (Pre-test dan post-test) sebagai instrumen dalam penelitian. Berdasarkan hasil tes, peneliti menyimpulkan bahwa rata-rata skor post-test lebih tinggi dari pada pre-test, yaitu (60>55) dan (75>65). Penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa terdapat perbedaan nilai yang signifikan antara keduanya. Oleh karena itu, dapat disimpulkan bahwa siswa melakukan peningkatan dalam pembelajaran pengucapan melalui *tounge twister*.

This study aims to determine the effectiveness of the use of the tongue twister method on students' pronunciation. This research employed quantitative research with a quasi-experimental design. The population of this study is the second-grade students of SMAN 1 Campalagian, 150 students, and the sample consists of 32 students who are divided into two groups; the control group (16 students) and the experimental group (16 students). The control group was taught using the song technique while the experimental group was taught using the tongue twister method. The researchers used test (Pre-test and post-test) as the instrument in the study. Based on the test results, the researchers conclude that the average post-test score is higher than the pre-test, those are (60>55) and (75>65). This research indicates that there is a significant difference in value between the two. Therefore, it can be concluded that students make improvement in learning pronunciation through tongue twisters.

Keywords: *Effectiveness, Pronunciation, Tongue Twister.*

INTRODUCTION

Pronunciation is one important aspect of speaking English, it can be said that basic skills must be understood before deep learning about speaking. Experts specified that pronunciation is the act of producing the sound of speech including articulation, vowel, formation, accent inflection, and intonation, often regarding the correctness or acceptability of the speech sound (Rebecca, 1993). Since Indonesians are not native speakers, most of the

students have difficulty understanding and delivering the correct pronunciation in English. The ability to speak using accurate pronunciation is very important. If the students do mispronounce while speaking, it makes it the listener difficult to understand what we are talking about. The students consider pronunciation a difficult subject since the sounds of words are usually different from their written form.

Pronunciation is one important aspect of speaking English, it can be said that basic skills must be understood before deep learning about speaking. Experts specified that pronunciation is the act of producing the sound of speech including articulation, vowel, formation, accent inflection, and intonation, often regarding the correctness or acceptability of the speech sound (Rebecca, 1993). Since Indonesians are not native speakers, most of the students have difficulty understanding and delivering the correct pronunciation in English. The ability to speak using accurate pronunciation is very important. If the students do mispronounce while speaking, it makes it the listener difficult to understand what we are talking about. The students consider pronunciation a difficult subject since the sounds of words are usually different from their written form. The students feel confused and difficult to pronounce some English words, especially unfamiliar ones.

Machacova (2012) identified that tongue twisters are phrases or sentences which are difficult to pronounce because similar sounds are accurate but provide the students with enjoyable activities at pronunciation practice. Tongue twister sentences consist of similar sounds of words but tongue twisters are often different in meaning. Moreover, some tongue twisters are tomorrow's and give amusement values. This technique is needed because students will be drilled to pronounce English words correctly by using some similar and interesting phrases or sentences. Through tongue twister, students are hoping to feel easy in imitating and remembering the English phonemes.

In relation to some issues that previously outlined above, the researchers then identified that the second-grade students of SMAN 1 Campalagian do not have motivation to practice speaking, the students lack of vocabulary, pronunciation, and have low speaking skills. Thus, this study aims to determine the effectiveness of the use of the tongue twister method on students' pronunciation in learning pronunciation in SMAN 1 Campalagian. Our hypotheses in this research are: 1) There is no improvement of students' pronunciation after the implementation of Tongue Twister method (H1). 2) There is an improvement of students' pronunciation after the implementation of Tongue Twister method (H2).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Na'im (2014) described teaching English pronunciation using the drilling technique and explains the students' difficulties in learning English pronunciation by using drilling technique. He got two students 20 difficulties in learning English pronunciation, those were a matter of memorizing and matter of the student's ability to distinguish and to pronounce isolated sounds. There are 2 research questions was what are the difficulties in learning English pronunciation techniques drilling techniques can apply in learning English pronunciation. As we know that the tongue twister is the same as drilling, but there are some complicated words to be pronounced, differentiate the similar sounds.

The other research by Qurnia (2009) describes the implementation of songs as the media to improve students' pronunciation and to find out the improvement of students' pronunciation after being taught by using songs. The researcher conducted a (CAR) Group room Action Research that followed the model design of her research. Moreover, The study of Purnama (2019) used quasi experimental research, through test and questionnaire as an instrument. This research was applied to second grade students in MTsN 1 Aceh Besar in the academic year 2017/2018. The result of this research the mean score of post test is higher than pre test (72 > 52) and (61 > 55). And the students get improvement in learning pronunciation through tongue twister.

The gap between previous researchers and this present research including the first research used group room action research in implementing tongue twister to improve student's pronunciation and that research applied at tenth-grade students. While this research applied tongue twister in improving students' pronunciation with quasi-experimental and conducted at eleventh-grade students. The second research with this research, the difference resides in the use of techniques in learning pronunciation, that is drilling technique and tongue twister. The drilling technique was used to analyze the difficulties in pronunciation.

The third research used song in teaching pronunciation and was conducted by group room action research. Meanwhile, this research used tongue twister to improve students' pronunciation with quasi-experimental design, the fourth research similar to this present research but this research distributed questionnaire in conducted the. And the last is the researcher used tongue twister in teaching pronunciation and used test and questionnaire as an instrument. Meanwhile, the differences are that research applied in MTsN but this research collected the data in Senior High School.

METHODOLOGY

This research employs quantitative research, which is a quasi-experimental design, involving pre-test and post-test to measure students' ability in pronunciation. The researchers also collected the data through additional literature studies.

The population of this research is the second grade students of SMAN 1 Campalagian, in the academic year of 2021/2022. They are grouped into 5 groups where each group consists of 25-35 students. The total population is 150 Students. The sample of this research comes from two groups of the second grade of SMA 1 Campalagian in the academic year of 2021/2022 chosen randomly by using simple random sampling. The result of sample random sampling is XI MIPA 2 as experimental group and XI MIPA 5 a control group, which consist of 16 students each group.

This research was held in six meetings. In the first step, the researchers choose the participants using cluster sampling. The second step, the pre-test distributed to the student in the first meeting, the test is about tongue twister simple sentences to measure the student's pronoun ability. In the third step, the researchers gives treatment in the second meeting until the fifth meeting to the experiment group that is using the tongue twister method in teaching pronunciation and the last step is the researcher gives post-test to them in the sixth or last meeting, the test that distributed in post-test is similar with a pre-test. The tests that are given by the researcher to the students are pronunciation tests. After the tests are given by the researcher to the students, the researcher would score the tests.

FINDINGS AND DUSCUSSION

Findings

This part shows the result of the research where the control group is the group taught without using the Tongue twister Technique. A pre-test was conducted to determine the result of the pronunciation. The subject in the control group pre-test is 16 students. From the result of the pre-test, data showed the highest score achieved by students is 90 and the lowest score is 30.

Table 4.1. Data pre-test in control group

No	Interval	F	%
1	30	1	6.3

2	35	1	6.3
3	40	2	12.5
4	50	4	25.0
5	55	1	6.3
6	60	3	18.8
7	65	1	6.3
8	70	1	6.3
9	90	2	12.5
Total		16	100

Based on the table, there were 16 students who have done the pre-test in the control group. The table shows that only 2 students reach the average value (75) and there were 14 students which have a score below 75 and they do not succeed did the pre-test.

Table 4.2. Categories data of pre-test in control group

No	Interval	Category	F	%
1	85-100	Very Good	2	12.5%
2	75-84	Good	0	0%
3	60-74	Fair	5	31.25%
4	40-59	Poor	7	43.75%
5	0-39	Very Poor	2	12.5%

The table in the previous page shows that the students of pre-test in the control group have a variety score which is divided into 4 categories. There were only 2 (12.5%) of 16 students who were successful who did the pre-test and the categorized as very good and there were 7 (43.75%) students who got a poor score. We can conclude that majority of the students in the control group belonged to a poor category in pre-test.

a) Post-test

A post-test of the control group aims to look at outcomes of the learning of pronunciation without using the Tongue twister Technique. From the result of the post-test, the data showed the highest score achieved by students is 95 and the lowest score is 35.

Table 4.3. Data post-test in control group

No	Interval	F	%
1	35	1	6.3
2	40	3	18.8
3	50	2	12.5
4	55	2	12.5
5	60	1	6.3
6	65	2	12.5
7	75	2	12.5
8	80	1	6.3
9	95	2	12.5
Total		16	100

Based on the table, there were 16 students who have done the pre-test in control group. Table shows that only 5 students reach the average value (75) and there were 11 students which have score below 75 and they do not succeed did the pre-test. This test score students' result after gave treatment (song).

Table 4.4. Categories data of post-test in control group

No	Interval	Category	F	%
1	85-100	Very good	2	12.5%
2	75-84	Good	3	18.8%
3	60-74	Fair	3	18.8%
4	40-59	Poor	7	43.8%
5	0-39	Very poor	1	6.3%

Table 4.4 shows that there were 5 of 16 students which reaches the average value. There were 2 (12.5%) students as very good category and 3 (18.8%) students as good category. But there were 7 (43.8%) students have poor scores. It can be concluded that the majority of the students belonged to poor category in the post-test.

b) Comparison between the pre-test and post-test scores of the control group

Table 4.5 contains the differences between the pre-test and post-test scores of the control group in pronunciation ability. Based on table 11, the mean value of the pre-test of control group was 55.93. Meanwhile, the mean of the post-test was 60.94. Thus, the mean score of the post-test was higher than the pre-test of score.

Table 4.5. Comparison data between pre-test and post-test in control group

Data	Pretest	Posttest
Number of group	16	16
Mean	55.93	60.94
SD	17.148	18.992
Low Category of Frequency	6.3 %	6.3%
Hight category of frequency	12.5 %	12.5%

2) Experimental group

a) Pre-test

The experimental group is a group taught using Tongue twister technique in learning pronunciation. The subjects in the experimental group are 16 students. For the result of the pre-test, the data shows the highest score achieved by students is 95 and the lowest score is 40.

Table 4.6. Statistical data of pre-test in experimental group

No	Interval	F	%
1	40	1	6.3%
2	45	3	18.8%
3	55	2	12.5%
4	60	1	6.3%
5	65	2	12.5%
6	70	1	6.3%
7	75	1	6.3%

8	80	3	18.8%
9	90	1	6.3%
10	95	1	6.3%
Total		16	100

There were 16 students who have done the pre-test in experimental group. This group was implemented the tongue twister method. Based on the table above, there were 6 students which reaches the average value (75) and 10 students have score below 75. So, there are more students who get scores below the average compared to students who have good scores. This score is students' result before get treatment or before implemented tongue twister method.

From the statistical data, the category of a pretest score of experimental group is divided into five categories namely very good, good, fair, poor, and very poor.

Table 4.7. Categories data of pre-test in experimental group

No	Interval	Category	F	%
1	85-100	Very good	2	12.5%
2	75-84	Good	4	25%
3	60-74	Fair	4	25%
4	40-59	Poor	6	37.5%
5	0-39	Very Poor	0	0%

The table shows that there are four categories obtained from students who have variety score. It can be seen, there were 6 of 16 students' which reaches the average value, 2 (12.5%) students as very good category and 4 (25%) as good category. And form the table, the were 6 (37.5%) who have the majority value. The research conclude that the students in experimental group was poor category in pre-test.

b) Post-test

A post-test of the experimental group aims to look at outcomes of the learning of pronunciation using the Tongue twister Technique. From the result of the post-test, the data showed the highest score achieved by students is 95 and the lowest score is 45. By using

SPSS, it is known that the average score (mean) achieved by students in the experimental group post-test is 75.00; mode is 90.00: median is 80,00 and the standard deviation is 16.931. The frequency distribution of post-test scores of pronunciation skill with the experimental group are shown in table 4.8.

Table 4.8. Statistical data of post-test in experimental group

No	Interval	F	%
1	45	1	6.3
2	50	2	12.5
4	60	2	12.5
6	70	1	6.3
7	75	1	6.3
8	80	2	12.5
9	85	1	6.3
10	90	5	31.3
11	95	1	6.3
Total		16	100

Based on the table, there were 16 students who have done the post-test in experimental group. From the data, there were 9 students which reaches the average value (75) and there were 6 students have score below average value. So, it can be conclude that there is improvement result from the pre-test in experimental group.

Table 4.9. Categories data of post-test in experimental group

No	Interval	Category	F	%
1	85-100	Very good	7	43.75%
2	75-84	Good	3	18.75%
3	60-74	Fair	3	18.75%

| 4 | 40-59 | Poor | 3 | 18.75% |

Table 4.9 shows that there were 6 students success in doing the test because they score is below from minimum standard (75), 3 (18.75%) students as poor category and 3 (18.75%) as fair category. it can be seen from the data, the majority of the students as very good category, that is there were 7 (43.75%) students got the score. So, it can be conclude that students in experimental group belonged to very good category in post-test.

c) Comparison between the pre-test and post-test scores of the experimental group

Table 4.10 contains the differences between the pre-test and post-test scores of the experimental group in pronunciation ability. Based on table 11, the mean value of the pretest of experimental group was 65.31. Meanwhile, the mean of the post-test was 75.00. Thus, the mean score of the posttest was higher than the pretest of score.

Table 4.10. Data comparison between pre-test and post-test in experimental group

Data	Pre-test	Post-test
Number of group	16	16
Mean	65.31	75.00
SD	17.075	16.931
Low Category of Frequency	6.3%	6.3%
Hight category of frequency	6.3%	6.3%

In addition, the standard deviation (SD) for the pre-test was 17.075 while the post-test was 16.931 thus the SD of pre-test is higher than the post-test. Then, it can be interpreted that the students' pronunciation ability of the experimental group based on the pre-test and post-test scores was homogeneous.

1. Prerequisite Testing Result

a) Test of Normality

The normality test was conducted on the data obtained from the pre-test and post-test, both the control group and the experimental group. Data is said to be normality distributed if the *Asymp. Sig* obtained from the calculation is greater than 0.05. The results of the normality test is presented in the table 4.11.

Table 4.11. Data of normality test

C	Sig	A	Statement
Pre-Test Control	0.200	0.05	Test distribution is normal
Post-Test Control	0.200	0.05	Test distribution is normal
Pre-Test Experiment	0.200	0.05	Test distribution is normal
Post-Test Experiment	0.137	0.05	Test distribution is normal

The normality test results are known that Asymp value, Sig. (2-tailed) is greater than 0.05, so it can be concluded that the distribution of the data of pre-test and the data of the post-test both control and experimental group are normal.

b) Test of Homogeneity

The homogeneity test was done after the normality test. Data is said to be homogeneous is significance value is greater than 0.05 (significance level). The *Test of Homogeneity of Variances* was employed to test the homogeneity. The result of homogeneity test is presented in Table 4.12

Table 4.12. Data of homogeneity test

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Hasil	Based on Mean	.138	1	62	.712
	Based on Median	.188	1	62	.666
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.188	1	57.241	.666
	Based on trimmed mean	.147	1	62	.702

Table 4.12 shows that the value of p (Sig.) of the test (0.712) was greater than 0.05. It means that the sample variance is homogeneous.

2. Hypothesis Testing Result

Paired Sample T-Test

Test of Paired sample T-Test is used to determine the average difference between two pairs of samples, this test can be done if the data is normally distributed. The paired sample t-test in this study was used to answer the research question "Is the use of tongue twister effective to improve students's pronunciation ability To answer the question, test was carried out on the pre-test and post-test of the experimental gruop, then the pre-test and post-test data of the control group.

Table 4.13. Data of paired samples t-test

Paired Samples T-Test

| | | | | | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | | | |
| Paired Differences | | | | | | | | | |
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1	Pre-test Control - Post text Control	-5.000	7.528	1.882	-9.011	-.989	-2.657	15	.018
Pair 2	Pre-test Experiment - Post-test Experiment	-9.688	11.470	2.868	-15.799	-3.576	-3.378	15	.004

Based on the output pair 2, the sig. (2 tailed) of 0.004 < 0.05, it can be concluded that there is a difference in the average student learning result for the pre-test experimental group with the post-test experimental group (using tongue twister). So, H1 is accepted "There is improvement of students's pronunciation after the implementation of Tongue Twister method.", while H0 is rejected.

b. Analysis of Pronunciation

Based on pronunciation rubric in chapter ii there are four categories that has been check. The tests are pre-test and post-test from control group and experimental group. There are 16 students each group that have done the test and the test is about tongue twister. From the test, the researcher wants to know the students' ability in pronunciation.

For the first category is about vowel in pre-test. From the control group, there are many incorrect pronouns from the students, and most of them got 2 score, it means the pronounces some vowels incorrectly consistently so almost the word in wrong talk and only in word, /iz/, /tu:/, /ɑ:n/. Meanwhile, the experimental group, most of them got 3 score it means the students makes inconsistent vowel errors. For example, in /skwer/, /'teɪbl/, /keɪdʒ/, /pærət/, and few word have correct pronounce which is /ei/, /ru:m/, /iz/, /sɪŋ/, /gets/. The student speaks the words without know the spelling, and the researcher used tongue twister to told about how to pronoun the word correctly. After used the method the researcher give the test again to know the students' improvement about pronounce the word. The students' vowel in the post-test is less then in pre-test. Most of the students got 4 score it means the students pronounces vowels correctly most of the time. For example in word /sez/, /netwʒ:rk/, /tu:/, /ɑ:n/, /daʊn/, /windou/, /ri:'bu:t/ and only a few incorrect pronoun in /rɪ'pi:tɪdli/, /gaus/, weɪvi/, /pouət/. The students incorrect pronouns the word that not familiar for them, so they difficult to speak that word. So, for the vowel category the tongue twister method gave improve better then song method.

The second category is consonant, the first is pre test in control group. The most of student got 3 score it means they makes inconsistent consonant errors and after applied the song method the students does not get the improve in post test, so it can be said that the most of students got 3 score again. While, pre test in experimental group, mostly of students get 3 score same with in pre test control group. But, when the researcher implemented the tongue twister method, the students' score have improve become 4 score it means the students pronounces consonants correctly most of the time. The students just got consonant error in a few words.

Next category is word stress. From the students' pre test in control group, mostly of them got 3 score, it means places stress on the right syllable of multisyllabic words most of the time, but miss places it on certain words. The students still low in stressing a word because they never learn specific about that so they make error in many words and about the post that which is after applied the song the students' result still same there is improve in this case. At the same time in pre test experimental group, the case in control group similar with this group. But, after used the tongue twister method, the students gave improve in this word stress, it is cause of the tongue twister method focus on how to spell the word correctly before did fast read like a tongue twister in general.

For the last category is sentence stress. Students in control group when got the pre test, they have 2 score it means that frequently misplaces stress on focus words and other key words and after got the post test they got 3 score that places stress on focus words and

other key words sometimes. From the researcher' analysis, it case happened because the students less reading practice or less to practice speak English. And for the pre test and post test in experimental group have improve from 3 score became 4 score that means places stress on focus words and other key words sometimes to be places stress on focus words and other key words most of the time. In tongue twister method, the researcher always gave practice in speak and how to pronounce the word correctly.

In conclusion, the song method does not gave significant improve because the method not learn specifically how to pronounce the word, how to stress the word and sentence. But while in experimental group which is used tongue twister method, the researcher gave lesson about pronounce the word correctly, word and sentence stress. So, the tongue twister method can help the students in improving their pronunciation ability.

Discussions

This research examined if the implementation of tongue twister improved students' English pronunciation. In this section, the researcher discussed the findings of the research concerning the two research questions. The research objective is also related to the aim of this study: to investigate the use of tongue twister to improve student's pronunciation ability in improving their pronunciation. The researcher collected the data using pre and post-tests, and experimental teaching, as instruments to answer the research questions. Based on the result discovered after analyzing the series of data, the following section discusses the findings of this study and answers the research questions.

The use of tongue twister to improve student's pronunciation ability

The research question is to investigate the use of tongue twister to improve students' pronunciation ability. As it was mentioned above, a series of tests (pre-test and post-test) had been conducted in experimental teaching. The researcher has analyzed the students' pre and post-test scores by emphasizing four aspects of assessment, they were: vowel, stress, word stress, and consonant. The tests result indicated that tongue twister technique had improved students' pronunciation development. This is supported by previous research namely Fraesti under the title "The effectiveness of tongue twister technique in pronunciation at SMAN 1 Nawangi Pacitan". Which in the result of her research showed tongue twister technique is effective to improve the students' pronunciation achievement at the tenth-grade students. The similarities of her research and this present research is both used tongue twister in learning pronunciation and applied with quasi-experimental design and also the result from those researches is same (tongue twister is effective to improve students' pronunciation ability).

While the difference is her research was applied at tenth-grade students but this research was applied at eleventh-grade students and about the instrument her research only used test but this research used test and questionnaire.

Based on the mean of each test had proven; mean of pre-test was 65.31 experimental group and 55.93 in control group. The result mean of post-test was 75.00 for experimental group and 60,93 for control group. This stage showed the significant difference between experimental group and control group on pre-test and post-test scores. This result reports that the significance level of *t-test*=.004 is lower than α= 0.05 (.000<0.05) the score is significant. It could be concluded that the average score of post-test was higher than pre-test. It meant that the implementation of tongue twister method can improved students' English pronunciation. Thus, H0 refused and H1 was received. It could be concluded that the average score of post-test was higher than pre-test. It meant that the implementation of tongue twister method improved students' English pronunciation. Used tongue twister method, the researcher gave lesson about pronounce the word correctly, word and sentence stress. So, the tongue twister method can help the students in improving their pronunciation ability.

CONCLUSION

Based on the data analysis about applying tongue twister technique to improve students' pronunciation at second grade of SMA 1 Campalagian, it can be concluded that based on the results of the research and discussion that has been presented in the previous chapter, it can be concluded that there is improvement of students' pronunciation after the implementation of Tongue Twister method. The value of Sig. (2-tailed) less than the significant level (0.004 < 0.05), then H1 is accepted.

REFERENCES

Arikunto, S. (2002). *Penelitian Tindakan Kelas.* Jakarta: PT. Bumi Aksara.

Arikunto, S. (2006). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif.* Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Arikunto, S. (2006). *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktek.* Jakarta: PT. Rineka Cipta.

Brown, H. D. (1994). *Principle Of Language Leraning and Teaching.* New Jersey: Practice Hall.

Brown, H. D. (2007). *Language Assessment : Principles and Grouproom Practices.* New york: Pearson Education Company.

Depdiknas. (2006). *Standar Kompetensi SMA/MA.* Jakarta: Dharma Bakti.

Djamari, M. (2008). *Tehnik Penyusunan Instrumen Tes dan Non tes.* Yogyakarta: Mitra Cendekia Press.

Fahruli, R. P. (2020). The Effect of Tongue Twister On Students' Pronunciation.

Hammond, J. A. (1992). *English for Special Purpose: A handbook for Teacher of Adult Literacy.* Sydney: NCELTR, Marquarie University.

Harmer, J. (2004). *The Practice of English Language Teaching.* Harlow: Longman.

Hornby, A. S. (1995). *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English .* London: Oxford University Press.

Jones, D. (1958). *An Outline Of English Phonetics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kelly, G. (2000). *How to Teach Pronounciation.* England: Longman, Pearson Education Limited.

Kriegel, D. (2005). *Teaching ESL versus EFL Principle and Practices .* English Teaching Forum.

Kriegel, D. (2005). Teaching ESL VS EFL Principle and practice. *English Teaching Forum*, 9.

Kunandar. (2008). *Penelitian Tindakan Kelas: sebagai pengembangan profest gruru.* Jakarta: PT. Rajagrafindo Persada.

Leavy. (2005). *Practical Research : Planning and Design.* New Jersey: Prentice-hall.

Lutfiani, D., & Astutik, I. (2015). Using Tongue Twister to Improve Student's Pronounciation. *ISSN*, 110-113.

Machcackova, E. (2012). *Teaching English Pronounciation to Secondary School Students With Foccus on "th" Consonant .* Brno: Masaryk University BRNO.

Margono. (2004). *Methodology Penelitian Pendidikan.* Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Margono. (2004). *Metodologi Penelitian Pendidikan.* Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Na'im, M. J. (2014). *Students's Difficulties in Learning English Pronounciation by Using Drilling Technique at Second Grade Studnets' of MtsN Aryojeding in The Academic Year 2013/2014.* Tulungagung: State Islamic Institute (IAIN) .

Nazir. (2005). *Vocabulary Developing Scills .* Yogyakarta: Yayasan Kansius.

Qurnia, U. (2008). *The Use of Songs to Improve Students Achievement in Pronounciation, an Action Research with the 11th Graders of MANU Limpung Batang in the Academic Year 2008/2009 .* Semarang: Tarbiyah Faculty, Walisongo State Institute for Islamic Studies.

Ramelan. (2003). *English Phonetics.* Semarang: UNNES Press.

Ramini, & Ginting. (2002). *English for The Academic Purpose.* Yogyakarta: Andi Offset.

Rebecca. (1993). *The Pronounciation of English .* Australia: Cambridge.

Richards, Jack, C., & Willy, A. R. (2002). *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology Of Current Practice.* New york: Cambridge University Press.

Rohman, M. (2016). *The Use of Tongue Twister Technique to Improve EFL Students Pronounciation: A Grouproom Action Research at the 10 Grade of SMA Unggulan Nurul Islami Semarang In the Academis Year of 2015/2016.* Semarang.

Ruth, & Stere. (1991). *Vocabulary Sentence and Language Education.* Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Seidlhofer, B. (1996). *Pronounciation.* Oxford: Oxford University.

Stewart. (2014). *Intergrating Language Skill through Tongue Twisters Games.* England: English Teaching Forum.

Sudjana, N. (2001). *Penelitian dan Penilaian Pendidikan.* Bandung: Sinar Baru.

Sugiyono. (2001). *Metode Penelitian.* Bandung: CV Alfa Beta.

Sugiyono. (2001). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan.* Bandung: Alfabeta.

Sugiyono. (2005). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan : Pendidikan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D.* Bandung: Alfabeta.

Sugiyono. (2007). *Statistik Untuk Penelitian.* Bandung: CV Alfa Beta.

Sugiyono. (2016). *Metode penelitian pendidikan.* Bandung: Alfabeta.

Sukardi, D. K. (1983). *An Analysis Study On Student's Difficulties in Pronouncing Centering Diphthons.* FKIP UNPAK.

Susanto, A. (2007). *A Srategic Management Approach, CSR.* Jakarta: The Jakarta Consulting Group.

Syamsuddin, & Damayanti. (2011). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan Bahasa.* Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.

Trask. (1996). *English Phonetics and Phonology : A Practical. Third Edition.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Turumi, Y. L., Jamiluddin, & Salehuddin. (2016). Using Tongue Twister To Improve The Pronouunciation Of Grade VIII Students. *e-journal of English Language Teaching Society (ELTS)*, 1-2.

Widianto. (2013). *Statistika Terapan : Konsep dan Aplikasi SPSS Dalam Penelitian Bidan Pendidikan, Psikologi dan Ilmu sosial Lainnya.* Jakarta: Gramedia.

Yanto, M. (2013). *Jadi Guru Yang Jago Penelitian Tindakan Kelas.* Yogyakarta: C.V Andi OFFSET.

Zulfikar. (2016). *Pengantar Pendekatan Statistika.* Yogyakarta: Deepublish.