Learning Habits and Speech Intelligibility of EFL Learners

Lalu Ari Irawan

Mandalika University of Education (UNDIKMA),

Abstract

The idea of intelligibility is essential within a conversation. The status of English as a global language and its emergence varieties, the notion of standard English (British and American) may no longer appropriate within the context of global communication. This leads to the importance of teaching learners to achieve intelligibility, which is more realistic and attainable rather than forcing the students to have native like proficiency. This study aimed to examine various learning habits that may affect the quality of intelligibility of EFL learners in an English Community namely GEC in Mandalika University of Education. Qualitative narrative research approach was used. The data were collected by using two instruments:(1) indirect observation by the of a native speaker acted as a rater; (2) face to face interview which aim to find out students' strategies in improving their pronunciation. The subjects of the study were five members of GEC who met a set of criteria. Among the five students, two performed well in aspects like word stress, segmental pronunciation, and voice quality, and these high achievers showed active improvement in both receptive and productive English skills, while the predominant issue observed among these students stems from a lack of established learning habits that facilitate consistent practice, particularly in developing productive language skills, which affects their level of intelligibility in pronouncing English words.

Keywords: *Speech Intelligibility, Learning Habit, Pronunciation*

INTRODUCTION

Intelligibility is a central notion when dealing with interaction using language in oral communication, especially in international context. To see this, the growing coverage of English across nations can be a strong phenomenon to be investigated. English has been serving global community members in various interest and levels. This has been marked as world Englsihes notion by Kachru. Notwithstanding that English has been transformed into a global language, quality of oral language production is still becoming issue when communication occurs across language entities. Kachru's ideas on global languaging community still requires individuals to be comprehensible despite of many varieties of English, circling in the idea of standard English (British and American), which may no longer relevant within the context of global communication. According to (Kang et al., 2020) the notion that one particular variety should be the standard-bearer for English is increasingly unjustified. According (Seoane, 2016), the development of these new varieties, which is in line with the notion of World Englishes. Due to the important of intelligibility, English users need to know what factors affect the speech intelligibility. Based on the research finding conducted by (Zahro, 2019), concluded that there are three factors affect accentedness, intelligibility, and acceptability, i.e. listener familiarity, speaker's clarity of pronunciation, and pronunciation accuracy. She also added that among those three factors, clarity and accuracy of pronunciation are the novel factor that affected the judgement. Based on the previous research finding above, it is fair to say that having a foreign-accented speech is not really matter in the context of global communication. However, having some phonological issue in pronouncing words is more likely lead to unintelligibility.

According to (Moedjito et al., 2019), when instructing English pronunciation to EFL (English as a Foreign Language) learners, the goal should be to help them attain intelligibility, which is a more realistic and achievable objective, rather than trying to make them sound like native speakers. He added that teaching pronunciation under the goal of making the students sound like native speaker is unattainable because there is no clear cut on the definition of native English. (Pardede et al., 2010), also said that the primary objective of the goals in teaching pronunciation is to cultivate the student's oral English skills in a manner that is easily comprehensible, tailored to their specific requirements, and fosters a favorable perception of themselves as a foreign language speaker. According to (Destiyana & Laila, 2020),intelligibility refers to the accuracy of understanding (sound) when the listener attempts to understand the words spoken.

Learning English for EFL learner requires a learning habit that can effectively support not only the knowledge of the language being learned but also to effectively cultivate a regular practice routine. The strong correlation between accent and the perceived quality of speech cannot be overlooked. An individual's accent can profoundly influence the clarity of their speech to others, making it crucial for EFL learners to attain a level of fluency and articulation that mitigates accent-related challenges and, in turn, amplifies overall speech comprehensibility. Therefore, it becomes imperative for EFL learners to develop a level of fluency and articulation that minimizes accent-related issues, thus enhancing overall speech comprehensibility. To accomplish this goal, EFL learners should adopt a comprehensive approach that balances both receptive and productive language skills. As the problem found in this study that among five sample students it was only two students who can be categorized into intelligible English speaker. Crucially, the issue identified among these students predominantly stems from a lack of established learning habits that promote regular practice, particularly in developing productive language skills.

Drawing from the preceding paragraph, it holds significance for students to cultivate learning habits that foster consistent practice and interaction with the language they are acquiring. A study conducted by(Moedjito et al., 2019) titled "What makes EFL speakers' utterances more intelligible in the context of global intelligibility?" underscores the pivotal role of word pronunciation in enhancing the intelligibility of EFL speakers' expressions.

According to (Schunk, 2012), there are three criteria of learning: change, endurance over time, and experience. The first criterion states that learning involves behavioral changes as individuals acquire the capacity to perform tasks differently. It is crucial to note that learning is not directly observed but inferred from its outcomes. The second criterion highlights the significance of enduring effects in learning. Lastly, the third criterion emphasizes that learning occurs through experiences such as practice, observation of others, and interaction with the environment.

Based on the explanation of these criteria, it can be concluded that learners can experience change in their behavior when they engage in activities such as practice, observation, and interaction. In the context of addressing inquiries concerning the factors influencing speech intelligibility, these criteria serve as invaluable reference points. They provide a framework for exploring how various learning habits can directly impact an individual's ability to communicate effectively. By delving into the connections between these criteria and speech intelligibility, we can gain insights into the cognitive and behavioral

processes that contribute to clear and comprehensible speech. This study aimed to see the interconnection between results of students' intelligibility measurement from their individual learning habits.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Pronunciation and speech intelligibility

To begin with, pronunciation plays a crucial role in improving intelligibility, and it is essential to understand the specific features of pronunciation that contribute to this aspect. As mentioned by (Berry, 2021) the pronunciation component is a fundamental aspect of any language course. In fact, inadequate pronunciation skills can significantly hinder effective oral communication. Pronunciation covers not only the accurate production of individual sounds (segments) but also extends to other aspects of speech beyond the level of individual sounds. These include intonation, phrasing, stress, timing, rhythm (suprasegmental aspects), as well as voice projection (voice quality). Furthermore, pronunciation, in its broader definition, covers attention to non-verbal cues such as gestures and expressions that are closely tied to our spoken language.

Addressing these various aspects of pronunciation is essential in order to enhance overall intelligibility. Paying attention to segmental features ensures the accurate production of individual sounds, while suprasegmental aspects such as intonation, stress, and rhythm contribute to the natural and fluent flow of speech. Voice quality, including volume, clarity, and resonance, plays a significant role in how well a speaker is understood. In the context of this study, examining these different aspects of pronunciation will provide valuable insights into the students' ability to communicate effectively. Further, assessing and addressing specific pronunciation features, educators can identify areas of improvement and implement targeted strategies to enhance intelligibility.

There have been many debates on the two main features of pronunciation, i.e. segmental and suprasegmental as which one is more important towards the intelligibility. Segmental pertains to all individual consonant and vowel phonemes, whereas suprasegmental encompasses speech features that extend beyond a single sound in an utterance, such as length, stress, intonation, juncture, and pitch/tone (Lok Raj Sharma, 2021).Related to which features give bigger impact towards intelligibility, it was concluded that suprasegmental-based pronunciation instruction involved communicative contexts, while segmental-based pronunciation instruction only focused on the lexical level, in which this means suprasegmental

give bigger impact towards intelligibility (Wang, 2022). On the other hand, many researches also claimed that segmental features give more impact towards intelligibility. Besides of the different views on the two main features, we cannot deny the fact of both segmental and suprasegmental are important to support intelligibility. Therefore, both terms should be taught in the same portion. However, due to the use of the both features as the measurement of intelligibility, this study might accidently show another new finding of what features matter more for intelligibility.

Problems often appear within pronunciation, especially to Indonesian English speaker, in which this caused by the different of orthographical system between English and Indonesian language. The different in orthography contributes to several challenges faced by Indonesian speakers when trying to articulate English words accurately. In Indonesian, vocal sound reading remains consistent and does not change in any form. However, in English, the pronunciation of vocal sounds varies depending on the word's structure.

In Indonesian, there are two types of vowel sounds: monophthongs and diphthongs. On the other hand, English covers three types of vocal sounds: monophthongs, diphthongs, and triphthongs. Further, another distinction lies in the consonant patterns. In Indonesian, the majority of words consist of only one consonant (e.g., "rak," "bak," "stop"), with double consonants limited to "-ng" and "-ny" combinations. In contrast, English words exhibit a wider range of consonant patterns, including single consonants (e.g., "stop"), double consonants (e.g., "slash," "laugh"), and even triple consonants (e.g., "night"). As a result of these contrasting orthographical systems, Indonesian English speakers often encounter difficulties while speaking English. According to (Miller, 2019), acquiring a new writing system involves more than just memorizing new symbols. It requires developing a fresh perspective on visual data and its connection to phonological information. Miller further highlights that the complex orthography of English poses a significant challenge for second language (L2) learners due to its irregular nature. For example, the letter "c" can represent the sounds [k] in words like "cat" and [s] in words like "certain."

These linguistic and orthographical differences between Indonesian and English underscore the importance of targeted instruction and practice to improve pronunciation skills. By understanding the specific challenges posed by the orthographic disparities, Indonesian English speakers can focus on developing their awareness of English phonology and enhance their ability to accurately pronounce English words.

According to James (2010) as cited by (Gilakjani, 2012), acceptable pronunciation can be categorized into three fundamental levels. At level 1, the speaker's utterances are not comprehensible to others, often attributed to the usage of incorrect sounds when pronouncing English words or the improper application of prosodic features while constructing English sentences. At level 2, the speaker's message becomes understandable to listeners. However, due to a distinctive and pronounced accent the pronunciation is considered unacceptable. For instance, the speaker's heavy accent may hinder their own comprehension. Finally, at level 3, the speaker's English is both intelligible to others and considered acceptable to listen to.

Learning Theories

Given the aim of this research, which is to investigate students' learning habits that enhance speech intelligibility, it is essential to emphasize three prominent learning theories: behaviorism, cognitivism, and constructivism.

According to (Picciano, 2017),behaviorism, as its name implies, is a branch of psychology that primarily examines human behavior. It emerged from a positivist viewpoint that emphasizes cause and effect relationships. In essence, behaviorism posits that actions lead to specific reactions. Within the field of education, behaviorism investigates how students demonstrate behaviors throughout the learning process. On the other hand, cognitivism centers on the cognitive processes of the mind, including motivation and imagination, which are essential in shaping individuals' responses to stimuli.

Constructivism, as a learning theory, refers to the activity of the learners to actively construct knowledge for themselves. This process occurs individually and collectively, as learners assign meaning to their experiences. The principles of constructivist learning theory include: active engagement with sensory input to create meaning and systems of meaning, the significance of hands-on experiences and actions, the role of language in facilitating learning, the interconnectedness of learning with human interaction and relationships, the contextual nature of learning that relates to existing knowledge, beliefs, prejudices, and fears, the reliance on prior knowledge to comprehend new information, the need for sufficient time and patience in the learning process, and the crucial role of motivation in driving effective learning.

METHOD

Research Design

To get into an in-depth view of the inquiry of this study, it was designed to be a qualitative study with narrative analysis method. Qualitative studies aim to obtain extensive

knowledge concerning specific contexts, to get a holistic comprehension of the research subject, or to create and establish concepts and categories. This study focused on analyzing some features of pronunciation, which was used to measure students' level of intelligibility, i.e. segmental (monophthong, diphthong, and silent later) and suprasegmental (stress and voice quality) (Thuv, 2015).

Participants

There were five students pointed as the subject of this research, in which those students are the member of an English club called GEC in Mandalika University of Education. The five subjects fit the determined criteria, in which they are were categorized as senior students in the organization or has joint the organization for at least one year and actively participating in the provided training class twice to three times a week. The first subject has been joining the GEC for three years and often take part in English competition such as public speaking competition. The second subject has been joining GEC for four years and joint an English course outside the campus. The third subject has been joining GEC for four years and also often take part in English competition such as public speaking contest. The fourth subject has been joining GEC for three years and also often take part in English competition such as public speaking contest. The fifth subject has been joining GEC for five years and also often take part in English competition such as public speaking contest.

Data Collection and Analysis Methods

The data for this study was collected through two methods: indirect observation and face to face interview. In the observation stage, a reading passage titled "The Boy Who Cried Wolf" was used as the instrument. A native speaker acted as a rater during the observation. The subjects were asked to read the passage aloud, and their readings were recorded for later evaluation by the rater. Within the passage, specific words related to different pronunciation features were observed, including eight words with monophthong sounds (sheep, saw, muttering, rushed, chase, wolf, laughed), four words with diphthong sounds (graze, decided, cried, entire), and three words with consonant or silent letters (could, fright, thought). In addition to the observation, a face-to-face interview session was conducted. The interview consisted of seven questions focused on students' learning habits. In this study, the data analysis approach adhered to (Creswell, 2009) suggested six-step framework. These steps involved preparing and organizing the data for analysis, reviewing all the collected data, initiating a comprehensive coding process, utilizing coding to develop a description of the setting or

individuals, determining how to present the description and themes in the qualitative narrative, and interpreting and assigning meaning to the data.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Data from observation on students' oral English performance shows various level of pronunciation quality as rated by a native speaker rater, in terms of suprasegmental and segmental speech features. Thus, interview with the students reveals a list of habits affects their oral English performance mentioned above. The following sections denote these facts that lead to findings of this study.

Students' Pronunciation

The findings of this study suggest that students face greater challenges in mastering suprasegmental aspects compared to segmental features when it comes to achieving adequate levels of intelligibility. Specifically, it was observed that voice quality and silent letter proved to be the most difficult elements for the students to attain proficiency in. This observation is supported by the data presented in Table 1, which illustrates the individual performance of each student across both suprasegmental and segmental elements.

Table 1

Pronunciation Level

Subject	Suprasegmental		Segmental			Score
	Stress (1-15)	Voice Quality (1-15)	Monophthong (1-8)	Diphthong (1-4)	Silent Letter (1-3)	
1	10	4	6	4	0	24
2	12	3	6	4	1	30
3	8	4	3	4	2	21
4	13	8	6	4	2	33
5	12	9	6	4	3	34

In Table 1, the proficiency of students in pronouncing words in different categories is presented. The results reveal that the category in which the highest number of students demonstrated correct pronunciation was diphthongs and word stress. Students performed well in this category, showing a strong understanding of these linguistic aspects. On the other hand, the category of voice quality stood out as the area with the lowest scores. It indicates that

students struggled the most with achieving the appropriate voice quality when pronouncing words. This finding highlights the need for focused attention and improvement in this particular aspect of pronunciation.

Subject 1 achieved a total score of 24, which can be further broken down into 14 for suprasegmental features and 10 for segmental features. When examining the suprasegmental features, Subject 1 scored 10 out of 15 in the word stress category and 4 out of 15 in the voice quality category. Turning to the segmental features, Subject 1 obtained 6 out of 8 in the monophthong category, 4 out of 4 in the diphthong category, and unfortunately, 0 out of 3 in the silent letter category.

Subject 2 obtained 30 score, in which this is higher compared to subject 1. The score was break down to 15 score in suprasegmental and 11 score in segmental. Within the suprasegmental features, subject 2 obtained 12 out of 15 in the category of word stress and 3 out of 15 in the category of voice quality. Meanwhile, in the features of segmental, subject 2 obtained 6 out of 8 in the category of monophthong, 4 out of 4 in the category of diphthong, and 1 out of 3 in the category of silent letter.

Subject 3 obtained 21 score, in which this was the lowest score. The score was break down to 12 score in suprasegmental and 9 score in segmental. Within the suprasegmental features, subject 3 obtained 8 out of 15 in the category of word stress and 4 out of 15 in the category of voice quality. Meanwhile, in the features of segmental, subject 3 obtained 3 out of 8 in the category of monophthong, 4 out of 4 in the category of diphthong, and 2 out of 3 in the category of silent letter.

Subject 4 obtained 33 score, in which this was higher compare to the three earlier subjects. The score was break down to 21 score in suprasegmental and 12 score in segmental. Within the suprasegmental features, subject 4 obtained 13 out of 15 in the category of word stress and 8 out of 15 in the category of voice quality. Meanwhile, in the features of segmental, subject 4 obtained 6 out of 8 in the category of monophthong, 4 out of 4 in the category of diphthong, and 2 out of 3 in the category of silent letter.

Subject 5 obtained 34 score, in which this was the highest score. The score was break down to 22 score in suprasegmental and 13 score in segmental. Within the suprasegmental features, subject 5 obtained 12 out of 15 in the category of word stress and 9 out of 15 in the category of voice quality. Meanwhile, in the features of segmental, subject 5 obtained 6 out of 8 in the category of monophthong, 4 out of 4 in the category of diphthong, and 3 out of 3 in the category of silent letter.

Related to three levels of pronunciation elaborated earlier in the literature review, it can be observed that only Subject 5 and Subject 4 potentially belong to level 3 of pronunciation. Subject 5 demonstrated incomparable performance, achieving the highest score among all participants, indicating quite proficient in both suprasegmental and segmental features. Similarly, Subject 4 also exhibited indications of level 3 pronunciation, attaining a score surpassing the three preceding subjects. Subject 4's overall score implies that their English pronunciation is comprehensible and considered acceptable, further supporting the level 3 proficiency.

Students' Learning Habits

Table 2

Learning habits

Questions	Strategies & Activities	Response				
		1	2	3	4	5
Hobbies & Activities	Listening & watching	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Speaking Partner	Speaking with friends	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
	Speaking with foreigners	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓
	Speaking to him/herself	✗	✗	✗	✓	
Preferred place to practice	English community	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Tourism Places	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓
	Join English course	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗
Activities inside & outside the class of lecturing	Pay attention to lecturer	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Speak with lecturer	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗
	Learning vocabularies	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗
	Reading	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓
	Sharing with friends	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓
	Learn pronunciation	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗
	Study Tour	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓
	English Competition	✓	✗	✓	✗	✓

A total of seven questions were posed to the students to gather insights into their English language improvement strategies. These questions encompassed various aspects, such as hobbies related to English, activities both within and outside the classroom, engagement

beyond the GEC community, preferred speaking or practice partners, and locations frequented to practice English. By exploring these areas, a comprehensive understanding of the students' approaches to enhancing their English proficiency was obtained.

In the interview, Subject 1 provided insights into her approach to improving her English language skills. When asked about her hobbies and activities, she mentioned various practices such as listening to English songs, engaging in conversations with fluent English-speaking friends, watching English movies without subtitles, actively learning vocabulary and pronunciation, and participating in public speaking competitions. These activities demonstrate a well-rounded effort to enhance different aspects of language acquisition.

On the other hand, Subject 2 approached English language improvement differently. When asked the same questions, she revealed that she focused on reading and speaking practice within the classroom setting, rather than specifically targeting pronunciation skills. This suggests that Subject 2 prioritizes the development of reading comprehension and oral fluency as essential components of language learning.

Overall, both Subject 1 and Subject 2 showcase unique strategies for enhancing their English language abilities. While Subject 1 incorporates a wide range of activities outside the classroom, Subject 2 emphasizes classroom-based practices. These distinct approaches reflect individual preferences and highlight the diverse methods individuals employ to improve their language skills.

During the interview, Subject 3 shared insights into the activities and hobbies that contribute to their English language development. They mentioned engaging in activities such as listening to English songs, watching English movies, actively learning vocabulary, reading dictionaries for language reference, going on study tours, and participating in public speaking competitions. These activities indicate Subject 3's diverse approach to improving different language skills.

When asked about the places they went to practice English, Subject 3 mentioned solely being a part of the GEC community. This suggests that they primarily rely on this community for language practice and immersion. Moving on to Subject 4, similar to the previous subjects, they also emphasized listening to music as part of their language learning routine. However, Subject 4 specifically focused on enhancing their speaking skills through regular practice. This indicates a more targeted effort to improve their oral communication abilities.

Subject 5 followed a similar pattern as Subject 4, with a greater emphasis on speaking practice and exposure to native English speakers. They also actively participated in public speaking competitions, further enhancing their confidence and proficiency in spoken English.

In summary, each subject demonstrated a unique approach to improving their English language skills. Subject 3 engaged in a diverse range of activities, while Subject 4 and Subject 5 placed particular emphasis on speaking practice. These individual strategies highlight the multifaceted nature of language acquisition and the importance of tailored approaches to suit personal preferences and goals.

The observation of students' scores, joined with their responses during interviews, provides valuable insights into their English learning approaches and outcomes. It becomes evident that students who focus on developing both receptive and productive skills tend to excel compared to those who predominantly rely on receptive skills alone. Subject 4 and Subject 5, who obtained higher scores compared to the other three students, attributed their success to not only listening to English songs and watching English movies but also actively engaging in speaking practice.

On the contrary, Subject 3, who struggled the most in various aspects of pronunciation, shared similar habits with Subject 5. Interestingly, it was observed that Subjects 3, 4, and 5 did not specifically focus on learning pronunciation but instead relied on listening to improve their pronunciation skills. In contrast, Subject 1, who achieved a slightly higher score than Subject 3, benefited from joining an English course and actively learning pronunciation. This factor likely contributed to her better overall performance.

Despite the differences among the subjects, there was a common observation in terms of voice quality. Almost all subjects exhibited similar results in this aspect, indicating that their voice quality had a consistent impact on their overall performance. This highlights the significance of voice training and development in language learning, as it plays a crucial role in effective communication.

After carefully examining the findings above, two key points emerge. Firstly, there is a notable correlation between students' pronunciation abilities and their learning habits. This suggests that certain learning approaches and strategies may impact the development of pronunciation skills. Secondly, it is observed that the mastery of suprasegmental features of pronunciation tends to pose greater challenges compared to segmental features. This indicates that aspects such as stress, intonation, and rhythm require more focused attention and practice for learners to achieve proficiency.

Pronunciation ability vs. learning habits

By comparing the performances of the students and considering their learning habits, it can be concluded that those students who actively engaged in both receptive and productive skills in their English language learning demonstrated better outcomes compared to those who predominantly focused on receptive skills alone. Four main basic skills in English language are listening, speaking, reading, and writing. As these four basic skills are put or written in sequences, it is noticed that learning process starts from receptive and followed by productive skills. As what has been stated by (Lorena & Sadiku, 2015), listening and speaking are the skills that highly interrelated and work simultaneously in real life situations and aims at fostering effective oral communication. While reading and writing form a strong relationship with each other as skills or tools for attaining an effective written communication.

The integration of receptive and productive skills shows that learning process should be given the same portion to each skill. In this context, the quality of input, which refers to the language exposure and materials students engage with, is crucial in determining the quality of language acquisition. According to (Picciano, 2017), in line with behaviorist principles, learning outcomes are influenced by the way students respond to specific stimuli. These stimuli, when consistently repeated, can be assessed, measured, and ultimately controlled for each individual's learning process.

English educators should be concerned about this imbalance and strive to motivate students to enhance both their receptive (listening and reading) and productive (speaking and writing) language skills. By providing guided or independent learning opportunities that encourage active language use, educators can create a more balanced and effective learning environment aligned with behaviorist principles.

To delve further into this discussion, it is crucial to incorporate the concept of short-term memory and long-term memory into the language acquisition process. Short-term memory, also known as working memory, serves as a vital tool for transferring information to long-term memory and plays a significant role in language acquisition (Hermagustiana, 2018). Hermagustiana provides an illustration of how working memory operates. Working memory is essential for activities such as recalling the sentence we must write while striving to spell the words accurately and retaining the teacher's instructions while accomplishing specific steps in the task. This statement shows that when language receptive skills (input) is not brought to activity of productive skills (output), may leads to quick forgetfulness and weakness in

understanding the use of language features. According to (Hermagustiana, 2018) information will rapidly disappear permanently unless we actively try to preserve it.

Suprasegmental vs. segmental features

Suprasegmental features of pronunciation proved to be challenging for all subjects involved in this study. The definition of voice quality provided by (Kreiman et al., 2003) suggests that it encompasses the coordinated actions of various components, including the respiratory system, vocal folds, tongue, jaw, lips, and soft palate, resulting in the perceived outcome. None of the students' learning habits directly address this comprehensive definition. Several factors may contribute to the increased difficulty of suprasegmental features compared to segmental features. Firstly, suprasegmental features are characterized by their abstract and intricate nature, involving intonation, stress, and rhythm, which extend beyond individual segments and encompass the organization and timing of sounds. Furthermore, the perception and production of suprasegmental features heavily rely on implicit knowledge and sensitivity to timing, pitch, and stress patterns, rendering their development more challenging compared to segmental features, which focus on individual sounds and phonemes.

CONCLUSION

From the preceding discussion, several key points emerge. Firstly, in terms of segmental features, students demonstrated good proficiency in pronouncing diphthongs and monophthong vowels, but they encountered difficulties with silent letters. This indicates a need for further attention and practice in mastering silent letter pronunciations.

Secondly, in relation to suprasegmental features, all subjects displayed a lack of proficiency in voice quality. This suggests that students need to work on developing their voice projection, intonation, and overall vocal clarity to enhance their communicative effectiveness. Furthermore, the correlation between learning habits and students' intelligibility highlights the importance of actively improving English skills through both receptive (listening and reading) and productive (speaking and writing). This means, merely focusing on practicing these skills alone may not be sufficient to address voice quality issues. Therefore, students should also be acquainted with the theories of pronunciation, as pronunciation is a technical skill with specific guidelines for each phonetic element. Moreover, while being receptive facilitates understanding, it does not guarantee being understood if individuals do not consistently apply the acquired knowledge in productive activities. Therefore, it is critical for students to strike a

balance between receptive and productive language practice to improve both comprehension and expression abilities.

In conclusion, students should pay attention to segmental features such as silent letters and work on improving their voice quality as a part of their overall language development. Additionally, understanding the theories of pronunciation and actively applying them in productive activities is essential for effective communication. By adopting a comprehensive approach that encompasses receptive and productive skills, students can enhance their English proficiency and ensure better intelligibility in their spoken language.

REFERENCES

Berry, D. M. (n.d.). Level up your Pronunciation: Impact of a Mobile Game 1. In *MEXTESOL Journal* (Vol. 45, Issue 1).

Berry, D. M. (2021). Level up your Pronunciation: Impact of a Mobile Game 1. In *MEXTESOL Journal* (Vol. 45, Issue 1).

Creswell, J. W. (2019). *The Third Edition. Research Design, Qualitative Quantitative and Mixed Method Approaches*. University of Nebraska, Lincoln, SAGE publication.

Destiyana, D., & Laila, M. (2020). The Intelligibility of Indonesian Learners of English (ILE) in Understanding the Pronunciation of English Spoken by Thai Students. *Ethical Lingua: Journal of Language Teaching and Literature*, *7*(2), 419–425. https://doi.org/10.30605/25409190.220

Gilakjani, A. P. (2012). The significance of pronunciation in English language teaching. *English Language Teaching*, *5*(4), 96–107. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n4p96

Hermagustiana, I. (2018). *Istanti Hermagustiana-The Importance of Working Memory in Acquiring Second Language (L2) CaLLs* (Vol. 4).

Kang, O., Thomson, R. I., & Moran, M. (2020). Which features of accent affect understanding? Exploring the intelligibility threshold of diverse accent varieties. *Applied Linguistics*, *41*(4), 453–480. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amy053

Kreiman, J., Van, D., Sidtis, L., & Gerratt, B. (2003). *Defining and measuring voice quality*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/237236417

Lok Raj Sharma. (2021). Significance of Teaching the Pronunciation of Segmental and Suprasegmental Features of English. *Interdisciplinary Research in Education*, *6*(2), 63–78. https://doi.org/10.3126/ire.v6i2.43539

Lorena, C., & Sadiku, M. (2015). The Importance of Four Skills Reading, Speaking, Writing, Listening in a Lesson Hour. *European Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, *1*(1).

Miller, R. T. (2019). English Orthography and Reading. In *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching* (pp. 1–7). John Wiley & Sons, Inc. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0461

Moedjito, Jaelani, S. R., & Asrobi, M. (2019). What makes EFL speakers' utterances more intelligible in the context of global intelligibility? *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *9*(1), 157–166. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v9i1.15235

Pardede, P., Universitas, K., & Indonesia, J. (2010). *The Role of Pronunciation in a Foreign Language Program The Role of Pronunciation in a Foreign Language Program* ∗. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/337276730

Picciano, A. G. (2017). Theories and frameworks for online education: Seeking an integrated model. In *Online Learning Journal* (Vol. 21, Issue 3, pp. 166–190). The Online Learning Consortium. https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v21i3.1225

Schunk, D. H. (2012). *Learning theories : an educational perspective*. Pearson.

Seoane, E. (2016). *World Englishes Today* (pp. 1–16). https://doi.org/10.1075/veaw.g57.01seo

Thuv, Therese. (2015). How to Unravel Their Stories. The Tracing and Analysis of Narratives. North University

Wang, X. (2022a). Segmental versus Suprasegmental: Which One is More Important to Teach? In *RELC Journal* (Vol. 53, Issue 1, pp. 194–202). SAGE Publications Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688220925926

Wang, X. (2022b). Segmental versus Suprasegmental: Which One is More Important to Teach? In *RELC Journal* (Vol. 53, Issue 1, pp. 194–202). SAGE Publications Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688220925926

Zahro, S. K. (2019). Native and Non-Native Listeners Perceptual Judgement of English Accentedness, Intelligibility, and Acceptability of Indonesian Speakers. *Lingua Cultura*, *13*(1), 39. https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v13i1.5362