TONGUE TWISTER AS AN ICE BREAKER IN BOOSTING STUDENTS' SPEAKING ABILITY

Nopa Yusnilita
Nurul Afifah
Universitas Baturaja
Nopald14unbara@gmail.com

Abstract: This study discussed about how tongue twister effective in boosting students' speaking ability at the tenth graders of MAN 1 OKU. To collect data, the researcher used test in the form of recording video as an instrument. The methodology of this research was experimental research and the researcher used Quasi experimental method. From the population, the researcher took class X.IPA3 and X.IPS 1 as samples of this research, where X.IPA 3 was as the experimental class, and X.IPS 1 as the control class. The total number of sample was 72. The samples were taken by using simple random sampling. The students' mean score in pretest in control class was 4.66 while the pretest in experimental class was 6.49. The mean score in posttest in control class was 4.94 and the mean score of posttest in experimental class was 7.36. Based on the distribution of students' score in pre-test and post-test Tongue Twister strategy was effective in boosting students' speaking ability to the tenth Graders of MAN1 OKU because the students' score in post-test was better than pre-test both in control class and experimental class, and the significant difference is seen in experimental class that is taught by tongue twister. The minimum scores in pre-test were 1.67 in each class, and and the maximum score were 6.94 and 8.33, while the minimum scores in post-test were 1.67 and 5, while the maximum score was 7.5 and 9.17. If the value of Sig. (2-tailed) = 0,000 more than the Significance level (α=0,05) it means that it was significantly effective to use Tongue Twister strategy in boosting students' speaking ability at the tenth graders of MAN 1 OKU.

Keywords: Tongue Twister, Speaking, Ice Breaker

Introduction

Speaking is the activity to express thought and feeling orally (Djiwandono in Munir, 2005). Speaking is the capability in pronouncing sound or word to express or convey though, idea or feeling, opinion, and wish (Haryanto in Sunardi, 2004, p. 13). If both speaking and ability are combined, so it means a capability to utter the articulation of sound to express or to deliver thought, opinion and wish to the other person.

Speaking is the productive skill of a language to express the idea or to send message to the hearer. It means that when one speaks, he/she produces the expressions that should be meaningful (Harmer, 2007, p. 265). Indeed, wherever people intend to learn or to understand a spoken language, they use the language by speaking. Pronunciation is as a part of speaking that the learners need to be a concern on because people can do some conversation if both of them understand what they are talking about. In the teaching pronunciation, the teacher needs find a good way to teach.

Moreover, there were some important aspects that students should know to improve their pronunciation skill.

The ability to speak using accurate pronunciation is very important. If we do mispronounce while speaking, it makes the listener difficult to understand what we are talking about. Furthermore, it can be one of the factors which can lead to the conversation breakdown. The fact, most of Indonesian students' pronunciation abilities are still low. They consider pronunciation as the difficult subject since the sounds of words are usually different from their written form. They feel confuse and difficult to pronounce some English words, especially the unfamiliar one.

In this research, researcher used tongue twisters as astrategy to learn to speak this time. A tongue twister is a strategythat is aimed to consolidate the English sounds students have learned by creating a game like atmosphere for practice (Alemi, 2016). Role play and tongue twisters can be quite simple and are good strategies to organize. A tongue twister is a series of words or a longer piece, like a poem, constructed to be difficult to pronounce properly. Tongue twisters are used to create humor by challenging students to repeat the tongue twister very fast and listening to the funny results. Tongue twisters are also useful in understanding how we process the pronunciation of language (Revathy, 2016).

Tongue twister strategy which consists of a combination of sounds that are hard for the mouth and tongue to manage especially for non-native learners are meaningful tools to improve pronunciation, indeed for further, the ability to speak. By means of this, however, Pardede (2010) stated that mastering a foreign language speaking is not something impossible as far as the students and the teacher participate together in the total learning process, especially when creative technique is approached. Here in this research, the researcher will use this strategy to boost students' speaking ability by seeing how challenging this to be highlighted in teaching speaking when it comes to be practiced each pieces of tongue twister itself in days, frequently. Hence, hopefully the speaking ability will follow since the students are engaged to speak by repeating, practicing, imitating the words in series of tongue twister.

Siegenthaler (2007) defined ice breakers as the reception of corrective or evaluative information from the original sources, and as a secret means for sharing personal thoughts in motivating students to learn a language. Motivating students to get the ability in a language fields in terms to the success of the lesson is essential. It is important to break the ice of students in a positive way especially when it comes to be the teaching strategy involving as that ice breaker essential. Kanu (2011) stated that the situation drawn in ice breaker used at the beginning, whilst or the end of the learing sequences will introduce the students to confirm or review the material by creative way.

Said (2010) said that Ice Breaker is a game or activity that serves to change the atmosphere of ice in the group. Ice breaker is defined as a fun way to support the objective of presentation, even all human activities require the presence of Ice Breaker. Ice breakers are aimed to eliminate barriers between students, as creation of dynamic conditions among students, create motivation among fellow students to perform

activities during the learning process takes place, and directing the participants on the topic being discussed.

Meanwhile, Sunarto (2011) said that ice breaker is a strategy to improve students' excitement in hindrance of boring situation in the class, so that the students' interest in learning appeared. In conclusion, ice breaker is a transition from boring situations, drowsiness, saturation and tension to relax, excitement, and the intention is to make the learning goal is retrieved.

Methodology

This research used quasi experimental design. A quasi-experiment is an empirical interventional study used to estimate the causal impact of an intervention on target population without random assignment. In this research, the researcher will use non-equivalent control group design, where it is almost similar to the pre-test and post-test control group design. The sample of this research was the X.A.3 and X.S.1which each consisted of 36 students. One class was as the experimental class and the other one was as the control class.

The data were collected through oral test. This instrument took the form of an individual speaking test in the form of a monologue that would be applied to the pre and post test to see the significance of the speaking developments of the research subjects. This test was performed on pre-test and post-test which in both tests had the same procedure only different at the time of its application, as for the procedure as follows: The researcher provided some topics to be randomly selected by the students; They then talked within 3 minutes about the topic chosen; Assessment at the same time conducted by researchers and research members; and recording process continued so that data obtained can be re-checked. In collecting data also, there were two raters in analyzing the students' speaking in a recording. The raters were the researcher herself and the English teacher in MAN 01 OKU.

In analyzing the data, the researcher recorded students' speaking activity, or the students themselves did that. After that,the researcher transcribed it. And it scoring by using rubric. Technique of data analysis in this research was adopted from Heaton (2010) analysis techniques with adaptation by the researcher herself as the purpose of this research. This measured fluency, accuracy, grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation and comprehension. To check whether the samples of this research had normal distribution or not, the researcher used Kolmogorov-Smirnov throughSPSS 21.0. To determine that the data had normal distribution or not. And then to analyze the data from the result of experiment that used pre-test and post-test of experimental and control class, the researcher used paired sample t-test with SPSS 21 to analyze data.

Result and Discussion

1. The Result of Pre-test in Control Class

Pre-test in control classwas conducted on Monday, February 10th 2020 of students in X.S.1 class were 36 students. The researcher got all of the student's score

which was consisted of 36 items. The result scores of pre-test is in appendix, the total score of the students was 168 and mean was 4.66.The highest score was 6.94and the lowest score was 1.67.

Table 1
The Students' Score of Pre-test in Control Class

	Names	Students' Score		Total Score
		R1	R2	
	ASM	5.56	5.56	5.56
	APA	6.67	6.67	6.67
	AM	4.17	4.17	4.17
	BL	2	2.44	2.22
	DK	4	4.34	4.17
	DSR	4.15	4.2	4.17
	D	1.45	1.9	1.67
	DO	4.17	4.17	4.17
	DA1	1.67	1.67	1.67
	DA2	6.15	5.5	5.83
	ECP	4.44	4.44	4.44
	EI	4.44	4.44	4.44
	F	2.3	2.7	2.5
	FS	2	1.88	1.94
	JR	1.84	2.04	1,94
	LA	5.83	5.83	5.83
	LTF	5.83	5.83	5.83
	MF	4.25	4.08	4.17
	MR	2.5	2.5	2.5
	MO	6.67	6.67	6.67
	MH	4	4.88	4.44
	MRS	4.44	4.44	4.44

NA	4.25	4.08	4.17
OS	4.44	4.44	4.44
PPY	5.83	5.83	5.83
RH	5.75	5.9	5.83
RNF	6.11	6.11	6.11
RJ	5.83	5.83	5.83
RAR	6.6	6.73	6.67
RIS	6.39	6.95	6.67
RO	5.83	5.83	5.83
TQ	4.25	4.08	4.17
TE	4.72	4.72	4.72
TB	5.83	5.83	5.83
WA	6.9	6.98	6.94
YL	5.83	5.83	5.83
TOTAL	**167.09**	**169, 49**	**168**
AVERAGE	4.64	4.71	**4.66**
MAX SCORE	6.9	6.98	**6.94**
MIN SCORE	1.45	1.67	**1.67**

The maximum score was 6.94 and minimum score was 1.67. The researcher used Inter-rater reliability. Inter-rater reliability was essentially a variation of the students' score.

2. The Result of Pre-Test in Experimental Class

Pre-test in experimental classwas conducted on Monday, February 10th 2020 of students in X.A.1 class were 36 students. The researcher got all of the student's score which was consisted of 36 items.

Table 2
The Students' Score of Pre-test in Experimental Class

No	Names	Students' Score		Total Score
		R1	R2	
1	AS	6,67	6,67	6.67
2	AR	6,67	6,67	6.67
3	ARM	6,67	6,67	6.67
4	AMJ	8,33	8,33	8.33
5	AAK	8,33	8,33	8.33
6	AY	6,67	6,67	6.67
7	DW	5,83	5,83	5.83
8	DIS	6,67	6,67	6.67
9	DZF	6,67	6,67	6.67
10	DA	8,33	8,33	8.33
11	DT	5,83	5,83	5.83
12	EAP	7,22	7,22	7.22
13	FOP	4	4,33	4.17
14	FAG	8,33	8,33	8.33
15	HH	6,67	6,67	6.67
16	JA	6,67	6,67	6.67
17	KA	6,67	6,67	6.67
18	LTA	5,83	5,83	5.83
19	MID	8,33	8,33	8.33
20	MAA	4,16	4,18	4.17
21	MPS	5,83	5,83	5.83
22	NP	6,11	6,11	6.11
2	NA	5,83	5,83	5.83

2 3				
2 4	NR	5,83	5,83	5.83
2 5	OS	8,33	8,33	8.33
2 6	PDS	6,11	6,11	6.11
2 7	RS	5,83	5,83	5.83
2 8	RD	5,83	5,83	5.83
2 9	RA	6,11	6,11	6.11
3 0	RM	8,33	8,33	8.33
3 1	RK	5,83	5,83	5.83
3 2	RC W	4,17	4,17	4.17
3 3	SAD C	6,11	6,11	6.11
3 4	SU	4,17	4,17	4.17
3 5	SG	6,11	6,11	6.11
3 6	ZP	8,33	8,33	8.33
TOTAL		233.41	233.76	233.59
AVERAGE		6.48	6.49	6.49
MAX SCORE		8.33	8.33	8.33
MIN SCORE		1.45	1.67	1.67

The maximum score was 8.33 and minimum score was 1.67. The researcher used Inter-rater reliability. Inter-rater reliability was essentially a variation of the students' score.

3. The Result of Post-Test in Control Class

Post-test in control classwas conducted on Thursday, February 19th 2020 of students in X.S.1 class were 36 students. The researcher got all of the student's score which was consisted of 36 items.

Table 3
The Students' Score of Post-test in Control Class

	Names	Students' Score		Total Score
		R1	R2	
	ASM	5.83	5.83	5.83
	APA	6,92	6,98	6,94
	AM	4,17	4,17	4,17
	BL	4,17	4,17	4,17
	DK	4,17	4,17	4,17
	DSR	4,22	4,88	4,44
	D	2,25	2,75	2,5
	DO	4,17	4,17	4,17
	DA1	1,67	1,67	1,67
	DA2	5,83	5,83	5,83
	ECP	4,44	4,44	4,44
	EI	4,44	4,44	4,44
	F	4,44	4,44	4,44
	FS	2,5	2,5	2,5
	JR	4,44	4,44	4,44
	LA	6,11	6,11	6,11
	LTF	6,96	6,92	6,94
	MF	4,44	4,44	4,44
	MR	2,8	2,79	2,78
	MO	6,94	6,94	6,94
	MH	4,44	4,44	4,44
	MRS	4,44	4,44	4,44
	NA	6,11	6,11	6,11
	OS	4,44	4,44	4,44

	PPY	5,83	5,83	5,83
	RH	6,11	6,11	6,11
	RNF	5,83	5,83	5,83
	RJ	6,11	6,11	6,11
	RAR	7,22	7,22	7,22
	RIS	6,67	6,67	6,67
	RO	5,83	5,83	5,83
	TQ	4,17	4,17	4,17
	TE	5,83	5,83	5,83
	TB	5,83	5,83	5,83
	WA	7,25	7,75	7,5
	YL	5,83	5,83	5,83
TOTAL		**177.02**	**178,69**	**177.72**
AVERAGE		4.92	4.96	**4.94**
MAX SCORE		7.25	7.75	**7.5**
MIN SCORE		1.67	1.67	**1.67**

The maximum score was 7.5 and minimum score was 1.67. The researcher used Inter-rater reliability. Inter-rater reliability was essentially a variation of the students' score.

4. The Result of Post-Test in Experimental Class

Post-test in experimental classwas conducted on Thursday, February 19th 2020 of students in X.A.3 class were 36 students. The researcher got all of the student's score which was consisted of 36 items.

Table 4
The Students' Score of Post-test in Experimental Class

	Names	Students' Score		Total Score
		R1	R2	
	AS	8,33	8,33	8,33
	AR	8,33	8,33	8,33
	ARM	8,33	8,33	8,33
	AMJ	8,61	8,61	8,61
	AAK	8,61	8,61	8,61
	AY	7,78	7,78	7,78
	DW	6,39	6,39	6,39
	DIS	8,61	8,61	8,61
	DZF	8,33	8,33	8,33
	DA	9,17	9,17	9,17
	DT	8,33	8,33	8,33
	EAP	8,33	8,33	8,33
	FOP	4.7	5.3	5
	FAG	8,89	8,89	8,89
	HH	7,25	7,75	7,5
	JA	8,61	8,61	8,61
	KA	8,61	8,61	8,61
	LTA	6,39	6,39	6,39
	MID	8,61	8,61	8,61
	MAA	5,28	5,28	5,28
	MPS	6,11	6,11	6,11
	NP	6,11	6,11	6,11
	NA	6,11	6,11	6,11
	NR	6,39	6,39	6,39

	OS	8,89	8,89	8,89
	PDS	6,39	6,39	6,39
	RS	6,11	6,11	6,11
	RD	6,11	6,11	6,11
	RA	6,11	6,11	6,11
	RM	8,61	8,61	8,61
	RK	6,11	6,11	6,11
	RCW	5	5	5
	SADC	8,33	8,33	8,33
	SU	5	5	5
	SG	6,39	6,39	6,39
	ZP	9,17	9,17	9,17
TOTAL		**259.73**	**260.23**	**264.98**
AVERAGE		7.22	7.23	**7.36**
MAX SCORE		9.17	9.17	**9.17**
MIN SCORE		5	5	**5**

The maximum score was 9.17 and minimum score was 5. The researcher used Inter-rater reliability. Inter-rater reliability was essentially a variation of the students' score.

5. The Comparison of Pre-tests and Post-tests in Control Class

The distribution of students' score of pre-test between the control class and experimentl class was described in Table 5.

Table 5
The Distribution of Students' Pre-test and Post-test Score

No	Percentage Range	Criteria	Frequency and Percentage	
			Pre-test	Post-test
1	>8.1-10	A (Very Good)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
2	6.6-8	B (Good)	5 (13.89%)	6 (16.67%)
3	5.6- 6.5	C (Average)	11 (30.56%)	12 (33.34%)
4	4.1- 5.5	D (Poor)	13 (36.11%)	14 (38.89%)
5	<4	E (Very Poor)	7 (19.45%)	4 (11.11%)
Total			36 (100%)	36 (100%)

The table showed in control class, from 36 students, there were 7 students (19.45%), and 4 students (11.11%) in Very Poor category. There were 13 students (36.11%) and 14 students (38.89%) in Poor category. There were 11 students (30.56%) and 12 students (33.34%) in Average category. And, the last, there were 5 students (13.89%) and 6 students (16.67%) in Good category.

6. The Comparison of Pre-test and Post-test in Experimental Class

Table 6
The Distribution of Students' Post-test and Post-test Score

No	Percentage Range	Criteria	Frequency and Percentage	
			Pre-test	Post-test
1	>8.1-10	A (Very Good)	0 (0%)	18 (50%)
2	6.6-8	B (Good)	6 (16.67%)	2 (5.56%)
3	5.6- 6.5	C (Average)	12 (33.34%)	12 (33.33%)
4	4.1- 5.5	D (Poor)	14 (38.89%)	4 (11.11%)
5	<4	E (Very Poor)	4 (11.11%)	0 (0%)
Total			36 (100%)	36 (100%)

The table showed in experimental class, from 36 students, there were 4 students (11.11%), and 0 students (0%) in very poor category. There was 14 students (38.89%) and 4 students (11.11%) in poor category. There were 12 students (33.33%), and 12 students (33.33%) in average category. There were 6 students (16.67%), and 2 students (5.56%) in good category. There were 0 students (0%), and 18 students (50%) in very good category.

8. Statistical Analysis

Before being taught the speaking by using Tongue Twister strategy or treatment, the students were given pre-test and the last was post-test. To find out whether or not there was significance in students' speaking ability between post-test and pre-test the researcher did a statistical analysis by using SPSS 21 program. The result can be seen in following table:

Table 7
Paired Sample T-test

Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
P a i r 1	Po stt est	3,02 78	36	1,13354	,18892
	Pr ete st	2,66 67	36	1,17108	,19518

Based on the table 6, it was found that mean score of Pre-test in Experiment class was 2,6667 and the mean of Post-test was 3,0278.

Table 8
Paired Samples Correlation

Paired Samples Correlation

	N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1 Posttest & Pretest	36	,674	,000

Based on Paired Sample Correlation between pre-test and post-test was 0,674 with the N 36 students and the significance level was 0,000.

Table 9
Paired Samples Test

Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences							Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	pretest – posttest	,3611	,93052	1,5509	,04627	,67595			,026

Based on the table of paired samples T-test the mean score of pre-test and post test in SPSS was 0.3611. On the table, it was found that the value linkage was 0.232 and the value of sig was 0.026 lower than significance level=0.05, it was a great linkage between the score of pre-test and post-test. The outcome of the t-test produced the t-value. This calculated t-value was then compred gainst a value obtained from critical value table (called the T-distribution table). This comparison helped to determine the effects of chance alone on the difference, and whether the difference was outside that chnce range. The t-test questions whether the difference between the groups represented a true difference in this research or if it was possibly a meaningless random difference, or to be said, no difference. In this research, the difference between variable A (pre test) and variable B (post test) in both control class and experimental class was appeared, with the significant t-value.

Based on the table above, it presented the value of t-obtained = 2.32 it was higher than t-table 1.713 with df=35 and value of sig. (2-tailed) = 0.026 it was lower

significance level =0.05. The differentiation of these scores gave significant effect in determined what the alternative hypoteses was accepted or rejected. Based on the explanation above, the researcher concluded that there was significant difference between pre-test and post-test. In hypothesis testing, based on the result of the paired sample t-test analysis on SPSS version 21 from experimental class, t-obtained was higher than t-table. So it can realize that Tongue Twister was effective to apply in boosting students' speaking ability.

Conclusion

Based on the research, the researcher got result that used of Tongue Twister strategy in boosting students' speaking ability to the tenth grade students of MAN 01 OKU was effective. In addition, by applying this strategy the students enjoyed the activities and motivated to memorize so that they are fleunt enough in speaking because in learning process the students could share their experience about the topic of the text and the students could try and try again whenever they are false to pronunce or say the similar words preceded on the text without feeling bored and giving up because in Tongue Twister strategy the students are interest. In this strategy the teacher engaged their learners in active thinking, enchanted to try again, is motivated to learn, never gives up, enjoyed the experience of sharing topics, and increase their knowledge. Tongue Twister strategy was effective in boosting students' speaking ability to the tenth grade students of MAN 01 OKU, especially in teaching speaking recount text.

References

Ajayi, V.O. (2017). *Primary Sources of Data and Secondary Sources of Data.* Makurdi: Benue State University Press

Alemi,M. (2016). *Audio Lingual Method.* New York: Beth Press.Retrivedfrom https://www.researchgate.net

Arikunto, S. (2006). *Dasar - dasar evaluasi pendidikan*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara

Arikunto, S. (2010). *Dasar - dasar evaluasi pendidikan*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara

Arty et.al. (1985).Introduction to Research in Education, 8th ed.New York: Wadsworth

Bailey, K. M. (2008). *Speaking in Practical English Language Teaching.* Singapore: MrGrawwHill

Batko, A. (2004). *When Bad Grammar Happens to Good People: How to Avoid Common Errors in English.* Franklin Lakes: Career Press

Brown, H. D. (2008). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (4th Ed.). New York: Longman

Brown, H.D. (2008). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. New York: Pearson

Burns,A. & Claire, S. (2003). *ClearlySpeaking.* Sydney: AMEP ResearchCentre Macquarie University

Cintron, M. K. (2018). *Tongue Twister Technique.* New York:Longman   Retrieved by http://www..esplayland.com/articles/tongue-twisters.html

Cohen, Louis, Manion,Lawrence, &Morrison, Keith. (2005). *ResearchMethodology in Education.* NewYork:Routledge

Cohen, Louis, Manion,Lawrence, &Morrison, Keith. (2007). *ResearchMethods in Education.* NewYork:Routledge

Creswell, J.W. (2012). *Educational research: planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research, 3rd ed*. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.

Creswell, J.W. (2014). *Educational research: planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research, 4th ed*. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.

Daniel. (2016). *Pronunciation Improvement in EFL Young Learners through Phonics Instruction.*Retrived fromhttps://www.researchgate.net

Djiwandono, M. (1996). *Tes Bahasa dalam Pengajaran*. Bandung: Penerbit ITB

Gay, L. R. (2009). *Educational Research: Comprehencies for Analysis and Application,* 9th ed.. New York: Merrill

Gilakjani, A.P. (2011). *A Study of Factors Affecting EFL Learners' English Pronunciation Learning and Strategies for Instruction. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science,* 2(3),119.

Gilakjani, A.P. (2012). *Goals of English Pronunciation Instruction. International Journal of Language Teaching and Research,* 1(1), 4.

Gonzales, N. I. (2009). *Learning English with Tongue Twister.* New York: Lulu Press Inc.

Harmer, J. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. New York: Longman

Haryanto (2004). *Teaching English Using Action Board Games to Improve Students' Vocabulary and Speaking Competence at SMP Inpres Mallengkeri 1*. Makassar: State University of Makassar

Hayati, A. M. (2010). *Notes on Teaching English Pronunciation to EFL Learners: A Case of Iranian High School Students. Canadian Center of Science and Education, ELT, 3(*4), 121-126.

Hiebert, E. H.& Kamil, M. L. (2005). *Teaching and Learning Vocabulary Bringing Research to Practice.* London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publisher

Iriani, T. (2015). *Improving Fifth Graders' Pronunciation of "Th" by Using Tongue Twisters.* Malang: Malang States University

Isnawati, I. (2014). *English Instructional Evaluation 1*. Tulungagung: State Islamic College of Tulungagung

Jamatlou, F. (2011). *Revising the Temporal Measures of L2 Oral Fluency: A Case of Iranian EFL Learners*. University of Groningen

Kanu, S. (2010). *Ice Breakers in English Classroom.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. (2013). *Peraturan menteri pendidikan dan kebudayaan Republik Indonesia Nomor 68 tahun 2013 tentang kerangka dasar dan struktur kurikulum Sekolah Menengah Pertama/Madrasah Tsanawiyah.* Jakarta: Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan

Kerlinger. (2006). *Asas-Asas Penelitian Behaviour*. 3rd ed. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.

Kridalaksana, H. (2008). *Kamus Linguistik.* Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama

Lestari, A. C. (2019). *The Effectiveness of Tongue Twister Technique to improve fluency and accuracy.* Surabaya: States University of Ampel Surabaya

Lidia, R. (2017). *Teaching Pronunciation by Using Tongue Twisters games to tenth grade students of SMA Banding Agung, OKU Selatan*. University of Baturaja

Majid, A. (2009). *Perencanaan pembelajaran*. Bandung: Rosda

Spratt, M., Pulvrness, A., etc. (2005). *Teaching Knowledge Test Course Modules 1, 2, 3.* Cambridge: Cambridge English Press

McKay, S.L. (2008). *Researching Second Language Classrooms (ESL & Applied Linguistics Professional Series 1ˢᵗ Ed.* San Fransisco: Fab Press

Munir, A. (2005). *Communication Strategies toward Students' Speaking Ability: A Classroom Study of Speaking.* Selong: Selong STKIP Hamzanwadi Publish

Pallant, J. (2007). *SPSS Survival Manual – A Step by Step Guide to Data Analysis Using SPSS for Windows* (3ʳᵈ ed.). Maindenhead Open University Press

Pardede, P.(2010). *The Role of Pronunciation in a Foreign Language Program*. Retrieved from https://parlindunganpardede.wordpress.com/2010/10/07/349 accessed in October 2015

Pollard, A. (2008). *Education, Schooling, and Learning for Life*. London: Reinhart and Winston

Pollard, A. (2010). *Education, Schooling, and Learning for Life*. 2nd ed. London: Reinhart and Winston

Prommak, S. (2010). *Thai University Students' Perspectives on English Pronunciation Awareness: Is It Ignored or Awakened?*. Thailand: Thaksin University

Purpura, J. E. (2006). *Assessing Grammar.* Cambridge: Cambridge University

Revathy, M., Phil, M. A., etc, (2016). *Enhancing Effective Speaking Skills through Role Play and Tongue Twisters*. New York: Cambridge University Press

Richards, J. C. & Schmidt, R. (2004). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics,* 3rd Ed.. London: Pearson Education Limited

Richards, J. C. (2009). *Teaching Listening and Speaking: From Theory to Practice (RELC Portfolio Series).* Singapore: Singapore Regional Language Center

Riyadi, S. & Sitoresmi (2016). *Tongue Twisters in Pronunciation Class.* Surakarta: States Univeristy of Surakarta

Said, M. (2010). *80+Ice Breaker Games-Kumpulan Permainan Penggugah Semangat.* Yogyakarta: Andi Offset

Schmitt. N. (2010). *Researching Vocabulary: A Vocabulary Research Manual*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan

Scott, W. A. & Ytreberg, L. H. (2010). *Teaching English to Children.* NewYork: Longman

Siegenthaler, W. (2007). *Differential Diagnosis in Ice Breakers Learning.* New York: Longman

Stewart, L. (2014). *Integrating Language Skills through Tongue Twisters Games.*England: English Teaching Forum (Number 2, 2014).

Stuckey, K. (2009). Tongue Twister as a Therapy Tool. Super Duper Publication. Retrieved from: www.superduperinc.com

Sudijono, A. (2010). Pengantar Statistik Pendidikan. Jakarta: Rajawali Press.

Sugiyono, (2008).Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatif dan R&D. Bandung. Alfabeta

Sunarto (2011). *Ice Breaker dalam Pembelajaran Aktif.* Surakarta: Yuman Pressindo

Syahbudin, S. (2008). *Pendekatan Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Penerang.

Tarigan, H. G. (2008). *Speaking as a Capability in Using Language*. Netherland: Proudge

Turk, M. A. (2003). *Allelophatic in Foreign Language.* Istanbul: Avena